1-1-1976

A study of some residual effects of a temporary dropout prevention program on participating parents and students located in a disadvantaged and majority Black school district.

Ulysses Byas
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
A STUDY OF SOME RESIDUAL EFFECTS OF A TEMPORARY DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM ON PARTICIPATING PARENTS AND STUDENTS LOCATED IN A DISADVANTAGED AND MAJORITY BLACK SCHOOL DISTRICT

A Dissertation Presented
By
ULYSSES BYAS

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
December 1976
Education
A STUDY OF SOME RESIDUAL EFFECTS OF A TEMPORARY DROP OUT
PREVENTION PROGRAM ON PARTICIPATING PARENTS
AND STUDENTS LOCATED IN A DISADVANTAGED
AND MAJORITY BLACK SCHOOL DISTRICT

A Dissertation Presented
By
ULYSSES BYAS

Approved as to style and content by:

Atron A. Gentry, Chairperson
William H. Greene, Member
Richard Green, Member

Grace J. Craig, Acting Dean
Education
Dedicated to
My Understanding Wife
Annamozel
and Our Children
Melanie, Eric, Laverne, Alisia
My Deceased Mother
Marie Byas Sharpe
and My Siblings
Robert, Sarah, Richard, Carl, William, Albert and Emily
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This writer is indebted to the entire faculty of the Center for Urban Education for their constructive criticisms and professional encouragement and help during the entire course of study.

Special appreciation is due to the members of the writer's dissertation committee. Dr. Atron Gentry, chairperson was a supportive source of inspiration and guidance from enrollment through the final oral examination. Further acknowledgement is due Dr. William Greene, who spent many hours giving expert assistance contributing to the completion of the course. And to Dr. Richard Green, whose added insights provided depth and purpose to my study.

Appreciation is extended to the many persons who rendered valuable technical assistance. Inclusive among these persons are Silvija Aprans, Oretha Hoffman, Sylvia Jackson and JoAnn Wright. Marilyn Pajot was a source of encouragement and her professional help throughout the entire study was indispensable.

The writer is further grateful to Dr. P.K. Biswas, Dr. J.H.M. Henderson, Mrs. Consuello Harper, Mr. Allen Adams and Dr. Ellis Hall, who as members of the Macon County
Board of Education gave encouragement and support.

This writer is also grateful to the Rockefeller Foundation, and especially, Mr. Bruce Williams and Dr. Charles Smith. The Foundation provided an internship through the Macon County Board of Education, which made this study possible.
ABSTRACT

A Study of Some Residual Effects of a Temporary Dropout Prevention Program on Participating Parents and Students Located in a Disadvantaged and Majority Black School District

(February 1977)

Ulysses Byas, B.A., Ford Valley State College
M.A., Teachers College Columbia University
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Dr. Atron A. Gentry

Project ARISE, a dropout prevention program, was operated for four years by the Macon County, Alabama, school system. The program was funded by the U.S. Office of Education under Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The program was designed on the premise that parents of dropout prone students could play central roles in reducing the incidence of dropout. The major task was to identify specific parental behaviors believed helpful to students staying in school. These specific parental behaviors became the job description of parent workers.

Project designers hypothesized that, given proper incentive, parent workers would assume these central roles and the changed parental behaviors could induce positive effects on student absenteeism, suspension, and dropouts.
The specific purpose of this research was to determine the extent to which certain job-required parental behaviors continued in the post-project year (1975-1976), and their probable effects on the incidences of absentees, suspensions and dropouts among two groups of target students.

Two general questions were of primary concern to the investigator: (1) Can the school in poverty environments design temporary intervention programs which could develop behaviors in parents which are pupil and school supportive? and (2) If these pupil and school supportive behaviors are developed in temporary systems, will they continue after such programs are terminated?

This study revealed that former parent workers discontinued most (seventy percent to eighty percent) of the specific ARISE job-required behaviors during the post-project year. The researcher concludes, however, when other data are examined, it is clear there remains some residual and identified parental behaviors supportive of the school behaviors influencing positively upon S2 subjects in this study. Another finding in this study, however, was that the residual effects of Project ARISE on another class of students (S3 subjects) was negligible.

viii
The researcher concluded that it is clear that parents in the lower socio-economic level are not apathetic about their children. They, like others, need the time, energy and financial resources as necessary bases upon which to manifest their concerns. Educational program designers should build intervention systems to meet these needs of disadvantaged parents to assure their active support and participation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Throughout the history of elementary and secondary schools in the United States, educators have been concerned with developing effective methods to transmit selected cognitive and skill elements of the culture to individuals through varied processes of teaching and learning. According to Bennis, this transmission process was designed to equip the individual with the knowledge and skills thought to be required in coping with his or her adult responsibilities as a person, as a citizen, and a member of one's vocational group.¹ Schooling through graduation from high school was determined to be necessary in order for the individual to obtain the skills and develop understandings necessary to effectively function in our democracy. Educators, therefore, have been concerned about the growing number of students dropping out before high school graduation, even though the percentage of persons who drop out has declined sharply. Documentation of this concern and efforts to reduce the incidence of dropouts

come from a wide variety of sources over an extended period of time.

It was estimated by the President's Commission in 1971\(^2\), that 850,000 pupils feel so alienated toward the schools that they leave each year as dropouts before developing the skills, attitudes and understandings essential for meeting their own needs, and thus limiting their capacity to effectively participate in the larger society. The dropout rate among Blacks is much higher than among whites. In a study of the total population in the eighteen to twenty-six age group, of which Blacks constitute less than eleven percent, it was revealed that Blacks contribute more than twenty-six percent of the dropouts.\(^3\) The growing proportion of black population in central cities suggests that in urban school districts, dropping out is a much more serious problem.\(^4\)

Realizing the serious threat of the dropout problem, the United States Congress under Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, as amended, authorized a


\(^4\) Alan K. Campbell, "The Metropolitan Education
ten million dollar annual expenditure to develop dropout prevention programs. The Act limited participation and financial assistance to the local education agency or intermediate education agency. It mandated that the emphasis of the program be focused on the development and demonstration of projects using innovative methods, systems, or materials in order to reduce the dropout rate.\textsuperscript{5} It suggested that proposal developers recognize that children begin to drop-out of school long before they reach the secondary level. Moreover, the legislation required an all inclusive and strict accountability system.

The U.S. Office of Education set forth the following criteria on which each proposal would be evaluated:

(1) Reflect careful analysis of need for a dropout prevention program in the target area and addresses itself to the greatest needs;

(2) Utilizes results of similar programs, research findings, and the knowledge of recognized experts;

(3) Provides for involvement of other cultural and educational resources in program planning and

operation, including dropouts and potential dropouts and their families;
(4) Delineates the target group as related to needs for a dropout prevention program;
(5) Identifies specific performance objectives aimed at reducing the number of children who may not complete their elementary and secondary school education;
(6) Selects and describes innovative methods, systems, materials and program procedures specifically designed to fulfill stated performance objectives;
(7) Provides for feasible and efficient management of project;
(8) Provides for systematic ongoing evaluation to determine the degree to which performance objectives have been met in terms of product outcomes, operational processes and management;
(9) Provides for systematic dissemination activities;
(10) Delineates a program with potential to serve as a model and to contribute to the solution of dropout problems common to all or several states;
(11) Provides an adequate and efficient budget for each program component of the proposed project in
a form that enables cost-benefit analysis;
(12) Indicates adequate local annual commitment to the proposed project;
(13) Provides for adequate technical assistance in program development and operation; and
(14) Proposes adequate plans for an independent educational accomplishment audit of the programs. 6

The Macon County School System, which was experiencing a dropout problem of significant proportions, decided to seek a grant under the Title VIII Act.

Background of Macon County, Alabama

Macon County is located forty miles east of Montgomery in South Central Alabama. The city of Tuskegee is located in the center of the county. It serves as county seat of the 616 square miles within the geographic limits of the county. According to the 1970 census the population was 24,841. Macon is rural, has an 84 percent black population and is economically depressed.

The laws of the state of Alabama require a five-member county board of education. The Macon County School System is responsible for policy and administration of all public elementary and secondary schooling in the district. Board of Education members are elected at large by popular

vote. The current board is composed of one black male, two white males, and two black females. The superintendent of education is appointed by the Board and serves as chief administrative officer and secretary of the Board. The current superintendent is a black male and has served for seven years in the position.

The school system enrolled 5,100 students in grades one through twelve during the 1974-75 school year. There are eight schools in the system: three with grades 1-12, one with grades 9-12, one with grades 1-8, and three with grades 1-7. The racial composition of the pupil population is 94 percent black and 6 percent white. The racial ratio of the staff is 87 percent black and 13 percent white.

Project ARISE\(^7\)

The first step taken by the Macon County School System in seeking a Title VIII grant was to study the extent of the dropout problem locally. Those students who completed a school year but did not return the following year never appeared in official dropout figures. In order to establish reliable base-line data, an intensive study

\(^7\)An acronym for Arranging for Reorganizing Instruction for Success in Education.
was conducted to identify what were called summer dropouts. The results of the investigation revealed that nearly one and one-half times as many students dropped out in the summer as in the preceding school year. More specifically, system-wide there were sixty-two official dropouts reported during the 1969-70 school year. Research confirmed ninety-one additional summer dropouts, thus affirming that the dropout problem was extensive in the Macon County School System. The course was charted, the system's dropout problem was serious--programmatic intervention was mandatory.

Project ARISE, in proposal form, was developed and submitted to federal officials for funding consideration under Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It was apparent to designers of Project ARISE that pupils who are successful in school have unqualified support from home, especially from parents and other adults. (The review of literature in Chapter Two cites several authorities who support this thesis.) The parents attend school sponsored events, know administrators and persons

---

teaching their children, and generally support community efforts to improve educational quality in local schools. They show an interest in pupils' work and achievement, encourage and help them to improve and make arrangements at home for time and proper study surroundings. These examples of parental behaviors, supportive of the school, probably are the most important factors contributing to the success of students, except of course, the students themselves.

With very few exceptions analysis of environmental factors in the life of dropout prone students in Macon County, revealed a striking absence of parental school supportive behaviors. Severe economic impoverishment, low educational achievement of parents, and restricted opportunities, among other things, contributed to parental indifference to the value of staying in school, doing well and graduating from high school. These parents apparently lacked the behavioral traits, mentioned above, which characterized parents of successful students. However, the program designers believed with McGregor⁹ that the

motivation for assuming responsibility, the readiness to
direct behavior toward educational goals were all present
in parents of dropout prone students. ARISE designers
assumed the responsibility of designing a program to make
it possible for these parents to exemplify and refine char-
acteristics supportive of the school and supportive of
their dropout prone youngsters.

Project ARISE was funded in 1971 by the U.S. Office
of Education and was refunded for three succeeding years.10
The program was designed on the premise that parents of
dropout prone students could play central roles in reducing
the incidence of dropouts. The major task was to identify
specific parental behaviors believed helpful to students
staying in school. These specific parental behaviors
became the job description of parent workers.

Project designers hypothesized that, given proper
incentive, parent workers would assume these central roles
and the changed parental behavior could induce positive
effects on student attendance, absenteeism, discipline and
dropouts. Such parents, their deprivation not withstanding,
would:

(1) Attend PTA meetings;

10See Appendix A for other systems which were funded
under Title VIII.
(2) Enroll as students in adult basic education classes;

(3) Assume responsibility for keeping their own children regular in attendance;

(4) Work to encourage identified dropout prone students in their neighborhood to stay in school,

(5) Bring other parents to school related events;

(6) Encourage and help their children to do well in their courses;

(7) Make visits to homes of other dropout prone students; and

(8) Learn about assistance available at other community and social agencies.

During the initial year, 66 percent of the project's $150,000 grant was used to employ 24 parents of students who were identified as dropout prone. These parents were called Parent Counselor Aides (PCA's). Preference in hiring was given to those parents who had the largest number of school and pre-school age children living in the home. Thus, utility to them was in the rate of pay which was more than most had ever expected to earn. It was simply amazing to some people to see parents who appeared neutral, indifferent or sometimes hostile toward the school suddenly change their behavior almost overnight
to one of positive concern and supportive intervention.

Specific objectives of Project ARISE were (1) to decrease the dropout rate; (2) to decrease the rate of absenteeism; (3) to reduce the rate of pupil suspension; and (4) to reduce the incidence of disciplinary problems. The program design was a temporary intervention system in which parental support and reinforcement behaviors were built. The global objective of this design was to actually change the behavior of twenty-four parents from passive and/or negative to advocacy and support positions. Such a system of intervention, if proven successful, should suggest a model which might be helpful to school districts throughout the country.

In 1975, Project ARISE was evaluated by an external agency funded by the United States Office of Education. Tables 1 and 2 present the results of this validation study relative to four of the major objectives of Project ARISE. In every case, the objectives were achieved or exceeded.

Table 1 presents data on the enrollment for the school in which the program operated, the target population and the number and percentage of dropouts for each population. Percentages are given because of the fluctuation in total school enrollment. It should be noted that the target population increased after the initial funding year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>School Wide Dropouts</th>
<th>Target Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total School</td>
<td>Total Pupils</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Verna C. Mason, Title VIII Validation and Dissemination Group (Englewood, Colorado: 1975), Mimeographed, pp. 2-3.
after which it remained stable. The decrease in the dropout rate, for both populations, was greatest in the initial project year, with smaller decreases in succeeding years.

Table 2 presents the per pupil rate of absentees, disciplinary incidents, and suspensions for the same two populations (total school and target pupils) as seen in Table 1. The decrease in per pupil rate for each behavior was greatest in the initial project year, with smaller decreases in succeeding years. In some cases, data were not available for the target pupils as a separate group, as indicated by the symbol N/A.

It is apparent that the strategies and efforts of Project ARISE contributed to the substantial reduction in the number of dropouts among the target students and school at large. It is believed that a major factor in this reduction was the effective involvement of parents of dropout prone students in the total process of education. The sharp decreases in absentee, discipline and suspension rates strongly suggest that the program was effective. If high school graduation gives assurance that students will develop skills and understandings necessary to effectively function in our society, any school system experiencing
### TABLE 2

PROJECT ARISE: Average Rate Per Student of Absentees, Discipline, and Suspension at Target High School for Year 1970-75*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Absentees</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Suspension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Verna C. Mason, Title VIII Validation and Dissemination Group (Englewood, Colorado: 1975), Mimeographed, pp. 3-6.
a dropout problem may want to consider this model.

It appears that a portion of whatever successes achieved during the life of this program came about because of the behavior of parents. Students, who were identified as dropout prone, saw parents from their own homes and neighborhoods spending time literally consumed with school matters. Because of the unique job description, parents were required to keep their own and some neighbors' children regularly in school attendance, to attend school events themselves, to enroll themselves as students in evening classes, and to encourage students to do well in their studies. These parental support-of-the-school behaviors, exhibited to this extent probably for the first time, seemingly were major factors in reaching the objectives during the life of the program.

The general concern in this study is to determine to what extent, the identified support-of-the-school parental behaviors continued beyond the life of Project ARISE as measured through certain characteristics of students and opinions of former parent workers.

Specific Statement of the Problem

The specific purpose of this investigation is to determine the extent to which certain job-required parental behaviors continued in the post-Project year
(1975-76), and their probable effect on the incidences of absentees, suspensions and dropouts among two groups of target students. It is, therefore, hypothesized that:

\[(H_1)\] during the post-Project year, the former Parent-Counselor Aides \((S_1)\) who worked for three years and had children in school during 1975-76 will continue school supportive behaviors required by Project ARISE.

Related to and growing out of Hypothesis 1 \((H_1)\) are the following questions: (1) What is the incidence of absentees, suspensions and dropouts among the currently enrolled children of former parent workers? (2) What is the incidence of absentees, suspensions, and dropouts among other currently enrolled students who were on the caseload of parent workers?

In keeping with the stated purpose, the following fifteen hypotheses will also be tested:

\[(H_2)\] during the post-Project year, the absentee rate for the children of former PCA's \((S_2)\) will be lower than the baseline rate at the target school;

\[(H_3)\] during the post-Project year, the absentee rate for the children of former PCA's \((S_2)\) will be equal to or lower than the rate for target students during the last two years of
Project ARISE;

$$(H_4)$$ during the post-Project year, the suspension rate for the children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will be lower than the baseline rate at the target school;

$$(H_5)$$ during the post-Project year, the suspension rate for children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will be equal to or lower than the rate for target students during the last two years of Project ARISE;

$$(H_6)$$ during the post-Project year, the dropout rate for the children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will be lower than the baseline rate for the target school;

$$(H_7)$$ during the post-Project year, the dropout rate for the children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will be equal to or lower than the rate for target students during the last two years of Project ARISE:

$$(H_8)$$ during the post-Project year, the absentee rate for students on the former PCA's caseloads ($S_3$) will be lower than the baseline rate for the target school;
(H_9) during the post-Project year, the absentee rate for students on the former PCA's caseloads (S_3) will be higher than the rate for target students during the last two years of Project ARISE:

(H_{10}) during the post-Project year, the suspension rate for students on the former PCA's caseloads (S_3) will be lower than the baseline rate for the target school;

(H_{11}) during the post-Project year, the suspension rate for students on the former PCA's caseloads (S_3) will be higher than the rate for target students during the last two years of Project ARISE;

(H_{12}) during the post-Project year, the dropout rate for students on the former PCA's caseloads (S_3) will be lower than the baseline rate at the target school;

(H_{13}) during the post-Project year, the dropout rate for students on the former PCA's caseloads (S_3) will be higher than the rate for target students during the last two years of Project ARISE;
(H_{14}) during the post-Project year, children of former PCA's (S_2) will have a lower absentee rate than other students on the caseloads of former PCA's (S_3);

(H_{15}) during the post-Project year, children of former PCA's (S_2) will have a lower suspension rate than other students on caseloads of former PCA's (S_3);

(H_{16}) during the post-Project year, children of former PCA's (S_2) will have a lower dropout rate than other students on caseloads of former PCA's (S_3).

When Project ARISE started there was considerable concern about what would be done by the local school system when federal funds were terminated. The Superintendent of Education and his staff believed, and assured officials, that parents working with such a program would develop behaviors which might continue to be school supportive long after the project's termination. The study will test these hypotheses to determine some effects of parental behavior changes on school attendance, suspensions, and dropout during the post-Project year. Specifically, the purpose is to determine the extent to which there has been carry-over of school-support behavior and of previously learned
skills and attitudes and any continuing effect on certain identified students.

Significance of the Problem

Non-supportive and negative influences on parents of pupils, especially in extreme poverty environments, appear to be major factors, which contribute to dropping out before high school graduation.\(^{11}\) The significance of this problem is implicit in the question: Can the schools in poverty environments design temporary intervention programs which could develop behaviors in parents which are pupil and school supportive? Equally significant is the question: If these pupil and school supportive behaviors are developed, will they continue after such programs are terminated?

Positive answers to the above questions may suggest ways of holding thousands of pupils in school longer and give them a better chance at an equal opportunity to an education. This investigation may suggest possibilities

for:

(1) Breaking the dropout cycle where dropouts become parents and give birth to children who become dropouts;

(2) Identifying the kinds of supportive parental behavior necessary for disadvantaged pupils to remain in school through high school graduation; and

(3) Causing permanent behavior changes in parents through temporary intervention systems.

Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted in a rural southern school district where the per pupil financial support is probably among the lowest in the entire United States. According to a 1975 study, the school district average per pupil expenditure of $660.68 was 72 percent of the state average of $921.59 and approximately 49 percent of the national average of $1,357.03. In spite of the foregoing statement the findings, assumptions, and generalizations derived from data generated should be helpful to school districts throughout the country.


12 See Appendix B.
Another limitation is the fact that only a relatively short period of time has elapsed since the termination of the temporary dropout prevention program. The residual effects of the program at the end of an additional two years may be significantly different. Believing that this may be the case, some limitation will be placed on the investigator in his generalized remarks pertaining to findings.

**Definition of Terms**

The use of certain terms throughout this paper shall have the meaning as defined below. Where there are exceptions the investigator shall give the definition in the text of the report.

(1) DROPOUT--a person who withdraws from school before high school graduation for any reasons except death.

(2) ARISE--Arranging for Reorganization of Instruction for Success in Education.

(3) P.C.A.'s--Parent Counselor Aides.

(4) TARGET STUDENTS--the 350 high school students identified by Project ARISE as dropout prone.

(5) TEMPORARY INTERVENTION SYSTEM--an organizational structure through which social interaction with a designated ending date is established.
TARGET SCHOOLS--the high school and feeder elementary school.

INNOVATION--planned intervention programs designed to make changes in persons, groups, and organizations.

RESEARCH POPULATIONS--subjects participating in the study as described below.

$S_1$--Parent Counselor Aides who worked in the program each of the last three years and who had children in school during the 1975-76 school term.

$S_2$--currently enrolled student of Parent Counselor Aides who worked in the program each of the last three years.

$S_3$--currently enrolled students who were on the caseload of Parent Counselor Aides for three years.

Innovative educational programs such as Project ARISE might suggest some effective means of reducing the incidence of dropping out of school before graduation. It appears that the use of financial resources as a means for obtaining active parental support in this effort might be effective. If this is true, educational agencies must include parents of dropout prone students in their plans for programs designed to reduce the incidence of dropping out. Otherwise,
many more students may leave elementary and secondary schools without the skills and understanding so essential for living well in our society.

Chapter II is a review of the literature relevant for this study. Specifically, the review of literature for this study covers three areas: (1) The incidences, reasons, characteristics and employment and unemployment of the dropout; (2) The effect of parent and environment on students, especially the dropout prone; and (3) Change strategies in designing innovative programs.

Chapter III presents the methodology used in this investigation. The design instruments are discussed and research procedures followed are outlined. In addition, this chapter gives background, historical, and statistical information on the research populations.

Chapter IV presents results and shows analysis of data generated. A presentation of findings comprises the main part of this chapter. Comparisons are made of the findings with results during the pre-life and the life of ARISE. Detailed discussion of each point is included in this section.

The final chapter presents the summary, conclusion, and implication for further research. This concluding chapter summarizes the findings of the study, makes
recommendations for subsequent research, and gives implications of findings for the educational leaders and planners of public school systems.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

School Dropout--Background

Any review of literature should be helpful in understanding the major areas of a problem under investigation. This review of literature not only does this, but it also is helpful in understanding the historical and on-going dimensions of the problem. The problem under study here, the number and percent of pupils who leave before graduation from high school, has preoccupied educators for decades.

Concerns of educators are evident through the large number of studies conducted and special dropout programs initiated throughout the country.¹ Schools have made curriculum changes, modified requirements for participation in extra-curricular activities, and added courses to their program offerings. Some have employed additional personnel, especially in the areas of social work and counseling. These

efforts have decreased the percentage of dropouts; however, a recent *U.S. News and World Report* article states that there are 2.4 million Americans between the ages of seven and nineteen who are not enrolled in school.\(^2\)

The primary purpose of this review is to examine the literature pertinent to this study. Specifically, the review covers aspects of three areas:

(1) The incidences of and justifications for dropping out, characteristics of the dropout and the employment--unemployment of dropouts;

(2) The role of parents and environments on students, especially the dropout prone; and,

(3) Change strategies in designing innovative programs.

**Incidence, Cause, Characteristics of Dropout**

It is most difficult and almost impossible to obtain consensus on the exact number of dropouts in the United States. Depending on one's definition of the term dropout, the reported statistics on dropout rate might vary among the different sources reporting such statistics.

Wilstach (1966) attempted to show how the school dropout rate varies according to the definition of "dropout:"

(1) The United States Office of Education (U.S.O.E.) quoted the dropout rate (1961) in the nation at forty percent, utilizing the definition that a dropout is a student who failed to graduate from high school with his class with a base year of fifth grade.

(2) The United States Bureau of Census quoted the dropout rate at the same time as 17.1 percent. This rate was determined by subtracting the number of pupils in some kind of school from the number of school-age children.

(3) At the same time, the United States Department of Labor reported that the national school dropout rate was 33 1/3 percent with a school dropout being defined as one who did not complete high school.

(4) In a study done for Los Angeles County, the dropout rate was given as from twenty percent to thirty percent, defining the school dropout as one who did not graduate with his class from high school.\(^3\)

\(^3\)John Curtis Gowan and George D. Demos, eds. The Disadvantaged and Potential Dropout (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1966), p. 91.
The United States Office of Education defines a dropout as:

A pupil who leaves school, for any reason except death, before he graduates or one who completes a program of studies and does not transfer to another school. 4

The dropout then is generally defined arbitrarily as a pupil who withdrew for any reason prior to finishing high school. While this definition may be generally accepted, varying accounting procedures of schools throughout the country have many variables which make it difficult to realize the real meaning of the data. Gowan and Demos suggest some questions in this regard.

In assessing school dropout research, then, we must evaluate the definition assigned to the term dropout. Does it take into consideration such things as students who transfer to another educational institution, public or private? Does it make adjustments for pupils who move into the area, which could lower the dropout rate unrealistically? Is it possible to assess the reasons for which the students left school to ascertain that those reported were actually dropouts? Was the study done over a long enough time for statistical consideration to be given to the students who returned to education in some way. 5

Each year millions of persons leave the educational enterprise short of graduation. The enormity of this problem was pointed out by the President's Commission on

---

4 A Manual for Project Applications and Grantees: Dropout Prevention Program, Title VIII, Elementary and
School Finance, in 1971. It said there were 850,000 school dropouts, many of whom left because they found their school experiences irrelevant, 750,000 who graduated from the general track and did not go on to college, and 850,000 high school graduates who dropped out of college. In total, 2.45 million students left the formal educational system in 1970-71.\(^6\)

Recent data reveal that the current dropout rate is about 25 percent.\(^7\) This estimate was derived by comparing the 3.0 million persons who graduated from high school in 1972 with the enrollment of 4.0 million in the fifth grade eight years earlier. (The report of the estimated number of dropouts between fifth grade and high school graduation for the United States, 1950-58 to 1974-82 is reproduced in Appendix F.)

It is recognized that many variables may cause the percentage of students dropping out to make sharp increases.

---


\(^5\)Gowan and Demos, Disadvantaged, p. 93.

\(^6\)Dropouts: Prevention and Rehabilitation, p. 3.

Two such variables might be students who are suspended or expelled. A recent study concluded: "While hard data is very rare, a substantial cause and effect relationship does appear to exist between students who are suspended or expelled, on the one hand, and students who become labeled as dropouts on the other." This same study gives data suggesting that the problem of expulsion has acute and pronounced effects on minority pupils—"In the 147 districts reporting disproportionate minority over non-minority expulsion, the minority rate was: (1) Double the non-minority rate in 31 districts; (2) Triple the non-minority rate in 26 districts; (3) Quadruple the non-minority rate in 16 districts; (4) Five to 10 times the non-minority rate in 49 districts; (5) More than 10 times the non-minority rate in 25 districts."  

Sex, age and incidence of delinquency may be variables contributing to an increased dropout rate. In a recent project, it was reported that 40 percent of the dropouts in a school district over a four year period were female. Ninety percent of those female dropouts gave pregnancy as their reason.  

---

8 The Student Pushout--Victim of Continued Resistance to Desegregation, Southern Regional Council (Atlanta, 1973), pp. 6-11.

dropout rate nationally is between 30 to 40 percent. The rate is higher in the South than in the North; higher among boys than girls (53 percent versus 47 percent); higher in the slums than in the suburbs. Most dropouts withdraw from school during or before their sixteenth year. There is ten times the incidence of delinquency among the dropouts as there is among the stay-ins.\textsuperscript{10}

In another recent study (Table 3), it is suggested that economic and ethnic characteristics are major contributing factors to leaving school. The data in this table give some evidence of racial and economic effects in our country. Notice the bottom line of the table, the working class—in schools 61 to 80 percent white, 19 percent of them have an annual dropout rate of 5 percent or less. However, as the student enrollment approaches 80 percent black only 9 percent of them have annual dropout rates of 5 percent or less. It is significant to note that where student population of schools is listed as "other ethnic mixture," 21 percent of such schools have dropout rates of less than 5 percent.

Seventy-six percent of all schools with an enrollment of over 80 percent upper middle class white students have annual dropout rates of 5 percent or less.

### TABLE 3

PERCENT OF SCHOOLS WITH AN ANNUAL DROPOUT RATE OF FIVE PERCENT OR LESS: ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic Characteristics of Students</th>
<th>Over 80% White</th>
<th>61-80% White</th>
<th>21-60% White &amp; Black</th>
<th>61-80% Black</th>
<th>Over 80% Black</th>
<th>Other Ethnic Mixtures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Middle Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Lower Middle Working Class</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One half of the schools with over 80 percent middle-class white students have annual dropout rates of 5 percent or less. Conversely, in schools enrolling 61 to 80 percent upper and middle-class black students only 44 percent have dropout rates of 5 percent or less.

Many authorities have developed profiles of dropouts which might be helpful in identifying the dropout prone student in time to design new programs or to make modifications which might reduce the dropout rate. Table 4 presents some useful information from Colorado's Student Analysis System. The differences in item response of the dropouts in comparison to graduates give a succinct profile.

Dropouts usually have problems that they do not anticipate. Some of the problems faced by dropouts are mentioned by Stoops, Rafferty and Johnson: They have difficulty getting and holding jobs; they have less earning power than graduates; do not have the opportunity to advance; and are not educationally prepared to hold their jobs for long periods of time.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Dropout 1968-69</th>
<th>Graduate 1968-69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closest friends in school?</td>
<td>In school</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in District</td>
<td>3 years or more</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic aptit.</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Ability</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Lev.</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Placement</td>
<td>Retained 1 yr.</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Record</td>
<td>Previous Suspension</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Record</td>
<td>Absent 26+ days</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent 16-25 d.</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent 0-15 d.</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities in school</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities outside school</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation, Head Household</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial, technical, &amp; professional</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of Mother</td>
<td>High School grad +</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between home and school</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Answers</td>
<td>Dropout 1968-69</td>
<td>Graduate 1968-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil lives with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Parents</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Step Parent</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother or Father</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, an examination of some recent data on employment status by sex and race of a class of high school graduates shows that a diploma may mean very little and be relatively useless especially to many minority persons. Notice especially data in Table 5, minority male graduates' and minority male dropouts' unemployment rates.

The minority male graduates' unemployment rate (18.4) is over 2.02 times the unemployment rate of white male graduates (8.6). The unemployment rate of minority male dropouts (18.1) is about the same as the rate for minority male graduates. Notice that the minority male dropout unemployment rate (18.1) compares favorably with the unemployment rate of white male dropouts (15.8).

Data on minority women graduates' unemployment rate (32.4) in comparison with white women graduates' unemployment (9.3) is even more revealing of racial effects on employment. The indication is that minority women graduates' unemployment rates is over three times the rate of white women graduates.

Generally, unemployment rates decline from lower to higher age groups, and, the downward trend is steeper for graduates than for dropouts: however, the above data suggest that race may cause an exception to the generalization. It seems apparent from these data that new strategies, must be employed in our quest to find solutions to
### Table 5

Employment Status of High School Graduates Not Enrolled in College and Dropouts Aged 16 to 21 Years by Sex and Race, October, 1975*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex and Race</th>
<th>Graduates not Enrolled in College Labor Force Participation Rate</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Labor Force Participation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the social and economic problems of potential dropouts, especially for the minority student.

**Role of Parents and Environment on Dropouts**

While the above factors play significant roles in understanding the dropout situation, other important environmentally induced factors resident in the home and family are critical. The home and parent may be the most important influences on the dropout prone student. According to Bloom, the home environment has been studied as a means of understanding the factors which influence the development of children. Studies repeatedly show that the home is the single most important influence on the intellectual and emotional development of children.¹³

Speaking about the importance of the home, Cervantes says, "it is ironic, however, that in our field of academic achievement there is such a broad discrepancy between the findings of the theorists and the plans of the actionists. The social theorists point out that the family is of maximum importance in the development or lack of development of youth. But the social actionists--chiefly educationists and governmental social engineers--minimize or eliminate from consideration the nuclear family in their plans for

the development and direction of the youth they hope will not become dropouts.¹⁴

This sort of non-consideration of the family and home by the educational establishment has erected a wall serving as inhibitor to wholesome learning and staying in school.

A family living under severe economic constraints faces additional problems. Kaufman and Lewis are especially concerned about effects of poverty on dropping out. The public schools, they say, probably more than any other institution in our society, try to offer equal opportunity to all of their students. Yet there can be little doubt that the real opportunities available to a student from a middle-class home with verbal parents, who encourage and reward academic performance, are far greater than they are to a child born and raised in poverty. And it is from poverty settings that the majority of dropouts come.¹⁵

Bessent and Webb say that national surveys conclude that as much as eighty-five percent of the variation among schools, as reflected in students' achievement scores, are attributable to family-related factors.¹⁶ Gordon

¹⁴Cervantes, The Dropout, p. 11.


¹⁶Ira J. Gordon and William F. Breivogel, eds.,
and Breivogel feel that programs succeed in proportion to the emphasis they attach to the involvement of parents in the education of children. Accordingly, they state, anything that supports the parent role and underlines the significance of positive interacting patterns between parents and child, heightens the chances of successful child development and enhances the development of social skills of the parents as well.17

Passow, among other authorities who recognize the parents' role in education and especially that of the mother, says, "...How the mother feels about education and public schools and how she feels about her own ability to deal with the school system are clearly related to the child's cognitive abilities as well as to his behavior in the school setting. The image that lower-class mothers seem to hold of the school--and which they transmit to their children--is essentially one of a distant and formidable institution with which they have very little interaction and over which they exercise very little control."18

Daugherty states that, impoverished backgrounds,


17Ibid., pp. 98-100.

18A. Harry Passow, "Early Childhood and Compensatory Education," Chapter 5 of Implications for Education, p. 82.
restricted opportunities, and a sense of despair and resignation characterize the parents of the deprived children in our cities. Parental indifference to the value of education is transmitted to the children, whose school careers are naturally characterized by poor attendance, low achievement, and early leaving.\(^{19}\)

Another facet of this problem, especially of severely economically deprived, is posited by Henry who indicates that among the children of the very poor, survival must take precedence over every other consideration. But current motivational theory tends to downgrade immediate and physical motives. It turns its eagle vision instead, like a rising young executive, on "goal-striving," "status seeking," and "planning." By such elite and middle-class standards, the poor must be said to have little or no motivation.\(^{20}\)

Research reveals some of the characteristics of dropout students that have been brought out by recent studies. The home environment is a big factor to the potential dropout today. Some parents feel that going to school is wasting time, when the teenager should be seeking a job. On the other hand, the economic situation may be such that the student must dropout in order to support the family. . . .


Another major cause is irregular attendance. Families move frequently because of transferring from one job situation to another. This causes the student to be absent from school too often. When the student does return to school he is discouraged because of being left behind in the daily tasks. This increases his personal woes, so he takes the easiest way out. Truancy is another good indicator of a dropout. Also students that are having a difficult time with academic subjects, particularly reading and mathematics are behind their age group, and seldom meeting success, frequently dropout of school. Early marriage and pregnancy is another leading cause for dropouts. This is more evident in states that have such a low age requirement for marriage. 21

Gowan and Demos give some additional insight on the family situation from which many disadvantaged youngsters come:

In a culturally deprived area, the economic and educational aspiration levels of families and the community as a whole are low. Both parents and students are suspicious of and hostile toward school authorities. An apperceptive basis for academic learning is almost completely lacking. The value standards are considerably different from those of the middle class. Legally adjudged delinquent conduct is frequently accepted as normal. Reactions to situations may be motivated by mistrust rather than reason.

How should the school now approach the problem? Should it get in high gear immediately with reading clinics, curricular changes, work study programs, and the assignment of guidance counselors who have completed the prescribed courses in guidance? These steps hardly appear to be the answer. They would probably constitute only a small part of the total effect needed to meet what appear to be the two major challenges presented by this situation: These may be described as the need to develop a

school environment which can provide for understanding of and working with the people of the community to the extent that there is acceptance and cooperation by students and parents; and the need to develop a program that will help raise the socioeconomic sights of both parents and students, so that they may come to accept and strive for the cultural values that bring with them the stimulus for higher educational attainment.22

Many times educators interpret the absence of school supportive behavior from poverty environments as a lack of interest. Mood (1972) gives a most lucid description showing the great pressure under which these parents must live and operate.

Poor families do not have time to devote to their children, they are endlessly forced to trade time for money—to search for work, to moonlight, to find cheap food, to seek out an acceptable inexpensive place to live, to try to find cheap second hand spare parts for a disabled car or appliance, to try to find out how to replace the part themselves or to try and find a knowledgeable neighbor who can spare a little time to help them out, to search for a person who would loan a little money in an emergency at less than a confiscatory rate of interest. . . . This debilitating struggle to keep alive without money in a complex, highly organized, society is so frustrating, so humiliating, so emotionally exhausting, that one's patience and strength are totally spent when one finally gets home to one's children.23

This section of the review suggests that strategies designed to be of help to the dropout must include consideration of family, home environment, economic constraints,

22 Gowan and Demos, The Disadvantaged, p. 142.

and aspiration level of students and community.

Disadvantaged parents are not apathetic about their children when programs are designed and implemented which meet their needs. These parents, like others, need the time, energy and financial resources as necessary bases upon which to manifest their concerns. Educational program designers should build intervention systems to meet these needs to assure the active support and participation of disadvantaged parents.

Change Strategies in Innovative Programs

Many programs designed to improve conditions, especially of poverty persons, depend upon external intervention into the family. It may be possible to reverse procedures, or at least to add another dimension to the operating procedures of many programs already in existence. This can be done by inviting family participation in programs rather than insisting on opening families to institutional intervention.24

Portions of Deer's discussion of the "Institutional Dependence Model" is helpful in developing an understanding of dropping out of school. He writes: "Such problems as

---

absenteeism, scholastic failure and school dropout are viewed as symptoms of a far more fundamental problem of school; namely they are dependent upon supportive and reinforcing conditions in the home, neighborhood, and community for successful attainment of their own goals.\textsuperscript{25}

The home and immediate neighborhood, their problems and human interaction processes are significant parts of the student when he enters school. They continue for good or evil, to be significant behavior influencing mechanisms in the student's school. Deer states further "The dependence of the school arises from the fact that the behavior of the student has been influenced by individuals and groups in the home, neighborhood, and community prior to his entrance into school and continues to be influenced as the school seeks to achieve its particular socializing tasks with students. . . . A critical aspect of the contemporary attack on urban educational problems is that it has been organized largely in terms of theoretical models which direct ameliorative efforts at the individual student rather than at the community.\textsuperscript{26}


\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., pp. 273, 276-77.
It seems apparent to many persons that the school may not meet their needs. In fact, some may even view the school as counter-productive. They live with and see many examples in the neighborhood of persons with the label of failure which was stamped on by the school. Frost and Hawkes may give a clue as to why people turn from the school. "One of the major purposes of organizing a society is to develop mechanisms by which human appetites can be fulfilled. People form into groups in order that their common good can be fulfilled. If an individual's good is not met he seeks out different groups through which he can and will achieve the satisfaction of his appetites. It cannot be stressed too strongly that people become apathetic toward and anxious about ultimate goals they would like to achieve through societal organization if they continually sense a lack of reliability in the means offered to accomplish these goals."

People's active participation in and support of any program will be in direct proportion to the extent that they feel their needs are being met. Program designers must understand that if people (pupils or parents) believe

---

27 Frost and Hawkes, The Disadvantaged Child, p. 419.
they can have their needs satisfied through a specific program, their participation and support will be absolute. These human needs, according to McGregor, "... are organized in a series of levels—a hierarchy of importance. At the lowest level, but preeminent in importance when they are thwarted, are physiological, followed by safety, social, ego, and self-fulfillment needs." Careful consideration must be given to economic status of persons in attempting to design programs intended to solicit their participation.

In discussing the term union management cooperation McGregor gives four characteristics of psychological growth. . . . in the first place, psychological growth is a slow and arduous process. It involves a myriad of small changes in thinking and behavior which normally occur imperceptibly day by day. Although the rate of growth may vary somewhat, depending upon circumstances, sudden jumps occur rarely and then only as a consequence of rather severe crises.

In the second place, psychological growth is not an all or nothing process. . . . The growth process is uneven, maturity is achieved in one small way today and in another tomorrow.

The third characteristic of growth is that it may be arrested at any stage. . . . This characteristic of being arrested in the course of development is so common that

---

28 Bennis and Schein, Leadership and Motivation, pp. 8-11.
real emotional maturity is rare among individuals.

Finally, psychological growth, unlike physical growth, is a two way process. Retrogression is not at all unusual. Occassionally, in a critical situation, mature habits and ways of thinking that have been acquired painfully and slowly will suddenly disappear, to be supplanted by childish ones that have long since died.\textsuperscript{29}

There are no standard solutions for the dropout problem. However, programs may be set up in temporary systems to reduce the initial resistance to changing and testing hypotheses on a somewhat limited basis. In the book, \textit{Innovation in Education}, Miles says that temporary systems may be helpful in our quest to develop improved school environment. "The temporary social system provides an environment which meets personal needs, reduces defensiveness, and releases potential for creativity and innovation: It can be precisely fashioned by its design as a temporary utopia, flexibly capable of evoking the best possible contribution from its participants."\textsuperscript{30}

Three specific suggestions are given by Miles relative to how temporary systems may aid in educational innovation:

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., pp. 85-7.

(1) Temporary systems provide the opportunity for increased social validation of the desirability of particular innovations given uncertainty of outcome measurement and public vulnerability;

(2) Temporary structures can help innovators avoid the temptation to be palliative about the inadequacies of fundamentally bad permanent structures: they can enable vigorous, thorough-going development of innovations which might otherwise never make it through the protective fog of the status quo; and,

(3) The deliberate use of temporary systems opens the possibility of a more manageable process of educational change. 31

Educators must move from the position of being critical of parents' negative traits to accepting responsibility for increasing positive school supportive behavior. Delmet and Smallenburg's remarks in this connection are encouraging. "It does seem clear that persons can develop new role definitions as a result of their tenure in temporary systems. . . . since temporary systems are new, miniature, temporary and protected, it seems much easier to

31 Ibid., p. 485.
develop new norms in them. If the norms are strong, they tend to become internalized as attitudes in the person or carried over as practices into permanent organizations.\textsuperscript{32}

Any realistic attempts to make more students and parents feel a kinship to the school and its program must consider the many and varied aspects of change. Strategies of change, resistance to, and reasons for change must be carefully examined. Robert Chin and Kenneth D. Benne have identified several types of strategies for changing. Two of these and helpful in this review are the empirical-rational and normative-reeducative strategies. According to these writers,

\ldots probably the most frequently employed by men of knowledge in America and Western Europe, are those we call empirical-rational strategies. One fundamental assumption underlying these strategies is that men are rational. Another assumption is that men will follow their rational self-interest once this is revealed to them. A change is proposed by some person or group which knows of a situation that is desirable, effective, and in line with the self-interest of the person, group, organization or community which will be affected by the change. Because the person (or group) is assumed to be rational and moved by self-interest, it is assumed that he (or they) will adopt the proposed change if it can be rationally justified and if it can be shown

by the proposer(s) that he (or they) will gain by the change.33

In discussing a second group of strategies, normative-reeducative, for changing the authors explain:

... The strategies build upon assumptions about human motivation different from those underlying the first. The rationality and intelligence of men are not denied. Patterns of action and practice are supported by sociocultural norms and by commitments on the part of individuals to these norms. Sociocultural norms supported by the attitude and value system of individuals-normative outlook which undergird their commitment. Change in a pattern of practice or action, according to this view, will occur only as the persons involved are brought to change their normative orientations to old patterns and develop commitments to new ones. And changes in normative orientations involve changes in attitudes, values, skills, and significant relationships, not just changes in knowledge, information, or intellectual rationales for action and practice.34

This researcher believes that systems implemented to help the disadvantaged parents must be designed inclusive of consideration of both the empirical-rational and normative-reeducative strategies.

Summary

This review of literature suggests that the number of persons dropping out of school prior to graduation poses


34 Ibid.
a serious and growing problem to both the dropout and society. The incidence of dropping out may vary according to one's definition, however, most authorities agree that the school dropout is a problem of national significance.

There is substantial agreement among authorities that matters of race, level of family, stability of employment and place of residence are factors contributing to the dropout problem. Moreover, the literature is replete with widespread agreement attesting to the importance of influences of the environment, especially the home and parents, as factors contributing to decisions of students to dropout.

It appears that a growing number of authorities recognize the importance of designing strategies and developing school programs which may raise the socio-economic aspirations of both parents and students. Such strategies and programs could, with proper incentives, change negative and sometimes hostile attitudes toward schooling. Programs may even contribute toward changing such behavior from negative to school supportive.

Innovative strategies and programs aimed at changes in behavior and new role definition could be installed in temporary systems in order to gain initial local acceptance. If such programs are inclusive of methods through which individuals could obtain personal goals which are important
to them, permanent behavior changes may occur. It is believed by some authorities that many such behavior changes may continue after the termination of the temporary system.

Chapter III will present the methodology used in this investigation. The design instruments are discussed and research procedures followed are outlined. In addition, this chapter gives background, historical and statistical data about the research population.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The specific purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which certain job-required parental behaviors continued in the post-project year (1975-76), and their probable effect on the incidences of absentees, suspensions and dropouts among two groups of target students.

Related to a growing out of this specific problem are the following questions: (1) What is the incidence of absentees, suspensions and dropouts among the currently enrolled children of former parent workers? (2) What is the incidence of absentees, suspensions, and dropouts of other currently enrolled students who were on the caseloads of parent workers?

The research method that most closely approximates the research design selected for this study is termed causal comparative or ex-post facto.\(^1\) Several factors implicit in this study make it difficult to ascribe exclusively a particular research design which embraces all facets of this

investigation. Foremost among these factors is the very purpose of this research. Of central concern in this research is the changed behavior of selected parents and the effect of such behavior on some students in matters of school attendance, incidence of suspension and dropouts. The treatment and resulting parental behavior changes preceded the beginning of this study.

Subjects

The subjects in this investigation consisted of three classes. The first class of subjects \((S_1)\) consisted of former parent counselor aides (PCA's) who worked on Project ARISE during its last three years and who had children enrolled in school during the 1975-76 term. This class consisted of twenty-one persons. They represented twenty-one different households and included nineteen females and two males.

The second class of subjects, \((S_2)\) consisted of the children of former parent counselor aides in Class \(S_1\) who were enrolled in school during the 1975-76 school year. There were seventy-six persons in this class, enrolled in Headstart (pre-school) through twelfth grade.

The third class of subjects, \((S_3)\) consisted of students enrolled in school during the 1975-76 school year, who were on the caseloads of parent counselor aides for the last three years of Project ARISE. Sixty-four persons
persons comprised this class of subjects.

The first class of subjects \((S_1)\) was investigated by means of a semi-structured interview using a structured questionnaire devised by the investigator. The instrument used for this purpose is printed in Appendix C. The objective was to gather opinions and other data believed helpful in determining if those supportive parental behaviors required by Project ARISE continued beyond the project's termination.

The second class \((S_2)\) and third class \((S_3)\) were investigated by gathering data through examinations and surveying of local records. In some cases conferences with school officials were necessary. The purpose in examining these classes was to determine the incidence of absentees, suspensions and dropout among the subjects in the post-project year.

**Selection of Subjects**

Table 6 indicates the number of parent counselor aides employed during the operation of Project ARISE, the number of their own children enrolled in school both during the project and school year 1975-76. The number of PCA's with children in school and their former caseload students for the school year 1975-76 is included in the Table.

Former Parent Counselor Aides (PCA's) from Project ARISE comprised the \(S_1\) research class and were critical to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Period Month</th>
<th>No. of PCA's Employed</th>
<th>No. of PCA's Children in School During Project</th>
<th>PCA's with Children in School 1975-76</th>
<th>No. of PCA's Children in School 1975-76</th>
<th>( S_3 ) Children Enrolled in School 1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 or more</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>( 21*(S_1) )</td>
<td>( 76*(S_2) )</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 41 \)
*Subjects in investigation
the investigation. Table 6 indicates that a total of forty-one parents worked in the capacity of PCA over the four year life span of the project. The tenure of employment varied from a few months to the maximum of four years. The investigator wished to limit the study to those parents who worked in the project long enough to have possibly absorbed concepts and developed habits of school supportive behavior. Consequently, an arbitrary decision was made to include in this study only those PCA's who were employed for at least three years and who had children enrolled in school during the 1975-76 school year. Upon the application of this criteria twenty-one former parent counselor aides were selected to comprise this research group.

Research class ($S_2$) subjects were studied to determine what, if any, residual effects the school supportive behavior of their parents have had on them relative to matters of absentees, incidence of suspensions and dropping out of school. Consequently, this class, $S_2$, was derived directly from the subjects selected for $S_1$. A total of 76 ($S_2$) subjects comprise this class--39 were high school students (grades 9 - 12), and 37 enrolled in primary, elementary or junior high school during the post project year, 1975-76.
This research class \((S_3)\) was investigated to determine the extent of residual effects Project ARISE has had on students other than the PCA's own children who were on the caseloads of parent workers. The investigator wished to compare the school records of class \(S_2\) which had direct and continuous support from their PCA parents with those students \((S_3)\) who experienced the Project in a less direct and concentrated manner.

Sixty-seven students were identified who were on Project ARISE caseload of parents from 1972-73 through 1974-75 and were enrolled in school during the post project year, 1975-76. Two of these students were summer (1975) dropouts and one had transferred to another school system; consequently they were deleted from the study. The remaining sixty-four students comprise class \(S_3\).

**Characteristics of Research Population**

This research class \((S_1)\), composed of former parent counselor aides in Project ARISE, included 2 males and 19 females representing 21 different households. At the time of the study, 12 persons were in their forties with 5 being fifty, and 5 were under forty years of age. The majority of this population (13) were married and living with their spouse. Four aides were either separated or divorced, 2 were widows and 2 were single.

Seven parents (33 percent) in this research class
(S₁) completed high school. Fourteen parents (66 percent) in this class were themselves school dropouts, 12 had spouses who had not graduated from high school. Three persons completed the tenth or eleventh grades, 7 persons completed the eighth or ninth grades and 4 persons completed either fourth, fifth or sixth grades. The average grade completed for the entire class was 9.1.

These 21 parents, comprising research class (S₁), had a total of 170 children between them for an average of 8.10 children per family. At the time of their employment in Project ARISE, 116 of the 170 children were school age or younger for an average of 5.5 school age children per family.

This class (S₁) had 62 high school graduates among their children for an average of 2.9 graduates per household. Eighteen of the parents had one or more children who had graduated from high school. The range was from no graduates (3 parents) to nine children from one household who had graduated from high school.

Thirteen parents had all of the 29 children who had dropped out from this class. Two parents each had 6 children who dropped out and 2 parents each had 3 dropout children in the household. The average number of dropouts per household (1.38) for the entire S₁ population is much lower than the average number of graduates in these same households.
Previous to their employment with Project ARISE, 18 (86 percent) of the $S_1$ subjects had personal income of less than $250.00 per month. Ten were unemployed, 3 on welfare and 3 on social security. Only 2 listed personal income in excess of $449.00 per month. Sixteen parents either owned or were purchasing their house. Six reported their homes were debt free, while the 10 others paid monthly notes from $44 to $171 dollars. At the time of employment 15 PCA's reported a total family income of $449.00 per month or less, 5 had income between $500.00 and $799.00 per month and only one reported a family income in excess of $800.00 per month.

All subjects in research class $S_2$ were children of former parent counselor aides ($S_1$ research class) and lived in the 21 households. All subjects in this $S_2$ class were enrolled in school during the post project year, 1975-76. A total of 76 subjects comprise this class; 39 were high school students (grades 9 - 12) and 37 were enrolled in primary, elementary or junior high (grades Headstart - 8) during the post-project year.

Subjects in research class $S_3$ were students who lived in households which were on the caseloads of former parent counselor aides ($S_1$ subjects). All subjects in this class were listed among the target students in Project ARISE. Support-of-school behaviors of PCA's were directed
at keeping these students in school and lowering the incidence of absentees, suspension and dropouts. All 64 subjects in this class (S₃) were enrolled in school during the post-project year, 1975-76.

**Development of Research Instruments**

Some data desired by the investigator about the former PCA's research subjects S₁, were available from the records of Project ARISE. However, data on the school year 1975-76 obviously did not exist. In order to secure these data a decision was made to use the structural interview technique.² This method dictated designing a questionnaire to gather information from and opinions of S₁ subjects. Of special concern to the investigator in designing this instrument were those data giving some evidence attesting to the degree specific parental support of the school behaviors were continuing. The behaviors of interest to the investigator were the same as those which comprised the job description of PCA's in Project ARISE.

The questionnaire was designed to serve as the basis for the structured interview with each subject (S₁). The instrument was field tested through interviews with former PCA's who were not included in the research

²Ibid., pp. 96-99.
population. Following the field testing, several changes were made in sentence structure in order to clarify the instrument. Other items were omitted as having been found to provide no significant information. The questionnaire as it was used with the research population ($S_1$) is printed in Appendix C.

The individual questions in the instrument were tested for face validity to determine if they would produce usable information for the purpose of this study. The validity of some of the responses could be compared with data available from school and other records (questions 1, 2, 3, 10, and 11); or from Project ARISE files (question 6). However, the majority of the questions were not subjected to validity checks because they sought opinions or recall of events not recorded elsewhere (questions 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 14).

The investigator identified by name each person included in research classes $S_2$ and $S_3$. A simple matrix for each research class served as the research instrument used to gather the desired data. The matrix listed the names of each subject and spaces for recording incidence of absentees, suspensions and dropouts during the 1975-76 school term. Data were gathered from the local schools' permanent and attendance records. Where necessary, conferences were held with school principals, teachers and attendance personnel in the school system. In some
instances in order to validate data it was necessary to make direct contact with the parents.

**Personnel and Procedures Employed**

The investigator selected two professional persons who were familiar with the development and operation of Project ARISE to assist in data gathering. Their knowledge of contents of permanent records of the Project and established rapport with former PCA's added increased confidence in the validity of data generated. Moreover, their assistance shortened the period of time devoted to examination of records and the data gathering process itself.

Because of the wide range of cognitive achievement among PCA's and the objective of the investigator to secure data and consistency in understanding the questions, it was felt necessary to administer questionnaires in individual semi-structured sessions. The professional person who coordinated and supervised the former parent workers during the last years of Project ARISE, set up and conducted these sessions. It is believed that her already established familiarity and rapport with former PCA's increased the accuracy and therefore the validity of data. Furthermore, the procedure produced a one hundred percent response rate from the twenty-one subjects in their research class \((S_1)\).

The data gathering process for research subjects \(S_2\) and \(S_3\) was given valuable assistance by the professional
educational planner who played a major role in developing the initial proposal for Project ARISE. This person, with established credibility in the school system, made it unnecessary to follow a more formal procedure in gaining access to student records.

It should be added that, with one exception, all personnel employed by Project ARISE were still in the system at the time of the study. At one time or another all were contacted either to help validate data or to aid in the location of information or persons.

Statistical Treatment

Data gathered from the S₁ questionnaires will be examined for face validity only. Since the data generated by the questionnaire is opinion-based, it will not be subjected to further statistical processes. Hypothesis (H₁) will be evaluated on the nature and number of responses to questionnaire items.

Data gathered on the S₂ and S₃ subjects will be presented in Table form. In addition, where appropriate, this data will be subjected to statistical analysis to determine significance of difference between comparison groups (baseline, target students, and the two research populations).
The t-test will be used as part of the treatment of data relative to hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Either the baseline or ARISE target student's data will be used as one independent sample—the data from the research population ($S_2$ or $S_3$)—the other sample in the treatment procedure.

$X^2$ will be used as part of the treatment of data relative to hypotheses 6, 7, 12, 15, and 16. Either the baseline or ARISE target students data will be one attribute—the data from the research population ($S_2$ or $S_3$) will be the other attribute in the treatment procedure.

Hypotheses numbers 14 and 15 will be subjected to a $2 \times 3$ analysis of variance.

Chapter IV presents analysis and results of data generated. A presentation of findings comprises the main part of this chapter. Comparisons are made of the findings with the results during the pre-life and life of ARISE.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Project ARISE was based upon the assumption that socio-economically deprived parents of dropout prone pupils might play significant roles in causing their children to remain in high school through graduation. It was believed that if these parents refined and exhibited strong school supportive behaviors in their homes and neighborhoods, students would have fewer absences, reduced suspensions and decreased number of dropouts. According to Deer, "problems of absenteeism, failures, and dropouts are merely suggestive of far more fundamental problems; they are dependent upon supportive and reinforcing conditions in the home, neighborhood, and community for successful attainment of their own goals." 1 Passow states, "how the mother feels about education and public schools and how she feels about her own ability to deal with the school system are clearly related to the child's cognitive abilities as well as to his behaviors in the school setting." 2 Daugherty believes that, "impoverished backgrounds, restricted

2 Passow, "Early Childhood," p. 82.
opportunities, and a sense of despair and resignation characterize the parents of the deprived children in our cities."³

The twenty-one economically deprived parents (Research class S₁) in this study had 170 children among them. Sixty-two of their children were high school graduates and twenty-nine were school dropouts. The average personal monthly income of parents, prior to employment in ARISE, was less than $250.00. Fourteen of the twenty-one parents were dropouts themselves and twelve were married to dropout spouses. Because of these conditions it was believed by school authorities that the ARISE starting salary of $100.00 per week would be sufficient stimulation to motivate parents to intervene in and move to eliminate barriers to their children's positive success in school.

Project ARISE was designed as a temporary system through which the poor families might have the time to devote to their children.⁴ Moreover, it was designed to give increased support to the parents' role and to underline the importance of developing significant positive interaction patterns between the parents and children.⁵


⁵Gordon and Breivogel, Building Effective Home-School Relationships, p. 98.
The specific purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which job-required parental behaviors continued during the post-project year, and their probable effect on incidences of absentees, suspensions and dropouts among two groups of students.

Accordingly, the investigator reduced the specific purpose to sixteen testable research hypotheses:

(1) The objective of hypothesis number one was to determine the extent to which parent workers (S1 subjects) continued school supportive behaviors during the post-project year.

(2) The objective of hypotheses numbered two through seven was to determine the effect of parental behaviors as measured through matters of absentees, suspensions, and dropouts among the parent workers own children (S2 subjects) during the post-project period.

(3) The objective of hypotheses numbered eight through thirteen was to determine the effects of parental behaviors, as measured through matters of absentees, suspensions and dropouts upon the other students (S3) who were on the caseloads of parent workers.
(4) The objective of hypotheses numbered fourteen through sixteen was to determine the effect of parents on their own children ($S_2$) and other children ($S_3$) on their caseloads, and to document any significant differences between the two groups in matter of absentees, suspensions and dropouts.

$S_1$ Subjects

The $S_1$ subjects were the twenty-one Parent Counselor Aides employed on Project ARISE for three years and who had children enrolled in school during the post-project year, 1975-76. These subjects were examined by means of a structured interview and questionnaire. One hundred percent of the subjects participated in the survey, a fact interpreted by the investigator as a positive sign of school support in and of itself. Item number 5 in the questionnaire asked if the subject would accept another job as a Parent-Counselor Aide if it were offered. Twenty of the twenty-one subjects gave an immediate positive reply, another indication of beneficial residual effect of the temporary system.

Hypothesis ($H_1$) stated that during the post-project year, former Parent-Counselor Aides who worked three years
on Project ARISE and had children enrolled in school in 1975-76 (S₁) will continue school supportive behaviors required by Project ARISE.

The data resulting from tabulation of questionnaire responses will be presented in table form. Analysis of the data supports the validity of the hypothesis (H₁). This conclusion is supported by Delmet and Smallenburg, who in speaking of the possibility of developing new norms in temporary systems say, "If the norms are strong, they tend to become internalized as attitudes in the person and carried over as practices into permanent organizations."⁶

Table 7 indicates by S₁ subject, the school supportive activities each participated in during the post-project year. Of the nine specific activities tabulated, S₁ subjects participated in from three to nine activities. The mode is six activities (9 subjects of 21). The specific activities were engaged in by from three to twenty-one subjects. It is noted that the activity which claimed the attention and action of all the subjects, with one exception, was counseling of students in families on former

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' Performance of Specific School Supportive Behaviors in Post-Project Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Agrees Consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) # in School Children Keep Own Things to &quot;Do new&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) # School Parents Talk to</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) # Counselors Former Counsel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) # Personnel School Meet w/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) School Visit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Workshops Attend Ed.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE (10) Attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA (8) Attend</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
caseloads. Conversely, the activity which claimed least attention and action was enrolling in Adult Basic Education classes.

Table 8 presents data on the relationship of $S_1$ subject attendance at Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) meetings before, during and after Project ARISE employment. The before and after data represent subjects' responses to questionnaire items numbered 7 and 8. The data for attendance during Project ARISE employment is based on Project records. (PTA attendance was required and included in salary computations during employment.) The Table shows that PTA attendance rose during the Project, but returned in the post-project year to approximately the reported pre-project rate. If the subjects' reporting is accurate, it appears that Project ARISE as a temporary system had little or no residual effect on the frequency of PTA attendance. This is not at all unusual. McGregor says, "psychological growth, is a two way process. Retrogression is not at all unusual. Occasionally, in a critical situation mature habits and ways of thinking that have been acquired painfully and slowly will suddenly disappear, to be supplanted by childish ones that have been presumed to be long since dead." Moreover, when consideration is given to the

---

7 Bennis and Schein, Essays of Douglas McGregor, pp. 8-11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Meetings Attended Per Year</th>
<th>Prior to Project ARISE Employment</th>
<th>During Project ARISE Employment 73-74</th>
<th>During Project ARISE Employment 74-75</th>
<th>After Project ARISE Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
economic effect brought on the household by the death of the temporary system, it is amazing that these subjects retained any level of participation.

Table 9 summarizes the number and average times per subject \( S_1 \) that specific school supportive activities were performed during the last project year (1974-75) and the post-project year (1975-76). Data for 1974-75 were taken from records kept during the project; data for 1975-76 were taken from questionnaire responses. All of the subjects in this class are rural or semi-rural, economically impoverished, black and 19 of 21 are female.

Sixty-six percent are high school dropouts and 5.5 or their average 8.10 children per household are still living at home. These conditions are factors contributing to high rates of unemployment (see Table 3). The investigator anticipated a reduction in level of activity when employment ended; the data confirm this expectation. Nevertheless, the fact that these school supportive behaviors continued at all in the post-project year is considered positive, especially inasmuch as these behaviors seldom if ever occurred prior to Project ARISE employment and job training.\(^8\) In particular, it is notable that

\(^8\)Project ARISE: Proposal, pp. 18-19.
### TABLE 9

SCHOOL SUPPORTIVE ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY S\textsubscript{1} POPULATION DURING THE LAST YEAR OF PROJECT ARISE AND IN THE POST-PROJECT YEAR, BY NUMBER AND AVERAGE PER PERSON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES (School Supportive)</th>
<th>Last Project Year 1974-75</th>
<th>Post Project Year 1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseled students, parents,</td>
<td>5164</td>
<td>245.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferred with principal,</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>81.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselor or teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited classroom</td>
<td>NAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited non-target schools</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>35.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or community agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended school activities</td>
<td>NAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Superintendent's</td>
<td>NAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Target School</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>91.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAR = No Accurate Record

S\textsubscript{1} Subjects = 21
these subjects retained enough interest in and rapport with former caseload families to average nearly fifty-six counseling contacts over the post-project year. This affirms Gordon and Breivogel's position that, "anything that supports the parent role and underlines the significance of positive interacting patterns between parents and child, heightens the chances of successful child development and enhances the development of social skills of the parents as well."  

Table 10 compares the printed job description of Parent-Counselor Aides with $S_1$ subjects' recall of specific activities (question 6) and performance of these activities in the post-project year (question 9).

The responses to question 6 were in some cases so general that they fit more than one section of the job description and were therefore counted wherever they seemed highly appropriate. "Checking on students," "helping with suspensions," and "providing transportation" were treated in this manner. It could also be argued that activities in one job area ought to contribute to success in another for example, "visiting school" might serve to encourage students to do well. However, the activity seemed more specifically to apply to the area of home-school liaison and

---

9Gordon and Breivogel, Building Effective Home-School Relationships, p. 98.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Description of Parent-Counselor Aides</th>
<th>Unaided Recall of Job-Required Activities Question # 6</th>
<th>Activities Performed to Keep Own Children in School, 1975-76 Question # 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging regular attendance of students on caseload</td>
<td>28 Responses: checking on students helping with suspensions providing transportation making home visits keeping records making agency referrals</td>
<td>Not Applicable See Table 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging students to do well in school</td>
<td>14 Responses: getting report cards counseling students attending ABE classes assisting parents with needs group meetings with caseload</td>
<td>2 Responses: attending ABE classes sharing written materials with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating parents to participate in school related activities</td>
<td>17 Responses: attending PTA sponsoring PTA meetings attending school activities assisting parents with needs serving on community boards</td>
<td>1 Response: attending school activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 10--Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Description of Parent-Counselor Aides</th>
<th>Unaided Recall of Job-Required Activities Question # 6</th>
<th>Activities Performed to Keep Own Children in School, 1975-76 Question # 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing liaison between teacher, counselor and director (Home-School)</td>
<td>17 Responses: checking on students visiting classroom conferring with teachers, principal, etc. helping with suspension</td>
<td>4 Responses: visiting school conferring with teacher, principal, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing that students living in own household attend school regularly and punctually</td>
<td>18 Responses: checking on students providing transportation counseling them group meetings with caseload</td>
<td>18 Responses: counseling and encouraging them waking them providing transportation restricting TV and phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Service Training</td>
<td>8 Responses: attending staff meetings serving on committees preparing proposals</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project ARISE: Proposal, pp. ii-iii.*
so was counted there only.

In the third column, the responses relate exclusively to the children in the subjects' own household; therefore, the section on caseload students was left blank. (Table 9 provides information about this category.) Similarly, the section on in-service training is blank because the Project itself provided these experiences, which are no longer available to subjects. Because of the high degree of specificity in the responses, there is no overlapping of categories in this column.

It is noteworthy that in the answer to question 6 subjects recalled more specific activities relative to the attendance of caseloads than of their own children, while in answer to question 9, many more items were recalled relative to their own children. Since only sixteen of the subjects responded positively to question 9 (see Table 11) each respondent listed two or more items.

Of equal interest to the investigator is the fact that some activities were recalled, but apparently they are no longer engaged in or perhaps they are not perceived by the subjects as contributing to regular school attendance (i.e., attending PTA, getting report cards). In addition the investigator notes that although fewer subjects mention school contacts as part of current activities, sixteen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline Year 1970-71</td>
<td>ARISE Target Students 1973-74</td>
<td>ARISE Target Students 1974-75</td>
<td>S₂ Subjects 1973-74</td>
<td>S₂ Subjects 1974-75</td>
<td>S₂ Subjects 1975-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Students</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>11,837</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rate Per Student</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subjects indicate such contacts in item 14 (see Table 7). It should be noted that questions 6 and 9 required subjects to recall activities without prompting while question 14 gave the item and required only an estimate of time performed, suggesting the reason for this discrepancy.

$S_2$ Subjects

Several hypotheses relative to $S_2$ subjects were subjected to testing and analyses. Each hypothesis is stated and evaluated individually. The data in each section is presented in tabular form and in the narrative.

Statistically, the t-test was used as part of the treatment of data relative to hypotheses numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15. Either the baseline or ARISE target students' data is used as one independent sample—the data from the research population ($S_2$ or $S_3$) is the other sample in the treatment procedure. (See formula in Appendix D.) $X^2$ was used as part of the treatment of data relative to hypotheses numbered 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16. Either the baseline or ARISE target students' data was used as one attribute; data from the research population ($S_2$ or $S_3$) was the other attribute in the treatment procedure. (See Appendix E.) The 2 X 3 analysis of variance was used with hypotheses number 14 and 15.
Absentee Rate

Data seem to suggest that regular and punctual attendance in school is a necessary prerequisite to high school graduation. A comparative study of dropouts and graduates during 1968-69 school year in the Poudre, Colorado School District found that 53.4 percent of that system dropouts were absent sixteen or more days during the year. Only 8.7 percent of the students who graduated were absent sixteen or more days during the year (see Table 4). In its quest to identify the dropout prone student, Project ARISE used high absentee rate as one criterion.

The investigator hypothesized that,

(H2) During the post-project year, the absentee rate for the children of former PCA's (S2) will be lower than the baseline rate at the target school.

The absentee rate for the S2 subjects during the post-project year was 5.01. The absentee rate for the baseline year was 12.29 (see Table 11).

The following results are obtained when the data is subject to t-test:

\[ t = 5.19, \text{df} = 69, p < .05 \]

The absentee rate of S2 subjects was significantly lower
during the post-project year than during the baseline year. This hypothesis is acceptable.

The investigator hypothesized that,

\((H_3)\) During the post-project year, the absentee rate for the children of former PCA's \((S_2)\) will be equal to or lower than the rate for target students during the last two years of Project ARISE.

The data indicate that this hypothesis could be acceptable if the absentee rate for the target students is averaged over the last two years of the Project. Table 11 presents the complete data on which the comparison is based. If averaged, the target student rate of 5.76 is slightly higher than the \(S_2\) rate of 5.01. If the two years are taken singly, however, the \(S_2\) rate is lower than the 1974-75 target student rate of 8.63 but higher than the 1973-74 rate of 2.90.

The following results are achieved when the data is subjected to t-test:

\[ t = 0.537, \ df = 69, \text{ not significant (NS)} \]

This indicates that the absentee rate for \(S_2\) subjects during the post-project year was not found to be significantly different from last two years of the ARISE project.

The investigator formulated no hypothesis relative
to the $S_2$ subjects in comparison with themselves over the three year period. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that during the post-project year, the absentee rate of 5.01 was lower than the 1974-75 rate of 6.54 but slightly higher than the 1973-74 rate of 4.78. A careful study of Table 11 will show that the absentee rate of the target group increased in 1974-75 compared with the previous year. However, the rate of increase (1.37) times during 1974-75 for $S_2$ subjects was lower than the ARISE target students rate of increase (2.98) times.

**Suspension Rate**

The findings of the Poudre, Colorado School District (Table 4) indicate that 23.8 percent of school dropouts had a previous suspension. Only 8.2 percent of pupils who graduated listed a previous suspension.

The investigator hypothesized that,

$(H_4)$ During the post-project year, the suspension rate for children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will be lower than the baseline rate at the target school.

The data indicate that the suspension rate is somewhat lower; however, when subjected to t-test, there is no significant difference:
The suspension rate for the $S_2$ subjects during the post-project year was .3425. This rate is lower than the baseline rate of .50. However, since the $S_2$ group's suspension rate is not significantly lower, the hypothesis is not acceptable nor is it completely rejected. Table 12 presents the complete data on which the comparison is based.

The investigator hypothesises that,

(H$_5$) During the post-project year, the suspension rate for children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will be equal to or lower than the rate of target students during the last two years of Project ARISE.

The suspension rate of $S_2$ subjects (.3425) is higher than the rate for target students during the last two years of Project ARISE, whether the years are averaged (.146) or taken singly (.094 and .197).

However, this hypothesis cannot be rejected on the basis of the data. Although the $S_2$ group showed more suspensions than the average of the last two years of Project ARISE, the difference was not significant:

\[ t = 1.093, \, df = 72, \, NS \]

The investigator formulated no hypothesis relative to the suspension rate of $S_2$ subjects over the three year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1 Baseline Year 1970-71</th>
<th>2 ARISE Target Students 1973-74</th>
<th>3 ARISE Target Students 1974-75</th>
<th>4 1973-74</th>
<th>5 S₂ Subjects 1974-75</th>
<th>6 1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Students</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Suspensions</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate Per Student</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.3425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
period (1973-76). Nevertheless, the data reveal that the suspension rate for $S_2$ subjects was higher in the post-project year than in either of the last two project years. In fact, the suspension rate increased yearly for both the $S_2$ group and the target group. If the rate increases continue, it could be argued that the suspension rate will return to the baseline rate sometime in the future.

**Dropout Rate**

The investigator hypothesized that,

$$(H_6) \text{ During the post-project year, the dropout rate for the children of former PCA's (} S_2 \text{) will be lower than the baseline rate at the target school.}$$

During the post-project year, the $S_2$ subjects experienced 6 dropouts from a class of 76 subjects, a dropout rate of 0.079. That figure is lower than the baseline rate of 0.135 (see Table 13).

On the basis of the data treatment, this hypothesis is not acceptable nor rejected completely. Chi-square was used to subject this hypothesis to treatment. In this case the investigator compared the number of actual frequency of the event with an expected frequency. The expected frequency was obtained from prior data--which in this case--baseline compared to the baseline data:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1 Baseline Year 1970-71</th>
<th>2 ARISE Target Students 1973-74</th>
<th>3 ARISE Target Students 1974-75</th>
<th>4 1973-74</th>
<th>5 S₂ Subjects 1974-75</th>
<th>6 1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Students</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Dropouts</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ x^2 = 2.04, \text{ df} = 1 \text{ NS} \]

Thus when comparing the number of dropouts among \( S_2 \) (6) with the expected number (10.25), the difference is not great enough to be significant. In fact the baseline and \( S_2 \) were similar.

The investigator hypothesized that,

\((H_7)\) During the post-project year, the dropout rate for the children of former PCA's (\( S_2 \)) will be equal to or lower than the rate for target students during the last two years of project ARISE.

On the basis of the data, this hypothesis is not acceptable. The \( S_2 \) subjects had a dropout rate of 0.079 during the post-project year, while the target students had dropout rates of 0.00 and .057 in the last two years of the project. Insufficient data existed, for the chi-square method requires an expected frequency of five or more which was not obtained for this comparison. However, the \( S_2 \) data were very similar to what would have been expected. (Six obtained versus expected of 4.34.)

It might be noted here that from Table 13, there were no dropouts from the \( S_2 \) class during the last two project years. The explanation, however, is that the definition of the \( S_2 \) subjects included their enrollment in
school in 1975-76. Consequently, any potential subjects who dropped out in the two preceding years, were eliminated from the study.

\( S_3 \) Subjects

Absentee Rate

Six hypotheses relative to \( S_3 \) subjects were subjected to data analysis and testing. Each hypothesis is stated and evaluated individually. The data in each section is presented in tabular form and in the narrative.

The t-test was used as part of the treatment of data relative to hypotheses numbered 8 through 11, and chi-square was used with hypothesis 12. (See Appendix D and E for formulae.)

The investigator hypothesized that,

\( (H_8) \) During the post-project year, the absentee rate for students on former PCA's caseloads \( (S_3) \) will be lower than the baseline rate for the target school.

This hypothesis may not be accepted on the basis of the data and treatment. The \( S_3 \) subjects had an absentee rate of 9.91 during the post-project year. This rate is lower than the baseline absentee rate of 12.29. However, results of t-test treatment yield the following:

\[ t = 0.93, \text{ df } = 53, \text{ NS} \]
Although the post-project year absentee rate of $S_3$ subjects was lower than the baseline rate, the difference was not significant. Table 14 includes the complete data on which this comparison is based.

The investigator hypothesized that,

$(H_9)$ During the post-project year, the absentee rate for students on former PCA's caseloads ($S_3$) will be higher than the rate for target students during the last two years of project ARISE.

On the basis of the data, this hypothesis may be acceptable. The $S_3$ subjects during the post-project year experienced an absentee rate of 9.91. This rate is slightly higher than the absentee rate of target students in 1974-75 (8.63), and higher than the 1973-74 target student rate of 2.90. Furthermore, when the two years are averaged, (5.76) the hypothesis may be accepted. Subjecting the data to t-test revealed:

$$t = 1.62, \, df = 53, \, p < .05$$

Although the investigator did not hypothesize about the $S_3$ subjects in comparison with themselves over the three year period, it should be noted that the absentee rate fluctuated widely from one year to another, with the interim year (1974-75) much lower than the other two years.
### TABLE 14

**COMPARISON OF ABSENTEE RATE OF BASELINE, TARGET STUDENTS AND S₃ SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1 Baseline Year 1970-71</th>
<th>2 ARISE Target Students 1973-74</th>
<th>3 1974-75</th>
<th>4 S₃ Subjects 1973-74</th>
<th>5 1974-75</th>
<th>6 1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Students</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>11,837</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rate Per Student</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
under consideration. On the other hand, target student absentee rate was higher in the interim year than in the previous year. When the absentee rate for target students is averaged for the 1973-75 period and compared with the 1973-75 averaged absentee rate of $S_3$ subjects the latter is higher--5.76 to 7.9.

**Suspension Rate**

The investigator hypothesized that,

$$(H_{10})$$ During the post-project year, the suspension rate for students on former PCA's caseloads ($S_3$) will be lower than the baseline rate for the target school.

On the basis of the data analysis, this hypothesis is not acceptable. The $S_3$ group had 42 suspensions, a rate of 0.78 per student which is higher than the baseline rate of .50. When subjected to t-test the difference is significant.

$$t = -1.785, \ df = 53, \ p < .05$$

Table 15 presents the complete data on which this comparison is based.

The investigator hypothesized that,

$$(H_{11})$$ During the post-project year, the suspension rate for students on former PCA's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline Year</td>
<td>ARISE Target Students</td>
<td>S₃ Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Students</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Suspensions</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate Per Student</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
caseloads ($S_3$) will be higher than the rate for target students during the last two years of project ARISE.

On the basis of the data, this hypothesis may be accepted. The $S_3$ suspension rate in the post-project year of 0.78 is higher than the suspension rate for target students in either of the last two project years (.094 and .197). Subjecting the data to the t-test revealed the following:

$$t = -4.06, \, df = 53, \, p < .05$$

The $S_3$ suspension rate (post-project year) was significantly higher than the average of the last two years of the project.

Although the investigator did not hypothesize about the $S_3$ subjects' suspension rate in comparison with themselves over the three year period, it is informative to note that the $S_3$ suspension rate increased continuously over the period in question. During the same time period, the data indicates a similar increase in the suspension rate for target students.

**Dropout Rate**

The investigator hypothesized that,

$$(H_{12})$$ During the post-project year, the dropout rate for students on former PCA's caseloads
(S₃) will be lower than the baseline rate at the target school.

The S₃ subjects experienced only two dropouts from a class of fifty-nine persons, yielding a dropout rate of .034. This rate is much lower than the baseline rate of .135. The hypothesis is therefore acceptable.

\[ X^2 = 5.164, \ p = 0.05, 1 \text{ df} \]

Table 16 shows the complete data on which this comparison is based.

The investigator hypothesized that,

(H₁₃) During the post-project year, the dropout rate for students on former PCA's caseloads (S₃) will be higher than the rate for target students during the last two years of the project.

On the basis of the data, this hypothesis may be either accepted or rejected. The S₃ dropout rate of .034 was higher than the dropout rate of target students in 1973-74 (0.00), but lower than the same group in 1974-75 (.057). If the target students' dropout rate is averaged over the two years, yielding a rate of .028, then the hypothesis on the basis of this examination may be accepted. However, when attempting to subject the data to chi-square treatment, even though it was somewhat lower, we have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ARISE Project Students</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number Students</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number Dropouts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
insufficient data. Table 16 contains the complete data on which these comparisons are based.

A perusal of the data in Table 16 indicates that the dropout rate for the S₃ class fluctuated over the three years of the study. This conclusion is not warranted however. Due to the definition of the S₃ subjects, that they be enrolled in school during the 1975-76 school year, all dropouts from previous years were excluded from the study. The seven dropouts indicated for 1974-75 were actually "summer dropouts" who were undetected as such until the investigator initiated the study.

Comparison of S₂ and S₃ Subjects

The investigator hypothesized that (H₁₄) during the post-project year, children of former PCA's (S₂) will have a lower absentee rate than S₃ students. Results of mathematical treatment comparing S₂ and S₃ subjects revealed that S₃ have more absentees than S₂ subjects.

\[ t = 1.79, \text{df} = 121, p < .05 \]

This hypothesis is acceptable. S₂ subjects had an absentee rate during the post-project year lower than the S₃ subjects. It is interesting to note, however, a distinct difference in the absentee patterns of the two groups over the three year period. During 1973-74, S₂ had an
absentee rate of 4.78, which increased the following year to 6.54 and decreased during the post-project year to 5.01. A plotting of this data would show an inverse V. On the other hand, $S_3$ had an absentee rate during 1973-74 of 9.06 which decreased to 5.12 in 1974-75 and went up to 9.91 during the post-project year, the opposite pattern of the $S_2$ subjects. (See Table 17.)

The investigator hypothesized that,

$$(H_{15})$$ During the post-project year, children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will have a lower suspension rate than other students on caseloads of former PCA's ($S_3$) students.

$$t = 1.75, \text{ df } = 121, p < .05$$

During the post-project year, $S_3$ subjects experienced a suspension rate of 0.78 compared to a suspension rate of 0.34 for $S_2$ subjects. In all three years, the $S_3$ subjects' suspension rate per student was approximately two times higher than the $S_2$ suspension rate. On the basis of this analysis, this hypothesis is acceptable.

The investigator hypothesized that,

$$(H_{16})$$ During the post-project year, children of former PCA's ($S_2$) will have a lower dropout rate than other students on caseloads of former PCA's ($S_3$).
### TABLE 17

**COMPARISON OF ABSENTEE, SUSPENSION AND DROPOUT RATES FOR S₂ AND S₃ SUBJECTS, 1973-76**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>S₂ Subjects</th>
<th>S₃ Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Subjects*</td>
<td>N=74</td>
<td>N=76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee Rate Per Student</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Subjects*</td>
<td>N=74</td>
<td>N=76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspensions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension Rate Per Student</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Subjects*</td>
<td>N=74</td>
<td>N=76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate Per Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of subjects varied because there was incomplete data on students who dropped out, affecting the absentee and suspension rate calculations.*
Using the chi-square treatment of data, we find:

\[ X^2 = 0.14, \, df = 1, \, \text{Not Significant} \]

Because of the small expected values, \( X^2 \) is not adequate to make any statistical analysis. This statement is true for both \( S_2 \) and \( S_3 \) subjects. Therefore, this hypothesis is neither accepted nor rejected.

**Summary of Results**

The specific purpose of this investigation was to determine the extent to which job-required parental (\( S_1 \)) behaviors continued during the post-project year, and their probably effect on incidences of absentees, suspensions, and dropouts among two groups of students (\( S_2 \) and \( S_3 \)).

Parent-Counselor Aides continued to be supportive of the school behaviors during the post-project year but at a reduced level. Eighteen PCA's indicated that they performed at least six of the specifically required ARISE activities during the post-project year. Those activities which required the subjects to leave home to perform witnessed the sharpest decline after the termination of ARISE. Attendance at Parent Teacher Association meetings and enrollment in Adult Basic Education classes were two areas which registered even sharper declines than other areas. The decreases in other activities appear to be excessive. However, considering that this class of parent was near zero in specified
behaviors prior to ARISE, the retention of a residual level in excess of ten percent is significant.

The objective of hypotheses numbered 2 through 7 was to determine the extent to which the school supportive behaviors of $S_1$ subjects were evidenced in the rates of absentees, suspensions and dropouts of their children ($S_2$) during the post-project year. Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 proved to be acceptable. The absentee rate for $S_2$ was lower than the baseline, lower than target students and the suspension rate was lower than the baseline rate. It should be noted, however, only hypothesis number 2 was significant. Hypotheses numbered 5 and 6 were not acceptable and the data collected were insufficient to draw any conclusion about hypothesis number 7.

The objective of hypotheses numbered 8 through 13 was to determine the effects of parental behaviors, as measured through matters of absentees, suspensions and dropouts upon the other students ($S_3$) on the caseloads of former parent workers. Except for number 13, all hypotheses were acceptable. The $S_3$ subjects' absentee rate was lower than the baseline and higher than target pupils; the suspension rate was lower than the baseline and higher than the target pupils and the dropout rate was lower than the baseline rate. The data were insufficient to draw
conclusions about hypothesis number 13.

The objective of hypotheses numbered 14 through 16 was to compare the effects of parents on their own children ($S_2$) and other children ($S_3$) on their caseloads, and to document any significant differences between the two groups in matters of absentees, suspensions and dropouts. Hypotheses 14 and 15 were accepted. The absentee and suspension rates for $S_2$ were significantly lower than the rates for $S_3$.

Hypothesis number 16 was neither accepted nor rejected. $S_2$ dropout rate exceeded the dropout rate of $S_3$.

Summary, conclusion and implication for further research are presented in Chapter V. This chapter summarizes findings of the study, makes recommendations for subsequent research, and gives implications of findings for educational leaders.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The general concern in this study was to determine to what extent identified support-of-the school behaviors continued beyond the life of Project ARISE as measured through certain characteristics of two classes of students and opinions of former parent workers. In order to reduce this generalization to researchable levels, the investigator formulated sixteen hypotheses.

Findings: \( S_1 \) Subjects

Former Parent Counselor Aides in Project ARISE continued some activities which were job-required during the life of the temporary dropout prevention program; however, most were severely reduced to a level of ten to twenty percent of the project level. This was true of activities related to keeping their own children in school, making contacts with school personnel, home counseling of their own children, contacts and counseling of former caseload students and parents, and contacts with community agencies.

A few activities which seemed significant to Project ARISE designers were apparently not perceived as significant by the former PCA's. For example, PTA attendance dropped
to the pre-project level: 13 of the 21 subjects attended fewer than half the PTA meetings and only 3 of the subjects viewed PTA attendance as leading to success of their children in school. When it is also noted that enrollment in Adult Basic Education dropped to 3, it is concluded that former PCA's continued least those activities which required them to leave the home or immediate neighborhood.

Based upon this investigator's knowledge and experience with these and other parents from this socio-economic background, the involvement in school supportive behavior prior to Project ARISE was negligible. Therefore, in comparison with pre-project involvement, in many cases, Project ARISE was able to increase parental activity in the areas specified 100 percent. The project made some differences in matters of attendance, absentees and dropouts among both classes of students. This study revealed, however, that PCA's discontinued most (70 percent to 80 percent) of the specific ARISE job required behaviors during the post-project year and therefore the hypothesis becomes statistically unacceptable. Nevertheless, when other data are examined, it is clear there remains some residual and identified parental supportive of the school behaviors influencing positively, especially upon the S2 subjects.
Findings: $S_2$ Subjects

These subjects were the children of former PCA's and were consequently either students identified as dropout prone or the siblings of dropout prone students.

The absentee rate of $S_2$ students, as a class, was actually decreased by Project ARISE. In the post-project year, these students had less than one-half the absences of the baseline rate which was statistically significant. Their absentee rate was also lower, but not significantly, than the average of the last two years of the target students, as predicted. Thirdly, the $S_2$ subjects themselves held their absentee rate to the same level in the post-project year as for the last two years of the project.

The $S_2$ suspension rate, on the other hand, increased, contrary to expectations, but it did not surpass the baseline suspension rate.

The dropout rate was higher than predicted. It will be noted, however, that all six dropouts were members of the previously identified target group, dropout prone. None of the $S_2$ subjects who were not so identified in previous years dropped out.

It may be concluded that the residual effect of Project ARISE on students in the household of the former PCA's is still open to question, although the reduced absentee rate would suggest continuing residual long range benefits. That there are some residual positive effects
is very clear. It is not clear from this research, however, if the residual effects are resident in behavior of parents during the post-project year, or residual in the students themselves. The latter could very well be the case since all of the $S_2$ subjects actually experienced at least one parent literally living in school for three or more years.

**Findings: $S_3$ Subjects**

These students were a sub-group of the target population of Project ARISE, and could be assumed to have the worse records of absentees and suspensions than the total school population, prior to the project. During the project, they were in regular contact with PCA's from their own neighborhood, parents of classmates and "buddies."

As expected, the absentee rate of these subjects in the post-project year was twenty-five percent lower than the baseline rate. However, it was higher than the rate for $S_2$ subjects, as predicted, and higher than the rate for themselves in the last two years of the project.

The suspension rate for this class was one and one-half times higher than the rate for the baseline year. It was also higher than the target rate as predicted and higher than the rate for the same class ($S_3$) during the two previous years.

During the last project year and the post-project year, the dropout rate returned to a rate close to that of the
baseline year (eighty percent). Even though only two students dropped out in 1975-76, the investigator anticipates additional summer dropouts, which would increase this rate; however, the actual number is impossible to determine at the time of this study.

It must be concluded that the residual effect of Project ARISE on the students on caseloads of PCA's was negligible as measured by this investigation.

Recommendations for Further Research

(1) A follow-up study of $S_2$ and $S_3$ subjects should be made at the end of a five year period. Five years would allow enough time to elapse so that a much clearer picture could be obtained relating to residual effects of the project on all siblings of these households.

(2) The project should be replicated over a relatively long period of time to permit some longitudinal studies of the effect of parental involvement in school activities on not only school attendance and dropouts, but also on academic achievements.

(3) There is a need for research to initiate and evaluate innovative ways to utilize welfare aid to dependent children, Social Security, rent subsidies and manpower training programs to
promote active parental participation in the education of children of the recipients. This investigator visualizes the possibility of coordinated block grants to needy families to include skills training and other benefits contingent upon certain school supportive behaviors such as keeping children in regular school attendance.

(4) An ARISE type project should be replicated on an operational basis in an urban area which is socio-economically deprived and has a high concentration of school dropouts.

(5) A replication of Project ARISE should include a sophisticated and appropriate survey of attitudes of parent workers, prior to and after employment. The survey should be culturally fair, relate primarily to school related attitudes and designed to be administered orally.

Implications for Educators

(1) Educational practitioners should try the temporary systems approach when seeking solutions to problems of improving the educational programs. Two appropriate areas which would probably be amenable to this approach are
(a) experimental designs in organizational structure and course offerings, and (b) effective, innovative parental participation in the school program.

(2) It is clear from this research that parents in the lower socio-economic level are not apathetic about their children. They, like others, require the time, energy and financial resources to manifest their concerns. It is necessary that educational program designers build in some immediate economic gains for poverty level parents to obtain their active support and participation.

(3) The dropout prone student (ARISE target students) needs continuous intervention inclusive of encouragement, help with socio-economic and academic problems in order to cope with and remain in school.

(4) The employment of parents of dropout prone students in meaningful roles as paraprofessionals at a salary above the poverty level may be an effective means of getting the school into the home. As a condition of employment, these parents would be required to keep their own children in school.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

ESEA TITLE VIII PROJECT LOCATIONS (1970-1975)

1. Texarkana, Arkansas
2. Miami, Florida
3. Paducah, Kentucky
4. Baltimore, Maryland
5. Fall River, Massachusetts
6. St. Louis, Missouri
7. Fredonia, New York
8. Dayton, Ohio
9. Pine Ridge, South Dakota
10. Seattle, Washington
11. Tuskegee, Alabama
12. Oakland, California
13. Englewood, Colorado
14. Hartford, Connecticut
15. Detroit, Michigan
16. Minneapolis, Minnesota
17. Trenton, New Jersey
18. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
19. Riverton, Wyoming
20. Los Angeles, California
21. Robstown, Texas
APPENDIX B

MACON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
TUSKEGEE, ALABAMA

July 30, 1975

1974-75 AVERAGE EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL (ADA) IN MACON COUNTY, COMPARED WITH STATE OF ALABAMA, WITH SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN OUR REGION AND WITH THE NATIONAL AVERAGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Macon County</th>
<th>Average Per Pupil in Alabama</th>
<th>Average Per Pupil in Districts Our Size in our Region</th>
<th>National Average Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>26,85</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>42.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional salaries</td>
<td>10,89</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>17.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. &amp; Cler. salaries</td>
<td>10,76</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>14.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenditures</td>
<td>5,57</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,07</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruction**

| Classroom teachers    | 460.25       | 34.53                       | 40.75                                                 | 64.60                     |
| Other professionals   | 43.72        | 3.27                        | 4.00                                                  | 7.20                      |
| Sec. & Cler. salaries | 7.47         | 0.56                        | 0.66                                                  | 1.15                      |
| Textbooks             | 0.70         | 0.06                        | 0.08                                                  | 0.14                      |
| Library materials     | 0.50         | 0.04                        | 0.05                                                  | 0.10                      |
| Audio-visual materials| 0.00         | 0.00                        | 0.00                                                  | 0.00                      |
| Teaching supplies     | 9.06         | 0.69                        | 0.76                                                  | 1.29                      |
| Other expenditures    | 7.27         | 0.55                        | 0.61                                                  | 1.06                      |
| **Total**             | **557.05**   | **42.36**                   | **47.62**                                             | **82.41**                 |

**Attendance Service**

| Salaries              | 0.00         | 0.00                        | 0.00                                                  | 0.00                      |
| **Total**             | **0.00**     | **0.00**                    | **0.00**                                              | **0.00**                  |

**Health Service**

| Salaries              | 20.76        | 1.53                        | 1.87                                                  | 3.23                      |
| **Total**             | **20.76**    | **1.53**                    | **1.87**                                              | **3.23**                  |

**Plant Operation**

| Salaries              | 18.14        | 1.36                        | 1.60                                                  | 2.68                      |
| **Total**             | **18.14**    | **1.36**                    | **1.60**                                              | **2.68**                  |

**Transportation**

| Salaries              | 10.46        | 0.78                        | 0.92                                                  | 1.54                      |
| **Total**             | **10.46**    | **0.78**                    | **0.92**                                              | **1.54**                  |

**Capital Outlay**

| Salaries              | 26.54        | 2.00                        | 2.20                                                  | 3.60                      |
| **Total**             | **26.54**    | **2.00**                    | **2.20**                                              | **3.60**                  |

**Debt Service**

| Salaries              | 26.69        | 2.00                        | 2.22                                                  | 3.60                      |
| **Total**             | **26.69**    | **2.00**                    | **2.22**                                              | **3.60**                  |

**Grand Total Expenditures**

| Expenditures          | **660.65**   | **49.39**                   | **55.05**                                             | **92.05**                 |
| **Total**             | **660.65**   | **49.39**                   | **55.05**                                             | **92.05**                 |

**Total Tax Collected in Macon County and the Average Amount Per Student Per Year for Support of Quality Public School Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Taxes Collected</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Amount Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>$198,957.41</td>
<td>5047</td>
<td>$39.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$208,616.38</td>
<td>5060</td>
<td>$41.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$227,932.73</td>
<td>4937</td>
<td>$46.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$234,866.78</td>
<td>4966</td>
<td>$48.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary Reappraisal - $20.46 Per Pupil
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Former Parent Counselor Aides in Project ARISE

This questionnaire was designed as part of a follow-up study of Title VIII Project ARISE. The twenty-one parents with children currently enrolled in school and who worked for three of more years as Parent Counselor Aides are included in the research. The purpose of the study is to determine if the project was effective for the parents and students involved. Your opinions and information are very important in determining the program's effectiveness. The answers you give may suggest strategies leading to programs inclusive of expanded use of parent workers in educational programs.

Yours answers to the questions will be used only to evaluate Project ARISE. All answers will be used in a way that will not reveal your identity.

PART I:

1. Male ( ) Female ( ) Married ( ) Divorced ( ) Single ( )
   Below 30 years of age ( ) 31-40 ( ) 41-50 ( ) Over 50 ( )
   High School graduate ( ) If you attended college, give number of years ( ) If you did not graduate from high
school, write in last grade you completed ( ) What was your reason for dropping out? ______________________

Spouse living in household: Yes ( ) No ( )
Number of other adults living in household ( )
Own home ( ) Renting ( ) Amount of monthly house note or rent $______ Spouse a high school graduate Yes ( ) No ( ) Last grade spouse completed ( )
Spouse's reason for dropping out ______________________

2. Using the chart, for each of your own children, write in below the age, their present grade in school. For those who graduated from high school, write "G." If in a pre-school program such as Headstart, Day Care or Nursery, write "P." If dropped out, write the last grade attended and circle it. (See chart next page.) For each person circled above, did the dropout occur before, during or after the Project terminated? ________

3. Immediately before your employment with Project ARISE were you Employed ( ) On Welfare ( ) Social Security ( ) Other Explain ________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Immediately before assuming work with Project ARISE was your own monthly income $249 or less ( ) $250-349 ( ) $350-449 ( ) $450-549 ( ) $550-649 ( ) Over $650 ( )

Immediately before assuming work with Project ARISE, what is your estimate of the monthly income of your total household? $349 or less ( ) $350-399 ( ) $500-649 ( ) $650-799 ( ) $800-949 ( ) $950-1099 ( ) Above $1100 ( )

4. Are you presently employed: Yes ( ) No ( )
On Welfare ( ) Social Security ( ) Other, explain ______

If currently employed, what kind of work? ____________

Do you believe your work with Project ARISE helped you in getting this job? Yes ( ) No ( ) Unsure ( )
At present your own monthly income from all sources is $249 or less ( ) $250-349 ( ) $450-549 ( ) $500-649 ( ) $650-799 ( ) $800-949 ( ) $950-1099 ( ) Over $1100 ( )

5. If we offered you another job as a Parent Counselor Aide would you accept it? Yes ( ) No ( ) Maybe ( )
PART II:

6. As a condition of your employment as a PCA, you were required to do some specific things and to engage in specific activities. Name as many of these as you can recall. 

7. Before you started to work as a Parent Counselor Aide, how many times per year did you attend PTA meetings? Never ( ) 1 or 3 times ( ) 3 to 5 times ( ) Always ( )

8. Please check the months you have attended a PTA meeting during the present school year.

Attend PTA Meeting

High School


Elementary

9. When you started to work as a PCA, did you do some new things to encourage your own children to be more regular in school attendance? Yes ( ) No ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the new things done during the Project</th>
<th>Still do in 1975-76</th>
<th>Approximate times/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. During the current school year, have you enrolled in the Adult Basic Education Program? Yes ( ) No ( )

11. During the current school year, have you attended any educational programs or workshops? Yes ( ) No ( )
   If the answer is yes, name them. ________________________________

12. During the school year, have you talked to other parents about matters related to school? Yes ( ) No ( )

13. During the current school year, have you counseled with or talked to any students who were in families on your caseload? Yes ( ) No ( )

14. Estimate below the number of times you have engaged in these activities during the school year:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseled student, parent, Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal, Teacher, Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited the Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended any School Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

The t-tests

The t-test was used as the statistical tool to examine hypotheses numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15. These hypotheses suggested that the group being discussed should be compared with prior data. From the group an estimate of the standard error of the mean was obtained by the following formula:

\[ S_m = \frac{S}{N} \]

Where:

S represents the sample statistic for the standard deviation, N represents the number of usable data entries

Then:

\[ t = (m-x)S_m \text{ and } df = n-1 \]

Where: t represents the test of the difference between the prior mean and S represents the standard error of the mean. M represents the prior mean; x represents the sample mean and df represents the degree of

then: \[ x = 5.014 \]
APPENDIX E

CHI-Square ($X^2$)

Chi-square was used as the statistical tool to examine hypotheses numbered 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16. This tool compares the number of actual frequency of the event with some expected frequency. The expected frequency was obtained from the prior data, the proportion of dropout students, for example, times the number of individuals in the new group.

FORMULA:

$$X = \frac{(0-e)^2}{e}$$

Where: 0 = observed frequency
e = expected frequency
### Estimated number of dropouts between fifth grade and high school graduation: United States, 1950-58 to 1974-82

| Fall of | 5th grade enrollment | School year | High school graduates | Dropouts
|---------|---------------------|------------|----------------------|-----------
| 1950    | 2.5 million         | 1957-58    | 1.5 million          | 1.0 million
| 1952    | 2.9 million         | 1958-60    | 1.9 million          | 1.0 million
| 1954    | 2.9 million         | 1961-62    | 1.9 million          | 1.0 million
| 1956    | 3.3 million         | 1963-64    | 2.3 million          | 1.0 million
| 1958    | 3.6 million         | 1965-66    | 2.6 million          | 1.0 million
| 1960    | 3.6 million         | 1967-68    | 2.7 million          | 1.0 million
| 1962    | 3.0 million         | 1969-70    | 2.9 million          | 1.0 million
| 1964    | 4.0 million         | 1971-72    | 3.0 million          | 1.0 million
| 1966    | 4.1 million         | 1973-74    | 3.2 million          | 1.0 million
| 1968    | 4.2 million         | 1975-76    | 3.3 million          | 1.0 million
| 1970    | 4.2 million         | 1977-78    | 3.4 million          | 1.0 million
| 1972    | 4.1 million         | 1979-80    | 3.5 million          | 1.0 million
| 1974    | 4.0 million         | 1981-82    | 3.6 million          | 1.0 million

*Compulsory attendance laws keep virtually all children in school at least until the 5th grade.
*Excludes persons who receive high school equivalency certificates and persons who leave the regular school system before graduation to enter trade, business, and vocational schools and who may consider themselves to be high school graduates. The estimated number of persons in these categories is approximately 200,000 a year.

Note —Includes public and nonpublic schools in the U.S. states and D.C.
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