DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 033 08 VT 005 447

By- Kaufman, Jacob J.; And Others

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND ITS INFLUENCE ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS. INTERIM REPORT.

Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Inst. for Research on Human Resources.
Spons Agency- Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Bureau No- BR-5-0060
Pub Date Jan 68
Contract- OEC-5-85-012
Note- 252p.
EDRS Price MF- $1.00 HC- $10.16
Descriptors- ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, CONTROL GROUPS, *DROPOUT PROGRAMS, DROPOUTS, EFFECTIVE TEACHING, *EXPERIMENTAL CURRICULUM, EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS, *GENERAL EDUCATION, INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT, LITERATURE REVIEWS, PROGRAM ATTITUDES, QUESTIONNAIRES, SELF CONCEPT, *SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, STUDENT ATTITUDES, TEACHER ATTITUDES, TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, WITHDRAWAL

The major purpose of this study was to test the effects on later employment of having a high school diploma or having skill training but no diploma. This report is limited to the immediate effects of two experimental programs for dropouts. Four groups of students were utilized: (1) the diploma group of 115 students who had dropped out of school but came back for 1 year after which they received a diploma, (2) the skill training group of 128 students who had dropped out but came back for 1 year of vocational training, (3) the control group of 91 students who had dropped out but were offered vocational guidance and financial incentives to participate, and (4) the graduate group of 85 students who were seniors matched with the experimental subjects on race, sex, curriculum and I.Q. The diploma group benefited the most as measured by psychological tests. Chapters are devoted to the social and psychological aspects of school withdrawal, students' evaluation of the program, human relations in the program, and teacher characteristics. The appendixes include the analysis of pre- and post-test results and a student interview-questionnaire. (EM)

INTERIM REPORT

Contract No. O.E.-5-85-012

M.M. Harris x

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND ITS INFLUENCE ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

An interim report on the experimental phase of a study to compare education versus training for young school dropouts.

January 1968

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Institute for Research on Human Resources
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND ITS INFLUENCE ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Jacob J. Kaufman and Morgan V. Lewis

with the assistance of

David C. Gumpper

January 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view of opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Institute for Research on Human Resources
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study described in this report required the cooperation of many people: teachers, administrators, counselors, local and state school and welfare officials, officers of a private foundation, physicians and, of course, those who participated as experimental subjects. For reasons which are discussed in the Foreword, it was decided that no individual or organization will be identified in this report. Consequently, it is not possible to acknowledge, by name, all of those who contributed to this study. But our appreciation of the 400 young people who served as research subjects must be mentioned. These young people were drawn primarily from poverty families and were burdened with all the handicaps that such a background entails. Yet those who remained in the programs showed that, given the chance, they retained a desire for individual accomplishment and responded to the opportunity for it.

The contribution of those individuals who were directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the experimental programs is also acknowledged. Of all the personnel involved in the study, they had by far the most challenging task. It is to their credit that many of them overcame their accustomed habits and found new ways to reach the students.

The necessity for anonymity does not extend to those who assisted in the planning of the study and the writing of this report. Christopher Mare, of the State College Area School District, was influential in many facets of the study. He acted as a consultant to administrators and teachers, particularly those from the diploma program, and contributed significantly to the development of the conclusions and recommendations in the final chapter. Raymond Hummel, of the University of Pittsburgh, assisted in the development of the guidance phase of the project. Joan Myers was of great assistance in the preparation of the material on the evaluation of the teachers. Maureen Thomas and Patricia Licuanan contributed to the analysis of the reactions of the students to the programs. Woo Jin Paik and Frederick Agostino prepared the statistical material which was concerned with the scope of the dropout problem. Richard G. Kaufman and Alice Emery showed diligence and

interest in the handling of the clerical work.

The authors wish to thank the New York Review and John Holt for permission to quote from his book review titled "Children in Prison."

Naturally, final responsibility for the presentation and interpretation of the data and the conclusions and recommendations remains with the authors.

Jacob J. Kaufman
Project Director

FOREWORD

This is a report of two experimental programs that were conducted for young high school dropouts. The students received either the credits required for a high school diploma or training in one of three skill areas. The study, of which these programs were a part, was directed by personnel from the staff of the Institute for Research on Human Resources of The Pennsylvania State University. The programs, however, were conducted by two school districts under contract with the University. This contractual arrangement limited the influence of the University on the programs, except to the extent to which the school districts accepted the suggestions of the University staff.

When this study was being planned, it was not anticipated that a report of this nature would be written. The original, and continuing, objective of this study is to determine the extent to which the diploma, as a credential, is a necessary requirement for entry into the labor force. The need for this report was impressed upon the staff by the major differences in the results of the two programs: in terms of retention rates, changes in academic achievement, and changes in attitudes toward self. Although the subjects assigned to the two programs were quite similar in characteristics, the high school diploma program had much more success with them. It was thought that the reporting of this case study would contribute to a better understanding of the role of the school environment on the education or training of disadvantaged youth.

The difference in the approach of the two programs to their students seems to be one of the major factors that accounted for the difference in their results. This approach is referred to in this report as the "attitudinal tone" or "atmosphere" of the programs. These terms refer to all those factors in the school environment that produced the affective response of the students--the way they felt about their schools.

The difference in the affective response prompted the preparation of this report. It was thought important that others who are involved in programs for the disadvantaged be informed of these experiences.

The difference between the programs provided an unexpected test of the importance of the atmosphere of the school. It had been intended to create a supportive climate in each of the programs. However, a number of influences, which are discussed at length in the report, prevented the fostering of such a climate in the skill training program. Despite the efforts of the University staff to develop an appropriate climate, most of the personnel of the agency that conducted the skill training program held essentially negative attitudes towards the students. These attitudes resulted in personal and instructional conditions that affected the students adversely.

This report attempts to explain why there were such major attitudinal differences in the two programs. These reasons are presented as objectively as possible. Consequently, some of the reasons that are advanced may not reflect well on a few of the organizations and individuals. Therefore, no individual or organization is identified.

The authors recognize the limitations of this study. It is based on a self-selected sample of dropouts who were taught by teachers drawn from one geographic area. The differences in atmosphere that developed in the two schools were, to a degree, beyond the control of the investigators. The authors are convinced that they understand the reasons for these differences, but this does not mean that they could reproduce the results in another study. Many of the factors that caused these results, such as individual attitudes, cannot be manipulated at will.

In this study most of the personnel from the skill training program held essentially negative attitudes towards the dropouts, but this result should not be interpreted as a condemnation of occupational or skill training. Rather, it is a condemnation of those personal characteristics and institutional rigidities that interact to deprive further our most disadvantaged youth. In this study these conditions were found primarily in the skill training

program. Another study might find these conditions reversed. Wherever these conditions are found--whether it be a school, a welfare office, a business organization, or a university--they should be identified and attempts should be made to counteract them. It is hoped that this report will aid in the task of identifying those factors that can contribute to the improvement of our schools and their educational programs, whether they be skill training or academic.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

CHAPTER I

SCHOOL DROPOUTS: THE EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

Historically the public school has been the institution most concerned with providing equal opportunities to all citizens. Public education in the United States has been increasingly available to all who can benefit from it. During the past few years the nation has turned its attention to those persons who have not participated in the rising standard of living. It is natural that society should look to the schools to help its more unfortunate members.

How well suited are the public schools to serve these particular groups? Although more evidence is necessary, that which exists raises some doubts about the ability of the schools to help people rise out of the poverty culture. The schools, it is often said, are middle-class institutions. This means that they reflect those values which most people in this country hold. These values include a sense of personal responsibility, attention to details, cleanliness, promptness, an orientation to future goals, politeness, etc. Behavior which reflects these values is expected and rewarded. Behavior which reflects another set of values--spontaneity, immediate gratification of desires, display of emotions--is disruptive to the conduct of the schools and hence is discouraged.

Students from a poverty culture often engage in behavior which alienates them from the teachers and administrators of the typical middle-class school. In addition, these students are often poorly prepared for the verbal emphasis on academic subjects. They have deficiencies in the necessary skills of reading and writing and can see little relevance of the required subjects to their lives. The combination of these personal and academic problems cause many students to withdraw from this institutional setting as soon as they can legally do so. With this act of withdrawal these students acquire the label of

"dropouts"--a label that has come to signify the presence of a number of social and personal problems.

What are some of the dimensions of this problem? And, indeed, is it really a problem at all? This chapter presents aggregate data that have been gathered to examine whether or not leaving school without a diploma is a handicap. These data do indicate that it is a problem now and likely to be a more serious problem in the future. The trend towards a highly urban labor force which requires skilled workers continues to limit the types of occupations that dropouts can enter. This limitation is reflected in lower labor force participation and lower earning for dropouts.

The comparisons of these aggregate data, however, cannot specify to what degree the greater "success" of the high school graduate is due simply to the possession of the diploma itself. Does the diploma "credential" increase the opportunities for its possessor to obtain meaningful employment? The present study was designed to examine this question. Before describing the study, however, data on the scope of the "dropout problem" are examined.

DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

Is There a Dropout Problem?

Approximately 15 years ago, the attention of the government, the educational system, and the general public began to focus upon the high school dropout as a significant social problem. More recently extensive advertising campaigns featuring personal appeals, by high government officials and celebrities from the entertainment world encouraging students to stay in school, have become commonplace. Federal allocations of funds to various programs, designed to promote school retention and the training of those who have already dropped out, have increased during this period.

Despite this activity, however, questions have been raised concerning the seriousness of the dropout problem. Some educators and social scientists have taken the position that the entire situation is not as bad as it has been pictured. This point should be explored because it may be that in the drive to lower the dropout rate, resources may be misdirected (Weisbrod, 1965). As shown in Table 1, with the exception of the latest year, there has been a steady increase in the ratio of high

school graduates to non-graduates since the early 1900's.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Students Dropping Out of High School
1899-1965

Year	Percentage	Year	Percentage
1899 - 1900	93.6	1949 - 1950	41.0
1909 - 1910	91.2		
1919 - 1920	83.2	1951 - 1952	41.4
1929 - 1930	71.0	1953 - 1954	40.0
1939 - 1940	49.2	1955 - 1956	37.7
		1957 - 1958	35.2
1941 - 1942	48.8	1959 - 1960	34.9
1943 - 1944	57.7		
1945 - 1946	52.1	1961 - 1962	30.5
1947 - 1948	46.0	1963 - 1964	23.7
		1964 - 1965	28.0 a)

a) Preliminary data

Source: Kenneth A. Simon and W. Vance Grant, Digest of Educational Statistics. Office of Education Bulletin 1965, No. 4 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office), 1966.

Although the absolute number of non-graduates has remained virtually static since the turn of the century, its proportion of the total student population has steadily fallen. It is projected that this decline in the proportion of non-graduates will continue until the end of the century, when there will be an irreducible minimum of uneducables who, because of physical or mental defects, cannot make use of the public schools (Dentler, 1964).

But the number of dissenters to the dropout problem is quite small in comparison to those who think that youngsters who do not complete their education represent a waste of human resources as well as a potential threat to society (Conant, 1961). The data in Table 1 may hide more than they reveal. They can

lead to the assumption that the present rate of improvement will continue indefinitely into the future, until an absolute minimum of uneducables is reached. This may not be a valid assumption. The problems of education in urban areas seem to be becoming more, rather than less, severe, and it is questionable whether sufficient resources will be allocated to deal with these problems.

Structural changes in the composition of the work force have made it more difficult for the uneducated to find employment. At the turn of the century, 38 per cent of the labor force was employed in farm occupations. In 1960, the figure was seven per cent. In addition, the nature of many farm occupations, as well as most others in the economy, has become increasingly complex. The increases in white collar and skilled occupations, that demand a certain level of educational attainment, are so commonly recognized as to require no real documentation. A shorter work week and more leisure time have stimulated the growth of the service industries in which workers need both social and verbal ease. The dropout is at a decided disadvantage in these growing sectors.

Impact on Special Groups

Without doubt the long-range trends in society are acting to the detriment of the dropout. The most pressing reasons for concern, however, are not these trends, but rather the concentration of dropouts in families of low annual income. One study in Detroit, for example, found that in areas of heavy concentration of nonwhite population over 70 per cent had never received a high school diploma and 50 per cent of the families had annual incomes under $3,000 (Barcus, 1964).

The three characteristics of low income, color, and school withdrawal all are found together. Because proportionally more nonwhite than whites have low incomes, school withdrawal appears to be predominantly a nonwhite phenomenon. Table 2 shows, for example, that 28 per cent of the families of white dropouts and 51 per cent of the families of nonwhite dropouts had annual incomes of less than $3,000.

Although the figures in Table 2 might at first be interpreted to indicate higher dropout rates among nonwhites, they actually show that more nonwhite families receive low incomes. When the ratio of graduates to dropouts is compared by income level, there are proportionally more nonwhites than whites graduated. Among white families receiving less than $3,000 per year,

TABLE 2

Annual Income of Families of High School Graduates and School Dropouts, 16 to 21 by Color and Sex

	Graduates						
		Less than $3,000					
	Total	Total	Less than $2,000	$2,000 to $2,999	$3,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $7,499	$7,500 and over
All persons	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Both sexes	100	10.2	5.2	5.0	18.1	27.9	43.8
Male	100	10.3	5.6	4.7	19.1	25.4	45.1
Female	100	10.0	4.8	5.2	17.4	29.8	42.8
White							
Both sexes	100	7.7	3.6	4.1	16.2	28.1	48.0
Male	100	8.1	3.3	4.3	17.0	24.9	50.0
Female	100	7.5	3.5	4.0	15.6	30.5	46.4
Nonwhite							
Both sexes	100	28.3	16.8	11.4	32.7	26.6	12.5
Male	100	26.4	18.6	7.9	33.6	29.3	10.7
Female	100	29.9	15.3	14.6	31.8	24.2	14.0

Note: Includes only families of unmarried persons living with, and related to, head of household. Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Source: Harvey R. Hamel, "Employment of High School Graduates and Dropouts in 1965," Monthly Labor Review, June 1965, p. 646.

TABLE 2 (continued)

Annual Income of Families of High School Graduates and School Dropouts, 16 to 21 by Color and Sex

	Dropouts						
		Less than $3,000					
All persons	Total %	Total %	Less than $2,000 %	$2,000 to $2,999 %	$3,000 to $4,999 %	$5,000 to $7,499 %	$7,500 and over %
Both sexes	100	33.3	19.3	14.0	27.3	23.5	15.9
Male	100	32.8	19.8	13.0	25.4	24.8	17.0
Female	100	34.2	18.3	15.9	31.1	21.0	13.6
White							
Both sexes	100	28.3	14.9	13.4	26.9	25.4	19.3
Male	100	26.9	14.9	12.0	25.4	27.4	20.3
Female	100	31.5	15.0	16.5	30.3	21.0	17.1
Nonwhite							
Both sexes	100	50.8	35.0	15.8	28.4	16.8	4.0
Male	100	56.1	39.2	16.9	25.4	14.3	4.2
Female	100	42.1	28.1	14.0	33.3	21.1	3.5

Note: Includes only families of unmarried persons living with, and related to, head of household. Because of rounding, sums of individual items may not equal totals.

Source: Harvey R. Hamel, "Employment of High School Graduates and Dropouts in 1965," Monthly Labor Review, June 1965, p. 646.

approximately one student was graduated for every four who dropped out (the actual ratio is .27). Among nonwhite families receiving less than $3,000 per year, approximately one student was graduated for every two who dropped out (the actual ratio is .56). The incidence of graduation by nonwhites is twice as high as that of whites when family income is controlled. Table 3 shows the ratios of graduates to dropouts by income level. For each level shown, more nonwhites than whites were graduated.

TABLE 3

Ratio of Graduates to Dropouts by Annual Family Income, Color, and Sex

	Less than $3,000					
	Total	Less than $2,000	$2,000 to $2,999	$3,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $7,499	$7,500 and over
White						
Total	.27	.24	.31	.60	1.11	2.49
Male	.30	.26	.36	.67	.91	2.46
Female	.24	.23	.24	.51	1.45	2.71
Nonwhite						
Total	.56	.48	.72	1.15	1.58	3.13
Male	.47	.47	.47	1.32	2.05	2.55
Female	.71	.54	1.04	.95	1.15	4.00

Figures in this table are derived from the percentages in Table 2.

Because of the confounding of color, poverty, and school withdrawal, the studies made of the IQs of graduates and dropouts are also inconclusive. As a rule, dropouts do score lower on IQ tests. Table 4 presents some typical data.

TABLE 4

IQ of Graduates and Dropouts, Five Areas

	Total[a]	110 and over	90-109	85-89	Under 85
	%	%	%	%	%
High School Graduates					
All areas[b]	100[c]	16	63	11	10
Area A	100	22	61	8	9
Area D[b]	100	17	55	12	16
Area E	100	15	73	8	4
Area F	100	9	61	16	14
Area G	100	17	63	12	8
Dropouts					
All areas[b]	100[c]	6	48	15	31
Area A	100	8	51	14	27
Area D	100	8	45	12	35
Area E	100	5	55	17	23
Area F	100	4	43	19	34
Area G	100	7	46	13	34

[a]Based on Otis Mental Ability Group test in 4 areas, and on Terman-McNamar in 1.

[b]Data for Areas B and C were insufficient to warrant presentation.

[c]Excludes 612 graduates and 794 dropouts for whom IQ were not reported.

Note: Area A = Vanderburgh County, Ind.
Area D = Port Huron, Mich.
Area E = Utica, N. Y.
Area F = Harrison County, W. Va.
Area G = Providence, R. I.

Source: "School and Early Employment Experience of Youth," A Report on Seven Communities, 1952-57, Bulletin No. 1277, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., August 1960.

While low IQ has been blamed for the inability of students to complete school (Blough, 1956), other investigators have demonstrated that aptitude tests discriminate against individuals from a poverty background (Eells et al., 1951; Fulk and Harrell, 1952). Penty (1956) has shown that if groups of graduates and dropouts are matched on the basis of social class, IQ differences disappear and the dropout has the same level of natural ability as the graduate.

A student from a poverty background is much more handicapped in his efforts to complete high school than his more fortunate classmates. Some of the psychological and sociological reasons for this handicap are examined in Chapter II. If he does not overcome the handicap, if he drops out, the chances are high he will work less and earn less than those students who do graduate. These data are examined next.

The Dropout in the Labor Market

The structural changes in the economy described above have produced a labor market which limits the employability of dropouts. There is evidence that, in the years since World War II, the difference between the incomes of graduates and dropouts has been growing. Table 5 presents the mean annual income for males 25 years of age and over by years of school completed.

Two trends are obvious in Table 5: mean income has been increasing over time and as education increases so does income. The gradually worsening position of the dropout is not as obvious. This is brought out by the figures in Table 6 which show the differences in the mean incomes of high school graduates and dropouts by selected years. The differences are clearly becoming larger.

TABLE 5

Mean Income (or Earnings) for Males 25 Years of Age and over by Years of School Completed, 1946 - 1965

	1946[a]	1949	1956	1958	1964	1965
Elementary						
Total	$2,694	$2,801	$3,271	$3,074	$3,476	$3,543
Less than 8 Years	2,294	2,412	2,751	2,533	2,956	2,976
8 Years	3,071	3,389	3,929	3,742	4,075	4,207
High School						
1 to 3 Years	3,232	3,774	4,717	4,585	5,133	5,327
4 Years	3,879	4,427	5,727	5,528	6,104	6,249
College						
1 to 3 Years	4,823	5,175	6,700	6,917	7,129	7,289
4 Years or More	5,975	7,226	8,940	9,141	9,230	9,554

[a]In 1946 total money earnings; 1949 to 1965 total money income.

Source: Herman P. Miller, "Income in relation to education." American Economic Review, December, 1966.

TABLE 6

Difference in Mean Income (or Earnings) Between Graduates and Dropouts 25 Years of Age or Older, 1946 - 1965

	Difference Between 4 Years High School and		
Year	Less than 8 Years Elementary	8 Years Elementary	1 to 3 Years High School
1946	$1,585	$ 807	$ 646
1949	2,014	1,037	652
1956	2,975	1,797	1,009
1958	2,994	1,785	942
1964	3,148	2,029	970
1965	3,272	2,042	922

Figures in this table were derived from the data in Table 5.

The unemployment rates of graduates and dropouts confirm the income data as to the unfavorable consequences of school withdrawal. Over the six year period covered in Table 7, however, the relative position of dropouts has not become poorer. For each year, though, dropouts do have higher rates of unemployment.

TABLE 7

Unemployment Rates Among Graduates and Dropouts by Sex, 1960 - 1966

Year[a]	Graduates			Dropouts[b]		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1960	14.9	15.3	15.2	19.0	c	18.2
1961	18.5	17.6	17.9	28.0	c	26.8
1962	14.3	13.8	14.1	27.1	c	28.6
1963	19.1	17.1	18.0	22.7	c	31.7
1964	12.9	23.4	18.7	17.7	36.5	24.8
1965	7.4	16.6	12.4	19.4	26.5	21.4
1966	8.7	18.5	14.2	13.6	24.4	17.4
1960-1966	13.1	17.6	15.6	20.0	28.9	23.1

[a]Rates are for the month of October of each year.

[b]Dropouts 1960 to 1963 refers to persons 16 to 24 years of age, 1964 to 1966 to persons 14 to 24 years of age.

[c]Per cents are not shown where base is less than 100,000.

Source: Special Labor Force Report, Monthly Labor Review, May 1961, May 1962, July 1963, May 1964, June 1965, June 1966, and July 1967.

To some degree the unemployment rates for dropouts and graduates tend to parallel each other. When graduate rates are high, dropout rates tend to be high. The agreement, however, is not complete. Apparently other factors, beyond general economic conditions, as reflected in the unemployment rates of graduates, determine whether or not dropouts will find employment.

There is a more fundamental weakness in the use of the unemployment rate to reflect the employment experiences of dropouts. Only those employed or looking for work are included in the civilian labor force on which the unemployment rate is based. Dropouts who never entered the labor market or who gave up the job search as futile are not included. The labor force participation rate does reflect the absence of these people in the labor force for its base is the noninstitutionalized civilian population. Table 8 presents the participation rates of graduates and dropouts.

The labor force participation rate of male dropouts over the seven years shown in Table 8 was, on the average, about 10 percentage points lower than that of male graduates. While regrettable, the male figure was not nearly as poor as the female dropout figure which was about 30 percentage points lower than that of female graduates. The labor force participation rate of female dropouts is undoubtably lowered by the number of young women who withdraw from school because of pregnancy. The necessity of caring for the newborn removes many women from the labor force.

It is clear that the dropout is at a definite disadvantage in the labor market. What all these comparisons fail to control, however, is the ability of the individuals being compared. They fail to answer this question: "Is the possession of the high school diploma a necessary credential for meaningful participation in the labor force?" The primary objective of the present study was to answer this question.

TABLE 8

Labor Force Participation Rates of High School Graduates and Dropouts by Sex, 1960 - 1966

Year[a]	Graduates			Dropouts[b]		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1960	88.5	69.5	76.7	76.4	49.2	62.2
1961	86.1	75.8	79.7	83.8	50.9	67.5
1962	90.8	71.4	79.5	84.9	34.0	56.5
1963	89.7	71.8	78.9	83.3	49.6	65.9
1964	90.9	69.8	77.9	76.6	37.8	55.3
1965	91.0	75.8	82.1	82.8	36.4	61.0
1966	87.3	68.4	75.7	80.3	44.4	62.3
1960-1966	89.3	71.7	78.6	80.8	42.1	61.0

[a]Rates are for the month of October of each year.

[b]Dropouts 1960 to 1963 refers to persons 16 to 24 years of age, 1964 to 1966 to persons 14 to 24 years of age.

Source: Special Labor Force Report, Monthly Labor Review, May 1961, May 1962, July 1963, May 1964, June 1965, June 1966, and July 1967.

THE PRESENT STUDY

To make the purest test of the importance of a diploma, the ideal method would have been to select a group of dropouts, to have awarded a diploma to half of them at random, and then to have studied the subsequent employment experiences of all of the subjects. This, of course, was impossible. No agency accredited to award a diploma would do so without justification. The study was, therefore, designed to give a group of dropouts the academic education necessary to qualify for a diploma. To test the effects of a year of training without the awarding of a diploma, skill

training courses were set up. It was reasoned that the students who completed these courses would have a salable skill but would lack a diploma. If the lack of a diploma does represent an artificial barrier to employment, these subjects should have less success in the labor market, despite their skill training, than those who obtained a diploma on the basis of an academic education. A third group of dropouts who received neither skill training nor a diploma was also recruited and tested. Finally, a fourth group of regular high school graduates was selected to match the characteristics of the experimental subjects on the basis of race, sex, curriculum, and IQ. The complete design of the study is described in Chapter III.

The objectives set forth in the original proposal were as follows:

(1) To investigate, on an experimental basis, whether it is better economically and psychologically to provide the opportunity for school dropouts to secure a high school diploma or to secure extended training for entry into a specific occupation;

(2) To explore the dimensions of the task of overcoming the artificial barrier to employment of a high school diploma;

(3) To evaluate the effect of the current emphasis on programs for youth which are aimed at preparation for entry into narrow occupational skills.

Another issue, not fully appreciated at first, was the importance of the "psychological atmosphere" or attitudinal tone" of the programs. These terms refer to the quality of the relationships between the students and the program staff. In the diploma program these relationships were primarily positive. The students sensed that the staff--the teachers, administrators, and counselors--were interested in them. There was rapport. In the skill training program this tone was largely absent. The teachers and administrators did not convey the sense of personal concern that their counterparts in the diploma program did.

The tone of the two appeared to be one of the main determinants of their relative success. Its importance so impressed the personnel associated with the study that it was decided to write this report to describe the reasons for the difference in the results of the separate programs.

This report is thus limited to a discussion of the experimental programs. Subsequent reports will examine the

experiences of the subjects after they left the programs. Measures of their labor market experiences will be compared to determine if either program gave its students an advantage.

In the present report the results of the tests and interviews of the subjects are discussed in Chapters IV and V. These discussions reveal that the diploma program did have superior results. The difference in the environmental tone of the two programs and some of the reasons for this difference are discussed in Chapters VI and VII. Chapter VI concentrates on the roles of the school administrators, counselors and the staff of The Pennsylvania State University. Because the teachers were most crucial in creating the tone of the program, Chapter VII describes the characteristics that differentiated successful from unsuccessful teachers. These characteristics were derived from interviews conducted with the teachers.

In the final chapter, Chapter VIII, the data and discussion presented in the previous chapters are summarized and interrelated. The results obtained in this study raise some serious questions about the suitability of the public school in general and vocational education in particular to serve students from a poverty culture. The results seem to indicate that a special orientation is needed if schools are to be successful with potential dropouts. This orientation is one that sees human behavior as the result of antecedent conditions and not as the reflection of moral character. This is an orientation that seems quite foreign to many teachers, including vocational teachers. If, as the results of this study indicate, vocational teachers, particularly those in trade and industrial programs, tend to lack this orientation, it raises the question of whether vocational training, as presently conducted, can serve as a means of moving people out of poverty.

CHAPTER II

THE SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF SCHOOL WITHDRAWAL

What is known about the early school leaver? The literature is vast, and continues to grow at a rapid rate. Therefore, it is necessary to be selective in any review of the literature. For the purpose of this report, the discussion will concentrate on more specific issues which are relevant to the present study.

The first of these issues is that of cultural deprivation, with an emphasis on the "conceptual deficits" hypothesis and on the theory that these deficits are cumulative in nature.

The second issue is that of cultural incompatibility. Incompatibility among cultural groups is a factor which combines its effects with those of cultural deprivation to create the syndromes of underachievement and dropping out of school. In the discussion of this issue, the areas of self concept, psychological adjustment, behavioral difficulties, and social expectations are explored.

The third issue concerns the role of the school in reaching students of low socioeconomic status. Here it is hypothesized that the present educational institutions are actually compounding the effects of cultural deprivation and fostering greater levels of cultural incompatibility. This includes a discussion of some aspects of the values inherent in present educational practices, the distribution of educational resources, and the characteristics of teachers and administrators vis-a-vis their students.

The fourth issue is concerned with the area of vocational training and its relevance for the alleged "non-academic orientation" of the lower-class student.

Finally, all of these issues are discussed by putting them in the context of retraining programs for high school dropouts, indicating how they may be related to the success or failure of these programs.

After the above issues have been discussed, certain other aspects of the high school dropout problem are analyzed, including such topics as family problems, peer identification, employment, and other topics which bear upon the follow-up data which are being collected in the present study.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE IN SCHOOLS

Cultural Deprivation

In recent years, the term "cultural deprivation" has come into popular usage as an explanation for everything that is "wrong" with the lower socioeconomic classes. However, this usage burdens the term with value orientations and makes it less useful to the social scientist. Reissman (1962) uses a less value-laden approach, pointing out that the lower socioeconomic groups have their own culture which has many positive aspects. He equates cultural deprivation with educational deprivation, using both terms to describe a state in which the individual has had limited access to an educationally stimulating environment.

This lack of stimulation results in a lower level of readiness for school on the part of the deprived child, getting him off to a bad start, in comparison to the non-deprived youngster. Hunt (1961) found that the impoverished milieu in which the deprived child finds himself does not allow him to develop an adequate conceptual frame of reference. As has been pointed out by Deutsch (1960), the more constricted this frame of reference and the greater its distance from the main stream of the larger society's culture, the less meaningful and less effective will be the dominant social values which the school attempts to instill in the child.

Varieties of experience are extremely important to the development of linguistic ability (Jenson, 1965), and the retardation of linguistic development in these children affects their later adjustments to life in general and to school in particular. John (1963) shows how, through the use of language, the child learns to gain control over his environment. Language is necessary

not only as a tool of thought but also as an aid in understanding the world. It is a means of self-expression, of gaining insight into the behavior of other people, and of developing the self concept.

To this linguistic retardation are added the deficits in perceptual skills, particularly visual and auditory discrimination (Hunt, 1961), which arise from the sterility of the environment. The combination of these factors results in a lack of readiness for school. This becomes apparent, as documented by Penty (1956), in the dropout's inability to master reading skills. The conceptual-deficit hypothesis is supported by Siller (1957), who shows that children of higher class status tend to score higher on all tests of conceptual ability than do lower-class children.

One of the circumstances which puts the lower-class child at an immediate disadvantage in the first years of school is his lack of training in "learning to learn." This is a term coined by Harlow (1949) and is used to refer to the existence (or lack) of a general positive orientation toward learning. It includes motivation to achieve, pleasure received from the learning experience, ability to pay close attention, ability for purposive action, and an orientation toward adults as basic sources of information, ideas, and rewards. It is generally agreed that middle- and upper-class children receive much preschool training in this, while lower-class children are denied the advantages of this training.

Krugman (1961) pointed out that, during the early school years, the deficits which arise from physical and cultural deprivation tend to have a cumulative effect. Freedman (1963) followed up on this idea with data showing that, by adolescence, the culturally deprived pupil is so far behind in every aspect of his school work that it is practically impossible for him to catch up.

In a series of studies, Deutsch has gathered evidence to support the cumulative deficit hypothesis. In one of these studies (Deutsch, 1964a) it was found that small differences in linguistic and cognitive abilities between children of middle socioeconomic status (SES) and those from low SES backgrounds show up in first grade, and that these differences become much larger by the time the children reach the fifth grade. In another study, Deutsch and Brown (1964) found that SES differences in intelligence test scores were small in first grade and much larger in fifth. This evidence led them to conclude that deprivational influences have greater effects on later developmental stages than on earlier ones.

Thus, any original dissimilarities among culturally deprived individuals are maximized by the cumulating effects of a sterile environment. Curry (1962) points out that, as a result of this, individuals who are blessed with higher levels of intelligence or fewer physical and emotional handicaps can overcome the sterility of their environment, while those who are not so favored are overcome by its cumulative burden.

This does not mean that the slum child is doomed to a life of failure, with no hope of ever breaking out of this vicious circle. Clarke and Clarke (1953) have demonstrated that children's IQs, which have been depressed by adverse environmental conditions, can be raised again by the removal of these conditions, even in adolescence and adulthood. However, Ausubel (1966) points out that the effects of cultural deprivation are <u>partly</u> irreversible, since existing developmental deficits do tend to become cumulative. In this way, deficits in functional capacity may significantly limit the extent to which later environmental stimulation can increase the rate of cognitive growth. By combining these findings, it can be hypothesized that those with high-to-moderate levels of intelligence, who are able to begin an escape from the slum environment, may get started on an upward spiral of self-improvement, while the rest are forever trapped within their circumstances.

Cultural Incompatibility

Those who have been investigating the effects of cultural deprivation have mostly concentrated on the ways of keeping deficits from becoming progressively worse, or upon helping those whose deficits have already cumulated to learn the basic skills which will allow them to catch up with the more fortunate. The first of these approaches has taken the form of an emphasis on preschool training for culturally deprived children. Deutsch (1964b) provides "preliminary data" showing that preschool, kindergarten, or day-care experience gives a relative advantage to those who have had this experience, and that this advantage is still present in fifth graders. However, another study contradicts these results. In a preliminary evaluation of the effects of the massive Project Head Start, where it has been claimed that children show "increased competence in communicative skills and social behavior, as well as greater intellectual curiosity and learning proficiency" (Office of Economic Opportunity, 1966, p. 32), Wolff (1966) concluded that these educational gains tend to disappear in as little as six to eight months after the children enter the public schools. This would seem to shed some doubt on the efficacy of enrichment programs in overcoming school-related problems. Similarly, the remedial

programs for older students have shown a notable lack of success (see Chansky, 1966, and pages 31 ff. of this chapter).

These indications of the ineffectiveness of compensatory or remedial programs in increasing educational achievement lead us to believe that other factors besides cultural deprivation are at work. One of these factors may be a form of cultural incompatibility. As Blough (1956) has shown, low socioeconomic status is the factor most frequently associated with dropping out of school. There can be no doubt that dropping out is, on the whole, a lower-class problem. At the same time, the public school system, as it is presently operated, is essentially a middle-class institution, set up to transmit and reinforce middle-class values and goals. Here lies a fertile ground for cultural incompatibility to show itself. The personality structure, behavior, and attitudes of those who get along in school have been shown to differ from those of the ones who cannot get along in school.

Reed (1964) has pointed out that the school child, like any other individual, behaves in an integrated fashion. If one facet of his personality structure is under stress, his entire behavior pattern will be affected and he may be unable to cope with the school environment. Therefore, a fruitful area of demarcation between those who are able to cope with the school's demands and those who are not able to do so may lie within the realms of general psychological adjustment, emotional maturity, and realistic attitudes toward life.

Documentation for this conclusion comes from Roessell (1954), who found that dropouts gave significantly more abnormal responses than a matched group of graduates on nine personality dimensions measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. In a similar study, Arnholter (1956) successfully differentiated matched populations of graduates and dropouts on the basis of mental health. In the retraining program studied by Rutledge and Gass (1967), when projective personality tests were given to the trainees, the psychologists who administered the tests said that they could not apply the standardized norms, for all the trainees would be considered emotionally disturbed by present standards.

This points to a difficulty encountered in most psychological studies of the culturally incompatible: one cannot simply label them as "unbalanced" and let it go at that. If their behavior does not measure up to the standards which are set, then the standards are not adequate. Testing for emotional adjustment can be valuable in the early identification of those who will have difficulties in coping with school, as demonstrated by Hermann and Cottle (1958),

but one must look further into the determinants of this "aberrant" behavior. Woellner (1951), in attempting to arrive at more specific causes, assigns major importance to feelings of frustration which arise from unfulfilled needs for security, acceptance, and accomplishment. Similarly, McCandless (1952) believes that frustration arousal interferes with problem-solving ability and may disrupt the entire pattern of school-related behaviors. However, frustration is not the only concomitant of need deprivation. Defeatist attitudes of apathy and withdrawal may also result. White (1959) has shown how this may be so when needs for accomplishment are not fulfilled.

A circular behavioral syndrome has been identified in which low accomplishment tends to lower aspirations, which in turn lead to even lower accomplishment, and so forth. For example, when the slum child gets off to a bad start in school, he may begin to feel that he is inferior. Expecting to do poorly, he does not try as hard, and as a result, his expectation is fulfilled. Schorr (1964) has termed this syndrome the "self-fulfilling prophesy." Rutledge and Gass (1967) found that their trainees had failed so many times in various pursuits that the effects of this accumulated failure expectation conditioned an avoidance response to situations in which either failure or success was possible; they were afraid of any sort of evaluative situation.

The expectations of others also have an effect on the behavior of the impoverished youngster. If the child's parents and friends expect him to fail in school, his work will suffer and failure is more probable (Bertrand, 1962). This may be a partial explanation of Allen's (1956) finding that children often fail to exceed their parent's scholastic achievement, and that students from the same family tend to drop out of school at about the same age or grade level.

It has been thought that one of the dropout's greatest difficulties may lie in a lack of motivation or aspiration, or what the sociologist would call improper socialization and what a psychologist would call lack of ego-strength. Both of these terms seem to refer to the same situation: a failure to incorporate the middle-class values of persistence and hard work which are necessary to earn a living. This is exemplified in "the dropout's apathetic response when he is told that he cannot succeed without an education, in his refusal to get up early in the morning to go to school or work, in his lack of ability to stick to a job he dislikes in order to gain a promotion to more desirable work" (Ausubel and Ausubel, 1962). Miller (1964) points out that since jobs are so unlikely

for these people, it is unclear to them just what they are supposed to be motivated to do. He seems to feel that they are being quite realistic in avoiding work, for they are most likely to fail, anyway. Erikson (1966) has taken a somewhat similar position, hypothesizing that Negro parents may try to protect their children, especially the gifted and questioning ones, by teaching them to "keep their places" and to avoid situations involving dangerous and futile competition. This is certainly a type of self-defeating behavior, but it may be a necessary means of protecting the shaky self concept of the culturally deprived youngster.

Merton (1957) has hypothesized that a disparity exists in the lower classes between the aspirations which are prescribed by the larger culture and the socially-structured avenues for realizing these aspirations, which are generally closed to these people. He thinks that this situation must lead to widespread anomie. Along the same line, Deutsch (1960) points out that reminders of the affluence of the larger society are constantly besieging these people. But when they attempt to identify with middle-class symbols, which are irrelevant to their way of life, only frustration can ensue, because they do not have the cultural traditions which lend perspective to desires for material goods.

One component of the depressed motivational pattern appears to be an inability to postpone gratification, that is, to work now for future rewards. Douvan (1956) demonstrated that the middle-class is characterized by more autonomous and generalized success striving, while the lower-class is more dependent upon the immediate reward loading of the task situation for its motivation. Mischel (1961) has identified a relationship between this preference for immediate rewards and the "lack of social responsibility which is characteristic of the slum dweller."

Very strong support for a cultural incompatibility hypothesis has been provided by Gill and Spilka (1962) who found that, within a population of culturally deprived students, groups of high and low scholastic achievers (which were matched on the bases of age, IQ, and grade level) could be differentiated by a test measuring "achievement via conformity." Thus, those who were not making progress in school were less able to <u>conform</u> to the dominant middle-class standards found in the school.

It is thus seen that the behavior and attitudes of the lower-class dropout differ from those of the student who accepts and incorporates the middle-class values of the school and goes on to graduate.

The distinction between cultural incompatibility and cultural deprivation is somewhat artificial, in that both reside in the same people and their effects tend to work together. The incompatible culture is no doubt an effect of deprivation, but it leads to self-defeating behavior patterns which only perpetuate, and often aggravate, the deprivating conditions. The situation is one of mutual reinforcement, and the direction is downhill. The overall effect is to create a situation in which the lower-class cannot efficiently utilize what is supposed to be society's main avenue of social mobility: the public schools.

The School's Contribution

It has been said many times that the school is a middle-class institution. Conversely, the dropout problem centers in the lower social classes. Can it then be said that the school is not reaching these children because it is not geared to deal with them on their own level? Traditionally, the schools have not been concerned with special techniques of overcoming cultural deprivation or cultural incompatibility. Their major attempts have been to do away with behavior problems and to instill the middle-class values of hard work, respect for authority, and patriotism in their students. And their approach to all students, no matter what the student's background, has generally been the same. These traditional concepts of education would certainly seem to hamper the school's effectiveness in reaching the lower-class child. Fullmer (1964) defines education not merely as the assimilation of content, but as the grasping of the relationship between the content and life. And yet the traditional school is discontinuous with the realities of lower-class life. Its curriculum has no relevance to the child's everyday experience; its demands and rewards are alien to him. Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965) conclude that in a situation like this, the school can become to the slum child a little more than a foreign outpost, an alien world to which he must try to adapt himself for a few hours each day. "Even the best teachers must fail if the child knows that the school is only a temporary respite from the realities he must eventually face" (Educational Policies Commission, 1962). In addition, Wax (1965) asserts that the bureaucratic complexity and institutional atmosphere of present schools present a formidable barrier to any involvement by culturally deprived individuals.

Another factor which tends to alienate lower-class pupils is the manner in which educational resources are allocated. The distribution of educational funds has not been arranged in such a way as to ease the burden of the schools in low-income neighborhoods.

Here one finds the paradoxical situation in which those schools which are located in middle-and upper-income neighborhoods receive more money per pupil than do the schools in lower-income areas. This has the effect of spending the greatest amount of money on those students who already are academically talented and have the advantages of an intellectually oriented home life, while the students who are most in need of special services are unable to receive them from their low-budget schools. Thus, educational funds are being shunted away from those areas where they could do the most good into areas where the need is not as great. (See Conant, 1961, and Tesseneer and Tesseneer, 1958). In addition, scholarships and other financial awards have a tendency to be awarded to students from upper-income families. Sexton (1961) has pointed to the fact that the criteria for these awards place a stress on "bookishness" at the expense of qualities like creativity, independence, and individuality.

The process of teacher placement is another factor militating against the success of lower-class pupils. Beginning teachers and those with poor records are sent to schools in the low-income neighborhoods and slums, while the best teachers are assigned to the higher-class schools (Della-Dora, 1962). Again, this seems to be a case of misappropriation of educational resources, with the areas of greatest need being denied those things which would be most useful to them.

The foundation of the problem rests upon the cultural disparities between middle-class teachers and the lower-class students. This problem exists even when teachers from lower-class backgrounds are sent to these schools, for in the process of obtaining their education many of them change to such an extent that they experience "culture shock" in returning to the poverty stricken neighborhood.[1]

---

[1]This happened in this project. One of the interviewers was a Negro who had successfully escaped his poverty background and became a member of the middle-class. He thought he would be a good interviewer because he "understood these people." But after a few visits to the homes of our students he experienced such culture shock that he could not return to do any more interviews, and resigned his job.

Slum children require considerably more reinforcement from their teachers than do other children, possibly because absent or overburdened parents cannot provide it (Deutsch, 1960). Yet the teachers typically come from backgrounds which are so different from those of the pupils that the teachers and pupils have difficulty in establishing rapport. The slum pupil cannot make use of the teacher's help until the teacher learns enough about slum culture and slum life to understand the pupil's words and actions. Davis (1950) thinks that until the teacher understands the basis for the pupil's behavior, he cannot effectively control or teach him. He must first discover what his words mean to the student, what the student must unlearn, and how the teacher can make the learning experience pleasant for the pupil. Hollingshead (1949) documents how, all too often, the teachers who are sent to these schools are not capable of developing this understanding. They have a tendency to misunderstand their pupils' behavior, manners, and appearance, and cultural incompatibility thus creates a wall between teacher and student. Teachers and administrators may become hardened and develop unconscious or implicit negative attitudes toward the children. Wax (1967) points out that this entire process can lead to the school becoming little more than a custodial institution. The students who sense this phenomenon must react by alienating themselves from a situation which is hostile to them.

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1960) and Rosenthal (forthcoming) has shown how strongly teachers' expectations can influence their students' performance in school. Among students with the same abilities, those whom the teacher expects to perform well will do so and those whom she expects to do poorly will not perform well.

Compounding these difficulties is the fact that the traditional practices of grading, punishment, and promotion may only doom the unprepared pupil to an unending succession of failures. Thus, the school may be only reinforcing the sense of personal insignificance and inadequacy that has already been forced upon him by the conditions of his life. Rather than creating and fostering aspirations in this youngster, it is crushing him, forcing him into feelings of apathy and despair.

This leads to a conclusion drawn by many people, but which still has not been accepted by most school administrators: the term "school dropout" is a misnomer; a better term would be "pushout," for these youngsters are being driven from the schools by forces beyond their control and (most of the time) beyond their comprehension.

Paul Goodman (1964), who is perhaps the most articulate and at the same time the most severe critic of our present educational institutions, places the blame for dropouts and alienation in the lap of the school administrators. He thinks that the reason for a pupil's disgust with the school does not center in the pupil's lack of ability to adapt to the school, but rather in the school's lack of ability to adapt to this pupil's special set of needs. Along this same line, Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965) conclude that the public schools must change from a selective system, which rewards and finally graduates only the more able and more fortunate students, to a system which develops each individual to his fullest capabilities.

Academic Versus Vocational Training

In the midst of the barrage of criticism aimed at the public school system, and the pained introspection to which it has been submitting itself, the question has arisen as to whether the potential dropouts can be saved (and actual dropouts lured into returning) by a stronger emphasis on a vocational, rather than academic, curriculum. The majority of extra-school projects aimed at reclaiming dropouts and/or aiding them in their search for stable, meaningful employment has been strongly oriented toward developing specific occupational skills. Many influential educators have decided, seemingly on an a priori basis, that this is what the schools must also do. However, there has been no lack of opposition to this point of view. Traditionalists declare that the public school system was designed to provide a general education for the masses, not to serve as an apprentice-training institute, and that short-sightedness and a focus on short-term goals can only weaken the school as a significant social institution. Abraham Maslow (1965) has expressed this position most eloquently in an examination of the goals of general education and those of vocational training. As he sees it, the goal of a general education is to produce more mature and psychologically well-developed individuals (i.e., better citizens), while the goal of vocational training is to produce a body of skilled workers and technologists. The question he then raises is: which of the goals will be best for our society in the long run? Obviously, he prefers the former.

But the proponents of vocational education also include some distinguished voices who present cogent arguments in support of their contentions.

James Bryant Conant (1961) thinks that youngsters who are about to enter the labor market need salable skills, and that their educational experiences should fit their subsequent employment

experiences. Kohler (1962) is perhaps most succinct when she bluntly states that academic courses just do not prepare youngsters for work. This is consistent with an idea developed earlier in this Chapter, that the school is often rejected because of its lack of relevance to the life of lower-class adolescents. Vocational education claims the advantages of increasing interest in the school, of giving the opportunity to learn skills which are relatively easy for lower-class pupils to value, of creating feelings of usefulness and self-respect, and of developing initiative and responsibility (Educational Policies Commission, 1962). Needless to say, this is quite an order to fill. A middle-of-the-road position is taken by Wrenn (1964), who charges the school with a multifold function of developing intellectual, social, and vocational competencies--in that order of importance. In other words, he suggests that vocational education has its place, but that other things must come first.

In order to discover what the students, themselves, have to say about this question, Larson (1958) interviewed students who were still in school, but who were identified as potential dropouts. The results were not strikingly in favor of either type of curriculum, producing a 60-40 split, but the amazing finding in this study is that 40 per cent of these youngsters who were about to drop out felt that their schools needed more emphasis on academic courses. Lichter (1962), who argues that potential dropouts should be sent to school specificially designed to meet their problems, still firmly believes that the curricula in these schools should be academically oriented.

Remedial Help

Only a decade ago, there was little hope expressed that those individuals who had escaped the influence of the school would ever return (Layton, 1953; Cantoni, 1955). The opportunities open to them to complete their education, and to receive diplomas for their efforts, were extremely limited. In addition, the act of amputating oneself from the school has strong emotional consequences, and the dropout cannot easily return to the situation which he once rejected, or which may have rejected him. Green (1962) found that the vast majority of those people who do receive equivalency diplomas are those who have been given the opportunity to do so in the armed forces. In 1951, Andrews stated (on *a priori* considerations) that many more of these "lost youth" would return, after being on their own long enough to realize the handicap under which they had placed themselves, if only enough strong encouragement were offered. Ten years later, Lichter's (1962) depth interviews of dropouts confirmed this. Myers (1956) also indicated that if the school system would

provide more support and assistance, larger numbers of dropouts could be convinced to takeup where they had left off.

Since the "great awakening" to the seriousness of the dropout problem, the situation has improved considerably. Today, dropouts are dropping back in again in large numbers. The back-to-school public information campaigns, the federal funds available, and the experimental programs designed for dropouts have not been without effect. Super (1964) cites a survey carried out in a medium-sized city in which 39 per cent of those who drop out each year are returning after a short period of time. In Los Angeles, 12 per cent of the total number graduating from the city schools each year are formed dropouts (Los Angeles City School District, 1963). The effectiveness of some of these programs is demonstrated by Slotkin (1964), who describes a program which was originally designed merely to provide pre-employment training (e.g., conducting oneself in an employment interview, filling out application blanks, etc.) for early school leavers who were given little chance of returning. After being showered with attention and encouragement, and becoming aware that the school really was interested in their personal welfare, a significant number returned to the regular school program and stayed on to graduate.

The Los Angeles study (1963) provides data to show that if the dropout does not return within three years of leaving, he probably will not return at all. Those who are forced to leave because of a crisis in their personal lives often return as soon as their personal circumstances permit. Others, after attempting to compete at a disadvantage in an industrial society which has little use for their unskilled services, apparently become disillusioned and return to equip themselves for more satisfactory vocational careers. As might be expected, these returnees are individuals who left the school for reasons other than a complete lack of academic ability, for only a small portion of the dropout population falls into this category. The Los Angeles data show, not unexpectedly, that whatever their original reasons for leaving, the returnees demonstrate large gains in vocational maturity and insight (as determined by objective measurements). Burchill (1959) found that these students also operate at higher motivational levels than they did before leaving, especially after they have reached the age of 21.

These data are encouraging to those who are involved in reclaiming these youngsters who were previously considered as lost to education and to society. Unfortunately, not all of the literature in this area is so encouraging. Donald Super, an acknowledged authority in the field of vocational psychology, has reported

results in direct contradiction to those cited above. He did a comparative study of high school graduates, "regular" dropouts, and dropouts who had later received equivalency diplomas (Super, 1964). The returnees were found to be significantly poorer than the regular dropouts in vocational maturity, achievement motivation, and self-esteem. They also reported less satisfaction with the ways in which they had handled their educational and vocational careers. However, due to methodological considerations, one should probably look at Super's data with skepticism.

Distressed by the scarcity of information at the time concerning the dropout's attempts to improve himself after leaving school, Green (1962) conducted a ten-year longitudinal study and concluded that dropping out need not necessarily be the end of one's education. For those who leave school before completing the requirements for graduation, there are other paths that can lead to job stability and success. Among these are apprentice training, correspondence courses, military specialist schools, adult education courses, and trade schools. Although only a minority of dropouts receive an equivalency diploma, many more get some sort of further education. Unfortunately, however, once it is started, the pattern of dropping out usually continues; for example, 40 per cent of the dropouts who enrolled in a trade school never finished (Greene, 1962).

Manpower Retraining and Adult Education

The prospects of rehabilitating large numbers of dropouts through presently existing school programs are not too bright. Presently, a maximum of about 25 per cent of dropouts return to the high schools, and Miller and Saleem (1963) found that if the dropout does not return within two or three years, he probably will not return at all. Dillon (1949) has shown that an important factor in this reluctance to return is the fear of being "out of place" with a younger age group. Thus, as the dropout remains out of school longer and longer, the effects of this factor become more potent. Another important factor may be a fear of returning to the scene of past failures. As Miller and Harrison (1964) have pointed out, most school districts just do not have the flexibility in their programs to help the dropout who wants to better himself. Greene (1966) has taken a strong stand on this position by pointing out that, in large part, the schools cannot be of much help in solving a problem for which they are largely responsible in the first place. He states that the dropout problem is not seen as a real problem by the schools, for they solve it by getting rid of the problem students.

Therefore, other facilities are generally being employed in the rehabilitation of the dropout. Most of this work is being done in the manpower development and retraining programs, with adult education programs taking up some of the slack. But these programs, too, have had their problems, and some of them have been unsuccessful.

Representatives of the U.S. Office of Education have recently stated that the major problem in helping adult dropouts lies in stirring up some motivation in them (USOE, 1965). Of course, the term "motivation" can have a large variety of interpretations, depending upon the orientation of the reader. In discussing these programs, motivation includes motivation to sign up, motivation to learn while in the program, motivation to stick it out, and motivation to apply what has been learned after the program is over.

The above mentioned statement of the U.S. Office of Education refers to the first of these factors: recruitment motivation. The report pointed out that, at best, a ten per cent return can be expected from recruitment efforts. Some insight into why this is so can be found in the reports of Barcus (1964) and Rutledge and Gass (1967). The dropouts studied by Barcus in many cases had "a negative attitude toward the help they received from others." Rutledge and Gass point out that this follows from a backlog of experiences of maltreatment, plus an inability to discriminate between sincere and insincere offers of help. They also indicate that the dropout's expectation of maltreatment may be quite realistic in far too many situations.

Rutledge and Gass also have something to say about motivations to stay in the program and to learn. Remaining in the program involves two difficult problems for these people. One of the problems is economic. Commitment to the program can put the trainee under difficult financial strains, especially if he has a family to support. If the training is to be extended for any length of time, the trainee will often abandon it at the first sign of a job, any job, because he cannot delay gratification of his family's immediate economic needs. The second problem is psychological. Motivation to immerse himself in the learning process is low because this process requires extremely difficult behavioral and attitudinal adjustments from this kind of person. With his backlog of accustomed failures, with his confortable acceptance of his own life situation, he is suddenly asked to alter significantly his self concept and to accept the middle-class achievement orientations which have been completely alien to his life.

Chansky (1966), reporting on Operation Second Chance, found that his students' motivation to learn did not follow from what he had been told to expect. Instead of being interested in realistic, experience-oriented vocational skill training, they were bored by its repetition and, instead, were highly motivated toward their academic training. This is exactly the opposite of what has been hypothesized by many educators and psychologists. It could have been due to the ways in which the two different programs were run, or it may have been an expression of a desire to succeed in the area where they had previously failed. This raises an interesting question: If many retraining programs have encountered a fear of failure in academic studies, while Chansky found just the opposite, may this not be a function of the atmospheres encountered in the different programs, rather than differences in the trainees? Chansky has also pointed out that family endorsement was an important factor in trainee acceptance of the program's goals.

If the success of these programs is measured in terms of increasing the employability of the trainees, then the lack of success in many cases has been notable, especially when viewed in terms of very small returns on very large investments. Some examples of this can be cited. The Detroit High School Leaver Project (Barcus, 1964) was designed to provide counseling and employment referral services for unemployed youth, most of whom were high school dropouts. Of the 435 people who were processed, five were subsequently hired by the employers to whom they were referred. The project staff was unable to determine accurately the number of subjects who found employment "on their own." North Carolina's Operation Second Chance (Chansky, 1966) offered both vocational and academic training to 139 dropouts. The post-program follow-up found that only 44 per cent of the trainees were employed, and that only 25 per cent of these had found training-related employment. The employed trainees were receiving an average salary of only $1.55 per hour. The follow-up was not long enough to provide any data on duration of employment or promotional advancements. The factors found to be most related to post-training employment were age, parent's occupational level, and arithmetic achievement.

If success is measured in terms of enhancing self-esteem and increasing vocational maturity, success levels do not appear to be much higher. Many programs claim success (cf. Schreiber, 1964, and Hunt, 1959) but have either used insufficient control measures to demonstrate this claim or have not taken the sorts of measurements which instill confidence in their claims. Barcus (1964)

flatly admits that no adequate measures of the Detroit counseling program were utilized. Even when adequate measures have been used, the results have not been very gratifying. This is illustrated by two doctoral disserataions coming out of the Oklahoma City Youth Project. Willis (1966) found that a human relations training course had no effect on a variety of criteria, and Wallace (1966) found that the employed graduates of the training program did not have higher levels of job satisfaction than did the employed members of a dropout control group.

However, there have been some notable successes. Rutledge and Gass (1967) have reported the results of a research and demonstration project in Detroit, in which a small number of hard-core unemployed men, about half of whom were dropouts, were enrolled in an extended employment training program. During the year of training, there were no voluntary dropouts from the program, although six were dropped for lack of cooperation. After the year of training twelve of those who completed the program were immediately employed in training-related jobs and most were performing at a satisfactory level, while the one other man who completed the training had found a training-unrelated job on his own. The major reason for the success of this program appears to be the intensive psychological support which the trainees received throughout the program. The atmosphere was almost therapeutic, for the men were carefully nursed through the culture shock which they experienced when coming into contact with middle-class norms and standards of behavior, and specific attempts were made to reinforce their shaky self concepts. This program may have been rather expensive in terms of the number of people who were helped (no cost data are reported), but it does esta. .ish what can be accomplished when conditions are controlled in such a way as to maximize every factor leading to success.

As Greene (1962) has pointed out, however, the major limitation of most of these studies is the lack of a sufficiently long follow-up period, so that no long-run conclusions as to their efficacy can be drawn.

Aspects of the Experimental Schools

The preceding account has tended to emphasize the failures of the schools in reaching the students who drop out of the schools. This is not to say that all schools or all teachers have been guilty of the above mentioned sins. But, in general, educational institutions have not lived up to their potential in this area. Even when some of the remedial programs for dropouts are successful,

they are merely making up for failures which have already taken place, for if the public schools were able to work with these youngsters, the remedial programs would not be necessary. The major contribution of these programs is not the rehabilitation of castoffs, but the discovery and demonstration of how the task can be successfully carried out, so that the public school system may learn how to serve all of its students.

The present study is concerned with the operation of two experimental programs for dropouts. In these operations, an attempt was made to put into practice what has been learned from the successes and the failures of others, and to discover what practical results can be expected when attempts are made to tailor the school to the needs of its students. Since the two programs differed in their surface orientations (academic accomplishment versus vocational training), their corrective approaches could not be the same. Nevertheless, both were designed to correct the effects of cultural deprivation and cultural incompatibility, so that the students could finish the programs as useful citizens who were ready to take their places in the community.

The underlying rationale of the study is explained in detail in Chapter VI. Here a brief description is presented of the ways in which the present study attempted to answer some of the issues raised earlier.

The basic difference in the designed approaches of the two programs lay in their attempts to overcome cultural deprivation. The skill training program was designed to provide courses of study which were close to reality, so that the students could readily see the usefulness of what they were doing. Instruction in basic communication and computational skills were to have been brought into the program at points where they were most relevant to the subject matter. The diploma (academic) program, however, had to use a more traditional approach. But it must be remembered that this is the approach which is normally used with the majority of public school students. Here, basic units were built around speech and reading, arithmetic, and science. In addition, enrichment courses were offered, such as music and arts and crafts.

In their approaches to cultural incompatibility, the design of the two programs was basically the same. Attempts were to be made to change the students' attitudes, both toward themselves and toward school. In order to overcome their anxiety concerning school and their expectation of scholastic failure, a non-threatening atmosphere was sought. It was anticipated that this would be done by using the administrators, teachers, and

counselors as agents of positive (rather than negative) reinforcement, by having them accept the students and respect them as individuals, and by assigning tasks with high probability of success. The counselors used casual, nondirective methods. Their major task was to support the students and to help with their problems.

Unfortunately, practice is not always congruent with design. In order to determine where programs were successful and where they were not, certain evaluative procedures were built into the study. Objective, standardized tests were given before and after the programs to measure changes in abilities, attitudes, and adjustment. After the programs were completed, the students were interviewed to learn about their feelings toward the programs and their values and goals. Evaluations of teacher effectiveness were also made. Reports of these interviews and evaluations constitute the bulk of the discussion in the following chapters.

OTHER ASPECTS OF DROPPING OUT

Up to this point, consideration has been given mainly to the role of the school in the dropout process. But the process neither begins nor ends with the failures of the school. The students are pushed out by the school, but they are also pulled out by other forces. The most important of these "pull" forces reside in the orientations of the family and the adolescent peer group. In the final report on this study, evaluations of these forces will be made, as well as an evaluation of the consequences of dropping out versus returning to school.

The Family

One major influence separating the school successes from the school failures may well be what Hollingshead (1949) has termed the "family culture." He states that a poorer family heritage and/or lack of training in the home leads directly to a significantly poorer adjustment on the part of the children to school in particular and to life in general. Child psychologists indicate that behavior patterns are established primarily by early experience in the family setting. Layton (1953) shows that a majority of dropouts report friction within the family as part of their difficulty.

Much work has been done in the area of parental attitudes toward school and their effect on the child's academic progress.

Allen (1956) provides statistics to show that the child's educational attainment is highly correlated with that of the parents, and that siblings within the same family tend to leave school at about the same age or grade level. That this "family educational pattern" is a product of attitudes which the parents convey to their children, either explicitly or implicitly, seems also intuitively obvious. Della-Dora (1962) feels that much of this difficulty originates in the social distance between lower-class parents and middle-class teachers, creating barriers to mutual understanding.

After examining environmental effects on educational achievement, Dave (1963) concluded that even more important than the home's social status characteristics are the parents' activities and the influences which they bring to bear on their children. He constructed an "index of home environment" which correlated +.80 with an exhaustive battery of tests measuring academic achievement. Factor analysis of his data provided the following relevant variables: (1) achievement press (parental pressures to achieve in school), (2) language models in the home, (3) academic guidance provided in the home, (4) stimulation to explore various aspects of the larger environment, (5) intellectual interests and activities in the home, and (6) work habits emphasized in the home.

These factors suggest that intellectual and academic orientations within the home environment can combine to create either positive or negative influences which affect the child's behavioral patterns in school.

This point is further supported by the work of Cervantes (1965), who compared the family lives of graduates with those of dropouts. (It should be emphasized that the environments of these families were carefully matched between the two groups. In addition, the respondents in each matched pair--one dropout and one graduate to a pair--were of the same age, sex, tested IQ, attended the same school, and came from the same general socioeconomic background.) It was discovered that the dropout is usually reared in a family which has less solidarity, less primary relatedness, and less parental influence than does the graduate's family. Eighty-one per cent of the dropouts' families had inadequate intercommunication, while 80 per cent of the graduates' families had adequate communication; 79 per cent of the dropouts felt rejected by their families, while 84 per cent of the graduates felt understood and accepted by their families; 62 per cent of the dropouts were unhappy in their homes, while 64 per cent of the graduates experienced happy home lives. In addition, it was found that the type of parental support of the

school was important. The graduates' families were better able to help them with their school problems, while the dropouts felt that their parents were merely nagging them and pushing them into something they did not want.

Although Dave has strongly supported the contention that family culture is more relevant than class status, this is in no way a contradiction of the previous findings connecting class status with dropping out of school. Home environment closely follows the general patterns of the larger environment in which the home is found, and attitudes within the family are conditioned to a great extent by the actions of other families in the same physical circumstances and by the attitudes of the larger society toward this particular social stratum. Documentation of this conclusion is to be found in a study by Blackwell and Godwin (1952), which shows that in low-income neighborhoods a general pattern of family disorganization is common. This is particularly true in the racial ghettos of the metropolitan slum, where the family as a social institution has been severely weakened and where drop-out rates are highest.

An interesting comparison can be drawn between the family structure of the Negro slum dwellers, whose dropout rates are very high, and the structure of the Jewish family in the years when the Jews inhabited metropolitan ghettos. Both groups have borne the brunt of discrimination and poverty, but the Jews do not have the history of brutal slavery and the Negroes do not have the strong religious ties of the Jews. A vast difference in the family structures of the two groups is apparent. Moynihan (1965) has documented the disintegration of the Negro ghetto family, while Brav (1940) has shown the solidarity of the Jewish family in the face of adversity. The Negro group, as a whole, has an extremely high rate of school dropouts, while in the Jewish group dropping out of school was uncommon. Jews have always held education in high regard, while Negroes have not had this tradition. Thus, the contrast between these groups points to a strong connection between family structures and values and school performance.

Cervantes (1965) has discovered a discrepancy in the family-friendship systems of graduates and school dropouts. The graduates' families chose as friends other families which would support their educational and achievement aspirations, thus enabling their children to receive outside support and to seek and achieve new goals within the educational system. The dropouts' families, on the other hand, were much less likely to use their friends in

this supportive manner. In addition, their friendship systems were both less extensive (in size) and less intensive (in closeness of relationship).

An entire series of studies in this area has reached consensus regarding this conclusion: anti-school attitudes on the part of parents are correlated with shorter school tenure of their children.

The Peer Group

At least as important as the family, if not more important, is the orientation of the adolescent friendship group. As many authors have pointed out, the adolescent in our society is encumbered not only with rapid biological changes but also with a condition of status marginality. In his peculiar position, he must develop a new frame of reference to give perspective to his values and attitudes. These are the conditions which lead to the formation of the adolescent peer group. Miller (1958) shows that, due to the status deprivation which burdens these youngsters, most of their concern focuses upon the attainment of status within their own little groups, and action in these groups is geared to this need. As they begin to develop stabilized positions in relation to their peers, the young members adapt to the authoritarian and manipulative structure of the group and, by doing so, perpetuate it. Each youngster acquires values and a life style that conform in some degree to the dominant norms of the group. "As he finds his personal identity and sources of recognition almost exclusively within the bounds of this tightly knit group, he is less responsive to rewards, enticements, and threats from outside of the group" (Sherif and Sherif, 1964). Thus, as Havighurst and Neugarten (1962) discovered, teenagers become highly defensive concerning their cliques, and their values are extremely resistant to any attempts at change, especially those originating in the adult world.

If the shared attitudes of the group provide a negative attitude toward the family, then the family's influence will be accordingly weakened. There is evidence to show that, in general, the peer culture is stronger in its influence than is the family, and often its influence negates the effects of parental pressure. Seidler and Ravitz (1955) have demonstrated that peer pressures override those of parents in the formation of social beliefs, political opinions, and occupational aspirations. Rosen's (1955) data consistently and cumulatively indicate that the norms of the peer group tend to be more closely related to members' attitudes than the norms of parents.

Miller (1959), in his observations of street-corner groups, noted that intrafamily relations and standards of behavior, which are set by parents, have relatively little direct influence on the adolescent's day-to-day behavior. Other observations of naturally-formed youth groups (Sherif and Sherif, 1964) have shown that the individual's standards of right and wrong behavior are not simply derived from parents and other representatives of adult society, and even these are filtered, reinforced, or contradicted in interactions among those peers who count for him.

The findings demonstrate that, for adolescents in general, the peer culture tends to be more influential in shaping attitudes, values, and behavior than is the family. But what about differentiation, within the adolescent population, between those who drop out of school and those who remain to graduate? Given the existence of an "adolescent subculture," which generally rejects the values of the adult society and resists the influence of the family (Coleman, 1961, and Smith, 1962), is there a difference in the structure and orientations of different peer groups within this subculture which can help account for the variation in choices concerning school tenure?

Cohen (1955) emphasizes the status deprivation which befalls lower-class boys when they fail to place well according to what he calls the "middle-class measuring rod." He states that the lower working-class cultural setting is more likely to arouse restricted aspirations, a live-for-today orientation toward consumption, a moral view which emphasizes reciprocity within primary groups, and lowered concern with abstract rules which apply across or outside of such particularistic circumstances. According to this formulation, the working-class boy is subjected to many social influences which emphasize the fact that the way to respect, status, and success lies in conformity to the demands of middle-class society. In this case, it is very likely that he has at least partially accepted this "middle-class measuring rod" as a legitimate set of values.

The formation of tightly knit in-groups is a way of regaining the self-esteem which has been lost in futile attempts to measure up to near-impossible standards set by another culture. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) have shown that the gap between culturally universalized goals and structurally limited means creates tension among those youngsters who aspire to economic success, leading to normative systems and value systems which support and legitimate culturally disapproved behavior patterns.

In Cervantes' (1965) study, it was found that the dropout's personal friends were typically not approved by his parents. The resulting "independent youth culture" of the dropout is in sharp contrast to the youth culture of the graduate, whose friends are parentally approved and thus somewhat integrated with the adult culture. The youth culture of the dropout is a culture of aggression, frustration, and protest; roughly 80 per cent of the dropout sample voiced intergenerational conflict, while 80 per cent of the graduates did not. In addition, there was a strong tendency for the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) responses of dropouts to merge with those of delinquents in a significantly antisocial pattern, while the graduates' TAT protocols displayed a prosocial bias. Thus, the "antagonism" analysis of American parent-youth relationships was found to be true of the dropout youth culture, and the "harmony" analysis was typical of the graduate youth culture. From these results, Cervantes concludes that the dropout has been driven out of the family circle, that the peer group is the product of this rejection, and that the culture of the dropout provides for them the acceptance which they typically cannot find in their homes. His data are reported in the form of an "index of influence" which shows that the graduate derives his characteristic influence from sources that originate in the home, whereas the dropout derives his characteristic influence from sources that originate outside the home, or are not controlled therefrom. The peer group appears to have a much greater influence in the lives of dropouts than in the lives of graduates.

From what has been found concerning the primary influence of the peer culture in the life of the dropout, a more fruitful area of research has been the dropout's friendship patterns as contrasted to those of the graduate. Again, an entire series of studies have led up to some general conclusions in this area. Dillon (1949) lists friends' influence as ninth in importance in a list of reasons for dropping out, based on frequency of mention in interviews of dropouts. This would seem to suggest that the dropouts, themselves, are consciously aware of this influencing factor. Kitsch (1952) observes the "influence of youth groups on the informal life of the school," and Hecker (1953) and Mack (1954) found cases of pupils who had dropped out because of friends' influence. Stuart (1955) states that one of the ways that dropouts and non-school-leavers differ is in the factor: "Most of the dropouts' close friends were out of school." The large-scale survey of Remmers and Radler (1958) found a disdain for school among large numbers of adolescents, in that concerns for friendship and popularity vastly overshadowed concern for intellectual achievement. Haller and Butterworth (1960) confirmed their hypothesis

that peer interactions affect educational aspirations and have a somewhat weaker effect on occupational aspirations. Coleman, Johannson, and Johnstone (1961) report data demonstrating that many adolescents are in conflict with adult educational goals--evidence that, in the present context, there are peer cultures separate from the adult culture which operate at cross-purposes with adult school personnel. In Polsky's (1962) intensive study of peer interactions within a juvenile detention institution, it was discovered that the boy's expectations toward the institution's school were rooted in group norms toward school and studying. Newly arrived boys who had motivation to learn were usually discouraged by the atmosphere prevalent in the peer culture and gave up their interest in school work. Individual negativism toward the school was monitored by the entire peer social structure of the institution.

These studies, and many others similar to them, have led Coleman (1961) to conclude that "the adolescent who cannot find status within the school may try to find it elsewhere, in deviate subgroups or in turning his attention completely away from the school ... anti-school groups may arise as serious contenders for adolescent leadership ... [these] adolescent subcultures exert a strong deterrent to academic achievement ... students with ability are led to achieve only when there are social rewards, primarily from their peers, for doing so."

Consequences of Dropping Out

For too many people, the lack of an adequate education has become a trap into which they were pushed and from which they cannot excape. The school, which was to be society's chief agent of social mobility, has instead become an instrument of class distinction. Sexton (1961) states that a person without a diploma is virtually frozen in his parents' occupational status; his potential for upward mobility is nil. And there are those who feel that the situation may worsen. Paul Goodman (1964) fears that in the urbanized future not only will more lower-class youth leave school, but more of the rest will go on to college, with the effect that social-educational stratifications will solidify even more.

This may be a consequence of the situation which Miller (1964) has called "credentialism." He indicates that we are increasingly evaluating people not on the basis of performance, but on the basis of their credentials. The diploma has become a union card for jobs. The dropout is not really worse off than

the graduate because he knows less, or is less able to do the work, but because his potential employers believe that he is somehow inferior. It is not the lack of what the ticket is supposed to signify that hurts him, but the lack of the ticket itself. Business wants employees with enough education to be retrainable, and it is assumed that persons without a minimum high school education cannot quickly learn new skills (Arbuckle, 1964; Tesseneer, 1958). This widely-held belief may not necessarily be true--it certainly has never been proven--but nevertheless it is an important factor. Taber (1963) points out that one of its ramifications has been the practice of "stockpiling" talent within a company, in which lower-level jobs are filled by persons with high potential so that the company has a reserve of superior employees upon whom it can rely in times of need. Unfortunately, these lower-level jobs are just those which could be filled by those with little education, while the shortage of manpower at high-level positions is merely aggravated.

Greene (1966) believes that the problem is largely economic. Because all of our youth cannot be absorbed into the labor force, industry needs some criterion for its hiring decisions. He says that using the high school diploma as a hiring criterion provides a plausible excuse for turning away Negroes and other lower-class applicants.

The overall economic significance of this lies in the growing number of hard-core unemployed people in our country. Generally, the rate of unemployment, at least in recent years, is low. But the four or five per cent figure accounts for a group of people who have been unemployed for a long time (possibly most of their lives), whose parents were unemployed, and whose children will probably be unemployed. Most of these people are dropouts (Cf. Plunkett and Riches, 1960). The Detroit High School Leaver Project (Barcus, 1964) studied graduates and dropouts in those areas of Detroit with heavy concentrations of nonwhites. Here, it was found that over 70 per cent had never received a diploma, and 50 per cent of the families had incomes under $3,000 per year. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics found few differences in short-term unemployment between graduates and dropouts, but twice as many dropouts were among the long-term unemployed (Plunkett and Riches, 1960).

Even when the dropout does manage to find employment, he is usuallly among the lowest paid and least likely to advance. Proportionally, five times as many dropouts as graduates end up at the lowest ends of the wage scale (Plunkett and Riches, 1960).

Barcus (1964) found that the dropout is much more likely to depend on part time, casual jobs. The positions open to him offer little or no opportunity to learn valuable skills, with the result that he has little job security. All too often he drifts from job to job, never managing to stay in one place long enough to compile any seniority (Super, 1963). Sexton (1961) reports a survey, undertaken by the University of Michigan during the 1958 recession, which documents the dropout's lack of job security. During this economic crisis, a college graduate had a 90 per cent chance of being employed for a full year, a high school graduate had a 75 per cent chance, but a worker with less than a high school education had only a 50 per cent chance for remaining employed for an entire year.

In addition, there has been a general upgrading of job skills in American industry:

> The recent trend in employment opportunities indicates that fewer and fewer completely unskilled workers will be able to obtain jobs in the decade ahead. Employers will want skilled workers. If present trends continue, professional workers will be in heavy demand. White collar jobs will grow at a more rapid rate than will blue collar jobs and it is quite clear that ... there will be little demand for unskilled workers--the slow learners and the high school dropouts who constitute a major problem in large city slums. (Conant, 1961, p. 51)

The Follow-Up Evaluation

The preceding discussion has focused upon some of the more dynamic causes of dropping out of school. These are rooted in the structure and orientations of the lower-class family and peer group. Many aspects of these variables have been investigated. But there are still several gaps in the knowledge of their operation, and some conclusions, which have been drawn on the basis of weak evidence, need further confirmation. In the on-going follow-up to the present study, data are being collected over a period of years not only for the dropouts who attended the experimental schools but also for control groups of regular dropouts and high school graduates. It is planned to make comparisons among these groups on such issues as the orientation of the family toward the school, the structure of the family at the time of dropping out, and changes in family orientation either preceding or accompanying changes in the educational status of the subjects. Many of the

same types of comparisons will also be made for the structure and orientations of the peer group.

The major portion of the follow-up, to be prepared in the final report, will be concerned with the consequences of dropping out. Economic consequences will be studied in terms of duration of unemployment, wage levels, and job-change patterns. Psychological consequences will be studied in terms of changes in self-concept, job satisfaction, and career goals. Social consequences will be studied in terms of social adjustment and political awareness.

In this manner it is anticipated that a follow-up study, continuing over a period of years, will clear up some of the questions which have arisen in the literature.

SUMMARY

Cultural deprivation would appear to be a major factor leading to low scholastic achievement and high dropout rates in lower-class schools. Retarded linguistic ability, restricted conceptual frames of reference, and lack of training in learning skills combine to place the lower-class child at a distinct disadvantage. As the child progresses in school, these deficits tend to become cumulatively worse. Programs designed to correct these deficits may not be as successful as their proponents had hoped they would.

Cultural incompatibility is another major factor in the low achievement - high dropout pattern. Life in a poverty environment reinforces behavior and attitudes which are at odds with the norms set by the larger society. Repression of this behavior only creates greater frustration. When attempts to succeed according to middle-class goals repeatedly fail, the individual begins to expect failure in everything which he tries. These expectations, in turn, lead to fears of attempting to better oneself, and the individual loses all motivation to achieve.

The school is not reaching lower-class students because its traditional practices only aggravate these conditions. Middle-class teachers and administrators do not understand either the needs or the behavior of lower-class students. Rigid behavior rules and curriculum standards alienate the students, making them

hostile and uncooperative. In addition, the distribution of educational resources is inequitable: middle-class schools spend more money per capita and get the best and most experienced teachers. In contrast, schools in poorer neighborhoods must get along on low budgets, with less experienced teachers. The school, in effect, reinforces feelings of inadequacy, contributes to the vicious circle of poverty and cultural deprivation, and drives the lower-class student away from its halls. Present educational practices almost demand poor performance from certain groups.

Vocational training is seen by some as the key to reaching lower-class students. It is pictured as inherently motivating, because it is "close to the realities of lower-class life." Such an attitude of condescension may only increase hostility toward the school. The effectiveness of vocational training for the poor has not yet been convincingly demonstrated.

In recent years, a large number of programs aimed at rehabilitating, retraining, or reeducating high school dropouts has been started. However, many of these have been less than successful. Some aspects of those programs which have been successful are: (1) giving the students a feeling that somebody really cares about them and wants them to succeed, (2) providing a supportive, almost therapeutic atmosphere, and (3) providing tasks which allow the students to compile a backlog of successful completions.

In addition to school-related factors, the orientations of both the student's family and his peer group are of central importance in the dropout syndrome. If status is achieved in these spheres only through activities unrelated to educational achievement, then improvement of the educational institution will yield little in the way of long term benefits.

The economic, social, and psychological consequences of low scholastic achievement and dropping out are bad both for the individual and for the whole society. The dropout is usually the last hired and the first fired; his employment security is low. He is paid less, finds jobs of lower status, and consequently has lower job satisfaction than the high school graduate. This affects his feelings of self-worth and he is more a burden on society than a valuable citizen.

The study which is reported on the following pages, and the continuing follow-up evaluation of its effects, is designed to shed more light upon the above issues and to provide information with which to answer some of the questions which have arisen in this area.

CHAPTER III

THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The issues raised in Chapter II touch on most of the facets of the "dropout problem". This study was designed to obtain data on many of these facets although some aspects received more emphasis than others. As was mentioned in Chapter I, the major hypothesis investigated was what Miller (1964) has labeled "credentialism," which is a tendency to evaluate people not by their performance but by their credentials--diplomas, degrees, union cards, etc. The credential investigated in this study was, of course, the high school diploma.

To test this hypothesis of credentialism it was necessary to assist young people who had left high school without a diploma to qualify for one. This meant conducting a special program which provided the preparation that is necessary to qualify for a diploma. Because this preparation alone, and not the possession of a diploma, may have been the more important variable, a second group was given skill training.

Both of these groups had to return to a school setting--a setting in which they had previously experienced failure and rejection. They had to succeed in a task at which they had previously failed. Many of the reasons believed to underlie their failures were outlined in the preceding chapter. These included family backgrounds of cultural deprivation and cultural incompatibility which caused the school, with its middle-class orientation, to be alien to the interests and needs of the students.

If the schools to which these subjects were to return were merely repeats of those they had left, it was highly likely that they would have withdrawn again. So an attempt was made to create an atmosphere that would be accepting rather than rejecting to the students.

The steps that were taken to stimulate a supportive atmosphere focused on the need for accepting the subjects as individuals rather than responding to them as stereotyped "dropouts." The characteristics of the students and the special problems they faced were explained to the staff of the programs. Little stress was to be placed on rigid rules of attendance and conduct, or on testing and grading. Staff personnel were to attempt to convey a tone of concern for the subjects. It was hoped that this environment would counteract the negative attitudes and expectations of failure which the subjects brought with them as they returned to school.

The degree to which such an atmosphere was created in the separate programs appeared to be one of the major determinants of their relative success. Chapters VI and VII discuss the difference in the attitudinal tone of the diploma and skill training programs and some of the reasons for this difference.

This report is limited to the immediate effects of the two experimental programs. To provide a baseline for evaluating these effects, two other groups were selected. One consisted of dropouts who received no training (hereafter referred to as the control group), and the other consisted of high school graduates (hereafter referred to as the regular high school graduates.)

Thus, there were four groups in the study: the diploma students, the skill training students, the control subjects, and the regular high school graduates. The experimental students--those in the diploma and skill training programs--were given a year long course of instruction. The diploma program was designed to give credit for the equivalent of three years of high school. The skill training programs prepared the students in one of three areas: data processing (mainly keypunching), merchandising (salesclerk), and small appliance and radio repairs. The control group subjects were recruited from the same lists as the experimental subjects and were offered vocational counseling and guidance, with payments as inducements to enlist their participation. The regular high school graduates from both the academic and vocational curricula were selected from the senior class of one of the participating school districts. These graduates were selected to match the experimental subjects as closely as possible on the basis of race, sex, curriculum and IQ.

Subsequent reports will discuss the employment and other experiences of the subjects after the school programs were completed. The employment experiences of the four groups will be compared in order to determine whether dropouts benefit more from general academic preparation or specific vocational training. The present

report is concerned with which program was more successful in the experimental phase of the study. There were three main tasks in this phase: obtaining the subjects, conducting the experimental programs, and collecting the experimental data. This chapter discusses these three in detail.

OBTAINING THE SUBJECTS

Characteristics of the Experimental Subjects

The following description of the characteristics of the dropout subjects was derived from interviews that were conducted both with the subjects who completed the program and those who withdrew before completion. Details of the interviewing are discussed in this chapter in the section entitled, "Data Collection."

The environmental characteristics of these subjects (graduates and dropouts of the two programs) were compared and found to be quite similar. Hence no intergroup comparisons are made.

The Family Environment. The parents of the subjects had on the average a ninth or tenth grade education. When the father was present and employed, it was in an unskilled or semi-skilled blue collar job. But in nearly 40 per cent of the families the father was not present because the parents were divorced or separated. In about one-third of the families there was no one employed and the family lived on welfare. Whether the father was present or not, the students reported that they were much closer to, and much more influenced by, their mothers than by their fathers.

The families were large, averaging five or six children. In most cases the parents did hold the ideal of having their children complete high school. The parents, or at least the mothers, were reported to have encouraged the students to stay in school and study, and to have been disappointed and angry when the students dropped out of high school. In most cases the parents were pleased when the students signed up for the retraining program, and offered assistance such as babysitting so that the students could continue. However, the parents were unsuccessful in their, at least, lip service encouragement of education. Not only these students, but many of their brothers and sisters had dropped out of high school. Few siblings achieved any education beyond high school graduation, although a good many received some training outside of the regular school system, such as in army schools, or in some kind of trade schools.

The family was seldom cited as being influential in the students' choice of job. Seventy per cent of the students say that their families were not of help when they made decisions about jobs. Thus, from all the above data it can be concluded that the parents presented the ideal of at least moderate upward mobility to their children, but were unable to help effectively their children in the means (by education or job) to that end.

Peers. The peer group was still a strong influence on the younger, unmarried students, but was less of an influence on the older and married students who reported that many of their old friends had drifted apart. Many of the students said that they were quite influenced by their peers when they dropped out of high school. Often they dropped out of school at the same time as a friend, or dropped out because most of their friends had already left school by graduating or dropping out.

The students said that many of their friends disliked school but many of them continued longer than the students did themselves. Few of the friends had any education beyond high school graduation. Many of them "just hung around" after high school because they had trouble obtaining steady jobs.

High School Experiences. Most of the students reported that they lost interest in high school. They did poorly in their studies and in many cases failed some grades. A few admitted being resentful and embarrassed when put in special education classes, which they regarded as classes for the "real dumb kids." However, aside from pregnancy, the most frequently cited reason for dropping out was not for scholastic, but for disciplinary problems--fights and bad feelings between the students and teachers, or between the students and principals. Frequently, the students felt that some of the teachers or the principals picked on them and their frends--blaming them for things they did not do, being too severe, and generally being unfair. It would seem that the students were pushed as well as pulled out of school: pulled by a peer group disinterested in education, and pushed out by school officials, who may have been negative towards students of a lower social class and with a low academic performance.

Employment Experiences. Almost all the students who withdrew from school had difficulty finding steady jobs with decent pay. At the time that they signed up for the programs about 40 per cent of the male students and almost all of the female students were unemployed. Many of the women were unmarried mothers who found that they could receive more money from the Department

of Public Assistance than they could make from any job they could get. The frustration and futility of job seeking for the unskilled, especially the Negro unskilled, was eloquently expressed by one unmarried mother in answer to the question, "Have you looked for a job?"

> Oh, these places! I went down to (city name) but they wouldn't give me a chance. I went to the hospital, this is my sixth time, they're all filled up. That's the same thing they tell me over and over and over. The _____ Laundry: They're filled up. The _____ Bakery: They're filled up. Every place I go they say the same thing over and over--I get tired of it. I went down to the unemployment office (mockingly), 'Fill your name in, we'll try to find you a job.' I'd rather go down Detroit like I started. My aunt down there tells me if I come she'll get me a job in the beauty parlor where she works. Me and my baby goin' to pack up and go! Around here they say they're filled up, but you know they're hiring.

Marriage. About 30 per cent of the students were married. Many of the women students dropped out of school because of pregnancy. The tendency was for the white women to have married but for the Negro women not to have married or to be already separated from their husbands if they did marry. Among the married, women frequently expressed discontent with their husbands. Often the women signed up for the program against their husbands' wishes. The married men, in contrast, often were encouraged by their wives to sign up for the program. Frequently the men entered the program in order to be better able to support their families.

Motivation for Change. The subjects expressed a moderate amount of dissatisfaction with their present level of living. About half of the total would prefer white collar jobs. Over half wished to live in a different city or a different type of neighborhood. Sometimes such proposed moves do not seem an improvement to an outsider, but the subjects seemed to feel that anything different might be better. Sometimes the dissatisfaction with their present way of life was expressed without any specific direction or plan of action. In the midst of one interview in a very noisy, chaotic household, a young women interjected with quiet determination, "I been poor all my life, I can't stay like this."

Some students rationalized their lack of success and expressed a "sour grapes" attitude towards successful people. About 20 per cent of the subjects said that successful people were snobbish, step over their friends, or were in some other way bad. For many of the students there was evidence that they had limited their goals. About 40 per cent said that a person should get a job just good enough to get along, not necessarily one that is better than his father's. The clearest indication of their desire for change, however, was their willingness to participate in the experimental program. This willingness suggests that these subjects were not the extremely alienated young people who reject all institutions of the larger society.

Recruiting for the Experimental Programs

Lists of all students who had withdrawn from the schools in the preceding two years were obtained from the high schools in the area. This total list contained about 1,200 names. In August 1965 letters were sent to all of these former students. The letter described the programs in brief and asked the addressee to call a telephone number if he or she were interested in the program. Arrangements were made with the telephone company so that all calls were toll-free. A postage-paid postcard was also included in case the addressee did not wish to call.

Those who responded to the letter were scheduled for a personal interview with one of the five guidance counselors who participated in the project. The counselors explained the nature of the two programs to the prospects. Where there was interest, the counselor assigned the prospect to either the academic or skill training program on a random basis. However, if the prospect had a strong preference for one of the two programs, to the point that he or she would not accept the random assignment, the counselors were instructed to grant the prospect's request. This procedure, of course, violated the principle of random assignment, but it was considered necessary to conduct the study. The pretesting results indicate that the assignment yielded comparable groups in the two programs. In addition to relying on those who voluntarily responded to the letter, other prospects were recruited by personal visits to their homes. Clergymen, the local offices of the Employment Service and the Department of Public Assistance and 135 area employers were also contacted and requested to refer prospects to the programs. Posters describing the programs were displayed at public housing developments and business establishments. Announcements of the programs were carried by local newspapers and radio and television stations.

Age was the only basis on which prospects were screened. An applicant who seemed "young" to the counselors was accepted. Applicants who, in the judgment of the counselors, were too old were rejected.

Group counseling sessions were conducted with the applicants to maintain their interest between the time they signed up for the program and the start of classes. These were unstructured sessions in which the counselors attempted to discuss with the applicants their feelings about returning to school.

Before the start of classes, it became apparent that the diploma program was the more attractive of the two. When the number who had signed up for this program reached 100, it was decided to limit all future prospects to the skill training program. By the start of classes on October 4, 1965 the numbers enrolled who also attended the first classes were 97 in the diploma program and 61 in the skill training program.

High degrees of attrition were expected in the early weeks of the programs because of the four hours per night, five days per week schedule. In general, these expectations of attrition were confirmed. Some of the original applicants never attended classes. Others attended for only a few days. For these reasons, it was decided to continue accepting applicants for the first few weeks of the programs. By the middle of November 1965 the numbers shown in Table 9 had been enrolled in the diploma program at one time, although many had already left.

After the middle of November, applicants were no longer accepted into the diploma program. The skill training program, however, experienced a more rapid loss of students. While there was little active recruiting for the skill training program after the first few months, applicants were accepted until the middle of April 1966. By that date, 128 students had been in the skill training program at one time or another.[1]

---

[1]The enrollment and attendance figures, by months, are included under the discussion of the programs.

TABLE 9

Applicants Enrolled for Diploma to November 15, 1965 and Skill Training Programs, to April 15, 1966 by Sex and Race

	Diploma			Skill Training			Race Total
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Race							
White	51	17	68	40	25	65	133
Negro	17	30	47	9	54	63	110
Total	68	47	115	49	79	128	
Sex Total				117	126		243

Recruiting for the Control Group

When recruiting for the experimental groups, the counselors had attempted to enroll in the control group those prospects who were not interested in the academic or skill training programs. Some were signed up in this way, but an additional effort was subsequently made to obtain the desired number of 100.

This effort was carried out by the guidance counselors. The remaining names on the original list of dropouts were divided geographically among the five counselors. The counselors contacted these individuals personally to solicit their participation.

Participation in the control group was offered to the prospects as an opportunity for broad vocational guidance and counseling. It was explained to them that various aptitude and ability tests would be administered. The results were to be interpreted to the individual with regard to their vocational relevance. The counselors said that they would try to help the subjects formulate vocational plans. As an added inducement, subjects in the control group were to be given an opportunity to prepare for and take the General Educational Development test to qualify for a Commonwealth high school diploma. The subjects were

also to be paid five dollars for each contact with the counselor.

Over 100 subjects were recruited for the control group by the middle of February 1966. Two sessions of pretesting were conducted on February 26. Although the subjects were informed they were to be paid five dollars for each testing session, less than half (50) appeared to take the tests. Subsequent efforts to test the missing subjects were made. Some experimental group subjects, who had been tested and then left the programs during the first three months, were transferred to the control group. When it was decided to terminate further efforts, pretest data were available for 91 subjects. The sex and race characteristics of these subjects are shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10

Control Group Subjects for Whom Pretest Data Were Obtained by Sex and Race

	Male	Female	Total
Race			
White	35	18	53
Negro	17	21	38
Total	52	39	91

Obtaining a Matching Group of Regular High School Graduates

Another major group of subjects was selected from the senior class of one of the participating school districts. These subjects were selected to match as closely as possible the subjects who were in the experimental program in May 1966. The matching was based on race, sex, curriculum and IQ. It was not possible to make a perfect match because there were fewer Negroes in the graduating senior class than there were in the experimental programs. All Negroes in the graduating class, regardless of sex, IQ or curriculum, were therefore included in the sample. Attempts

were then made to balance sex and curriculum. Wherever there were choices available, seniors with IQs similar to the experimental subjects were chosen.

In all a total of 119 seniors was selected. They were asked to attend a meeting at which they received a vinyl portfolio containing a letter, postcards, and three questionnaires. The letter requested their cooperation in a follow-up study of the post-high school experiences. Not all of those solicited returned completed questionnaires. Table 11 lists the characteristics by sex and race both of the seniors who were selected and of those who chose to participate.

TABLE 11

All Selected Senior Class Members and Those Who Agreed to Participate in Follow-up Study by Sex and Race

	Selected			Participated		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Race						
White	34	41	75	27	29	56
Negro	22	22	44	15	14	29
Total	56	63	119	42	43	85

THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

The Diploma Program

The diploma program was designed to give the students the equivalent of three years of high school credit. The credit units were composed of English, 3 units; mathematics, 2 units; science, 2 1/2 units; and social studies, 4 1/2 units. In addition to

these 12 academic courses, the students were offered five enrichment courses. The actual course content of each quarter is listed in Table 12.

The topics taught in many of the courses were coordinated. In the second quarter, for example, English, literature, and reading had a basic core. In the fourth quarter physical science was divided into three areas: chemistry, Earth and its atmosphere, and nuclear warfare. Each of these areas was taught by a separate teacher. Similarily, for Problems of Democracy the reading was organized into domestic problems, international problems, and the problems of society. Each of these was also taught by a different teacher.

TABLE 12

Course Content by Quarters in High School Diploma Program

First Quarter	Second Quarter
English	English-Literature
Biology (Physical Science)	Reading (Enrichment)
World History (Social Studies)	American History (Social Studies)
Speech (Enrichment)	Basic Mathematics I
Third Quarter	**Fourth Quarter**
English	Problems of Democracy-Reading (Social Studies)
Literature	Physical Science
Economics (Social Studies)	Basic Mathematics II
Arts and Crafts (Enrichment)	Music / Typing / Arts and Crafts — Choice of Two (Enrichment)
American Government (1/2 Social Studies)	
World Geography (1/2 Physical Science)	

School was held four hours a night five days a week. Classes started on October 4, 1965 and continued until October 6, 1966. In all, there were 250 class days. The average monthly enrollment and attendance for both the diploma and skill training programs are shown in Table 13.

Skill Training Program

Three skill training courses were offered to the students enrolled in this program. They were key punch operator, merchandising (sales clerk), and radio and small appliance repairs. The student was allowed to select the course he preferred. No females chose radio and appliance repairs and no males chose key punch operator. A few males initially selected merchandising, but they left the program after a short time. The units covered in each of the courses are listed in Table 14.

Table 15 shows the number of students who completed each of the programs by sex and race, and Table 16 shows these numbers as percentages of the number who enrolled in the program. It is clear from these figures that the diploma program had superior retention power. In both programs the Negro females showed the most persistence. Although students were taken into the skill training program up to the middle of April 1966, of those who completed the program 22 were in it for the full year, five entered in January 1966, one in February, and one in April.

TABLE 13

Average Monthly Enrollment and Attendance: October 4, 1965 to September 30, 1966

	High School Diploma Program			Skill Training Program		
	Average enrollment	Average attendance		Average enrollment	Average attendance	
	Number	Number	Per cent	Number	Number	Per cent
October 1965	99.3	81.9	82.5	70.9	47.6	67.1
November	88.5	72.4	81.8	68.5	37.3	53.2
December	82.7	59.2	71.6	63.5	34.8	52.5
January 1966	74.9	59.1	82.9	56.8	36.7	64.6
February	71.6	56.1	78.4	59.7	39.5	66.7
March	69.0	58.1	81.1	58.6	33.6	57.3
April	67.5	52.5	81.6	54.4	30.0	55.1
May	64.7	54.9	84.9	50.2	25.7	51.2
June	63.3	55.0	86.9	45.2	19.1	41.4
July	60.4	52.5	86.9	43.4	18.8	43.3
August	60.0	52.9	88.2	33.3	23.2	69.7
September	60.0	53.1	88.5	29.1	19.2	66.0

Average enrollment was calculated by summing the enrollment for each class day of the month and dividing by the number of days.

Average attendance was calculated by summing the attendance for each class day of the month and dividing by the number of days.

TABLE 14

Course Content in Skill Training Program

Data Processing

Unit	Contents
I	Basic Reading-Skills
II	Introduction to Data Processing
III	General Operation of the 024 Keypunch
IV	General Operation of the 026 Keypunch
V	General Operation of the 056 Verifier
VI	General Operation of the Sorter 082
VII	Special Features of the 082
VIII	Sufficient Practice to Develop Speed & Accuracy
IX	General Operation of the 548 Interpreter
X	General Operation of the 519 Reproducer
XI	General Operation of the 085 Collator
XII	General Operation of the 402

Merchandising

I	Elements of Retailing
II	Organization of a Store
III	Establishing Retail Store
IV	Management and Operation
V	Goodwill
VI	Merchandising
VII	Economics of Business
VIII	Basic Course in Math
IX	Advertising and Retail Advertising
X	Salesmanship
XI	Merchandise Math
XII	Textiles-Non-Textiles
XIII	Color, Line and Design
XIV	Review of Merchandise Math
XV	How to Apply for a Job

TABLE 14 (continued)

Course Content in Skill Training Program

Radio and Appliance Repair

Unit	Contents	Unit	Contents
I	Basic Theory	XII	Gas Dryers
II	Test Equipment	XIII	Refrigeration and Air-Conditioners
III	Prints and Diagrams	XIV	Batteries
IV	Tools and Equipment	XV	Vacuum Tubes
V	Heating Element Appliances	XVI	Transistors
VI	Food Mixers	XVII	Power Supplies
VII	Ironers	XVIII	Amplifiers
VIII	Electric Motors	XIX	Oscillators
IX	Electric Ranges	XX	Detectors
X	Laundry Equipment	XXI	T.R.F. Receivers
XI	Electric Dryers	XXII	Superheterdyne Receivers

TABLE 15

Students Who Completed
Diploma and Skill Training Programs
by Sex and Race

	Diploma			Skill Training			Race Total
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	
Race							
White	21	10	31	4	3	7	38
Negro	5	24	29	2	20	22	51
Total	26	34	60	6	23	29	
Sex Total				32	57		89

TABLE 16

Completion Rates for the Diploma and Skill Training Programs by Sex and Race

	Diploma	Skill Training	Total
Race			
White	$\frac{31}{68}$ = 46%	$\frac{7}{65}$ = 11%	$\frac{38}{133}$ = 29%
Negro	$\frac{29}{47}$ = 61%	$\frac{22}{63}$ = 35%	$\frac{51}{110}$ = 46%
Sex			
Male	$\frac{26}{68}$ = 38%	$\frac{6}{49}$ = 12%	$\frac{32}{117}$ = 27%
Female	$\frac{34}{47}$ = 72%	$\frac{23}{79}$ = 29%	$\frac{57}{126}$ = 45%
Total	$\frac{60}{115}$ = 52%	$\frac{29}{128}$ = 23%	$\frac{89}{243}$ = 37%

Completion Rate = $\frac{\text{Number Completing}}{\text{Number Enrolled}}$

DATA COLLECTION

Pre- and Posttesting

The tests and questionnaires used were selected to measure variables that the experimental programs attempted to influence. These were broadly grouped into attitudinal and ability variables. Most of the attitudinal changes related to self concept and other personality constructs. Standardized personality measures were thus selected to assess them. The ability variables, which the programs tried to influence, were basic communications

and computation skills. These were also tested using standardized measures. The degree to which communications and computation deficiencies hinder performance on traditional IQ tests was assessed by comparing a traditional test with two non-verbal IQ tests. The battery of tests used and the rationale for choosing each are presented in Table 17.

The pretesting of the experimental subjects was conducted during the fourth week of classes, October 25 to 29, 1965. It was delayed to this date so as not to frighten the subjects into leaving the programs. The investigators thought, and subsequent experience confirmed, that the subjects would have considerable anxiety about taking an extensive battery of tests. There was concern that introducing the tests in the first week may have made the students so anxious that they would have stopped attending classes. Delaying the tests made it impossible to obtain data on those subjects who attended for only a short time. While this was unfortunate, it was considered to be a better alternative.

The main testing session for the control group took place in February 1966. Because of the limited amount of time, the battery of tests given the control group was shorter than that given the experimental group. The tests administered were: IQ - The Revised Beta; Personality - The Adjective Check List and the Self-Esteem Inventory; and Achievement - The Stanford Advanced Paragraph Meaning Test and the Advanced Arithmetic Test. The control subjects were also given the opportunity to complete the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory at home. Information as to IQ of the control group members, as measured by traditional tests, was obtained from high school transcripts.

When the testing session for the control group was scheduled, 115 subjects had agreed to participate in the counseling and guidance program. Fifty of the 115 attended the testing session. By scheduling make-up sessions, by arranging individual appointments, and by shifting some experimental subjects who left the program in its first months the number of control group subjects for whom pretests were available was raised to 91. The characteristics of these subjects by sex and race were shown in Table 10.

The posttesting of the experimental subjects took place on September 27 and 28, 1966. The test battery included the same tests that were used for pretesting except that the Culture-Fair Intelligence Test was not repeated. The pretesting results indicated that for the experimental subjects the Beta was a more adequate measure of nonverbal intelligence. The Otis was included

TABLE 17

Standardized Tests Used in Project

Test and Publisher	Description and Reasons for Using
Intelligence	
Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Test Gamma Test Forms EM and FM. Harcourt, Brace, and World New York, New York.	A traditional IQ test. It was expected that they would not score well on this test. The plan was to use it as a benchmark against which to compare the nonverbal tests.
Revised Beta Examination The Psychological Corp. New York, New York	These are both nonverbal intelligence tests. The Beta uses maze tracing, picture absurdities, digit symbol substitution, etc. The Culture Fair uses relationships between geometric figures. It was hoped these tests would give a measure of innate ability unconfounded by verbal skills.
Culture Fair Intelligence Test Scale 2 Forms A and B Institute for Personality and Ability Testing Champaign, Illinois	
Personality	
Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) The Psychological Corp. New York, New York	The EPPS measures 15 personality variables or needs including achievement change, aggression, order, heterosexuality, etc. Each response choice consists of a pair of equally desirable statements; the respondent must choose the one most descriptive of himself. This construction is an attempt to make "faking" more difficult.
The (Gough) Adjective Check List (ACL) Consulting Psychologist Press Palo Alto, California	The 300 common adjectives that make up the ACL can be scored on scales that are directly comparable to the scales on the EPPS. This allowed correlation of the scales. The ACL also will add to an understanding of the self-perceptions of our subjects.

TABLE 17 (continued)

Standardized Tests Used in Project

Test and Publisher	Description and Reasons for Using
Personality (continued)	
Coopersmith's Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) Document 5902 American Documentation Institute Library of Congress Washington, D.C.	The SEI uses 50 items to tap the respondent's evaluative perceptions in four areas: peers, parents, school, self. The respondent checks whether an item is "like" or "unlike" himself. Eight "lie" items are included to detect and correct for a tendency to choose the socially desirable response.
Vocational Interest	
Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory (MVII) The Psychological Corp. New York, New York	This is a new interest measure that attempts to identify potential members of semi-skilled and skilled occupations through the similarity of their interests to those current members of the occupations. It was used to determine if the diploma and skill programs produce any changes in interests.
Reading and Arithmetic Achievement	
Stanford Achievement Tests Advanced Paragraph Meaning Test Forms W and X Advanced Arithmetic Test Forms W and X New York, New York	These tests are standardized for grades 7 through 9. Because of the wide range of ability in the subjects, it was expected that some would have considerable difficulty with this level. However, lower level tests would probably have yielded inflated scores for the majority of the subjects.

in the posttest battery of the control group. Posttest data were obtained for all 89 of the students who completed the programs. The control group subjects were scheduled for testing on October 1, 1966. Of the 91 for whom pretest scores were available, 37 reported for posttesting. Additional efforts brought the number up to 68. For the purpose of this report, it was decided to use the scores of these 68 while continuing efforts to test as many more control subjects as possible.

The comparison of the pre- and posttest results for the various groups of subjects are reported in Chapter IV and in greater detail in Appendix A.

Interviewing of Students

The interviewing that was conducted in the first year of the project was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the experimental programs. Interviews were conducted both with students who completed the programs and with those who did not. One latter group was interviewed primarily to determine the factors which influenced their decisions to drop out of the experimental programs. The interview schedule and the interviewer instructions are reproduced in Appendix B. These indicate the areas discussed in the interview. Essentially the schedule attempted to stimulate the respondent to talk about the program--either academic or skill training--and about himself. Table 18 lists the number of interviews conducted among the subjects who completed the academic and skill training program and among those who withdrew from the programs.

The interviews of students were conducted by guidance counselors who had had no previous connection with the project. They were given special instructions to prepare them for interviewing. A workbook containing samples of interview interactions was prepared. The interviewers wrote out what they considered to be possible responses to the comments described. They were then given a guide which outlined some of the responses the investigators thought would be useful in these situations.

The interviewers were equipped with battery powered portable tape recorders. Whenever possible they taped the interview. Sometimes due to failure of the machine, a noisy interview setting, or a refusal to be taped it was necessary to record the respondent's answers by hand. The interviews that were taped were later transcribed onto the schedules by the research staff.

TABLE 18

Number of Interviews Conducted Among Students Who Were Enrolled for the Experimental Programs

	Interviews	Total in Group	Percent of Total Interviewed
	N	N	%
Completed Program			
Academic	39	60	65
Skill Training	23	29	79
Withdrew			
Academic	27	55	49
Skill Training	34	101	34
Total	123	245	50

Tape recorders were used in an attempt to give the interviewer greater freedom in the interview situation. It was thought that if the interviewer was not required to record the answers he would be better able to guide the interview and more likely to achieve greater depth in the respondents' expressions of their feelings. The interviews lasted about 45 minutes to an hour and one-quarter. The tapes were transcribed and coded. Ten questions, including those that required the most subjective judgment, were coded independently by two coders. The categories were compared and it was found that the median intercoder agreement was 89 per cent. The range was from 71 to 94 per cent. These are per cent agreement not correlation coefficients. They indicate a high degree of reliability in the coding.

Chapter V presents the results of these interviews. These results tend to confirm the impressions obtained through direct contact with the programs. The diploma students perceived their program as more accepting of them. They also were more satisfied with the quality of instruction that they received and more

optimistic about its utility in the future. There is also some evidence that the diploma graduates became more confident of their own ability to control their future.

Interviewing of Teachers

To obtain another viewpoint on the effectiveness of the project, interviews were conducted with all the teachers who had taught for one month or longer. There were 22 such teachers, 14 from the academic program and eight from the skill training program. All of the interviews were conducted by the same person and were taped.

The interviewer did not follow a fixed schedule of questions, but there were some areas that he covered in each interview. (The list of these topics is reproduced in Appendix C.) The interviewer's usual technique was simply to start the teacher talking about the program. He would then guide the discussion into areas of interest. Direct questions were asked only when the conversation lagged or a topic was exhausted.

Analysis of these tapes was made by developing various rating categories. These categories include such things as the ability of the teacher to relate to students, insights of the teachers into students' behavior, involvement of the teacher in the programs, their creativity, and their ability to be self-critical. Each of the teachers was rated from 1 (most desirable) to 3 (least desirable) on 24 such attributes, plus an overall rating from 1 to 5. The actual rating categories and their definitions are reproduced in Appendix C.

The rating for the 25 categories are summated for each teacher to yield an overall index of his effectiveness. The teachers from each of the two schools were then ranked on the basis of this index from the most effective to the least effective. The ranking resulting from the analysis of the recorded interviews was compared to the ranking given by the supervisor from each program. The rank order correlation coefficient for the 14 teachers in the diploma program was .79. If one teacher, who showed insight and concern but was generally ineffective, is dropped, the correlation rises to .92. The level of these correlations indicates that the interviews accurately reflected the performance of the teachers in the diploma program.

In the skill training program there was essentially no correlation between the ratings of the tapes and the ratings by the supervisor. The rho value was -.13. This low correlation reflects the inability of the University investigators, despite strong efforts, to instill their orientation among the teachers and administrators of the skill training program. There was little agreement between the staff of this program and the University as to what makes a successful teacher. Some reasons for this lack of rapport are examined in Chapter VI.

The teachers were then divided into those who were judged from their interviews to be either generally successful or unsuccessful in their relationships with the students. Quotes on the tapes, which referred to the characteristics that differentiated the successful from the unsuccessful teacher, were transcribed independently by two judges. Certain themes that recur in these quotes were abstracted. These themes are discussed in Chapter VII.

The data and issues discussed in each of the separate chapters are interrelated in Chapter VIII. Some implications of the use of skill training programs as agents to affect the disadvantaged are noted.

SUMMARY

This study was designed to investigate two main issues concerning dropouts: credentialism and general (academic) versus vocational training. Credentialism refers to a tendency to evaluate people not by their performance but by the certificates they hold from institutions in our society. The credential selected for this study was the high school diploma. There is reason to believe that the absence of a diploma prevents young people from even being considered for many types of jobs. The second issue was concerned with whether it is better to give young people who have withdrawn from school specific skill training or general academic preparation.

A third issue--the one with which this report is mainly concerned--arose during the conduct of the experimental programs. This was the importance of the attitudinal tone of the programs. While it was not originally intended to investigate this variable, the difference between the two programs provided a serendipitous test of its effects.

This chapter describes the major steps involved in conducting the experimental phase of this study. In this phase subjects for the experimental and control groups were recruited and a matching group of regular high school graduates was selected. Year long programs were conducted for the experimental subjects. In the diploma program the subjects were given courses which were equivalent to the credits of a three year general high school curriculum. In the skill training program the subjects received training in data processing, merchandising, and radio and small appliance repairs. The control group subjects received no training but did receive guidance and counseling. The regular high school graduates were selected from the graduating class of one of the participating school districts. They were selected, to the extent possible, to match the experimental subjects on four variables: race, sex, curriculum, and IQ.

To evaluate the programs the subjects in the experimental and control groups were tested at the beginning and at the end of the year of their participation in the study. Standard tests of IQ, achievement, and personality were used. Interviews were conducted with the subjects who completed the programs and those who left without completing them. Interviews were also conducted with the administrators and teachers of both the diploma and skill training programs. The evaluation of these programs is presented in the separate chapters of the report.

CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECTS OF THE PROGRAMS ON ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS SELF

In this chapter the results of the tests which were administered to all of the subjects in the experimental program are analyzed and discussed in order to determine the changes, if any, which took place in the academic achievements and in attitudes towards self on the part of the participants. As indicated in the preceding chapter these were two areas where it was assumed that the school could play a role.

This chapter presents a summary of the major test results for the general reader. For those who are interested in the more technical aspects of the data analysis, a detailed discussion of the statistical aspects of this analysis and extensive data tabulations are provided in Appendix A of this report.

The subjects were tested extensively. The testing program involved the administration of nine different tests, from which 80 diagnostic scores could be obtained. (Descriptions of these tests can be found in Table 17 in Chapter III. In addition, the tests were administered twice, once at the beginning of the school year (pretesting) and once at the end of the school year (posttesting), so that changes could be measured. The control group, which did not attend the schools, also took the tests so that base levels for the test scores could be established. Including the regular high school graduate control group as well as the control group which received guidance, usable test scores were collected from a total of 352 subjects.

This report presents only those data which are directly relevant to the measurement of changes in intelligence, scholastic achievement, and attitudes towards self. In evaluating the data

the analysis of covariance procedure was employed. It was found that the diploma group profited most in all of these areas:

1. Both the diploma and the skill training groups raised their IQ scores.

2. The IQ increase by the diploma group was greater than that of the skill training group.

3. In terms of scholastic achievement, the diploma, skill, and control groups all started out on approximately the same level.

4. The diploma group showed a larger gain in reading achievement than either the skill or control groups.

5. The diploma group showed a larger gain in arithmetic achievement than either the skill or control groups.

6. The skill training group was originally higher in self esteem, but its esteem score was much lower by the end of the school year.

7. The diploma group increased in self esteem during the school year.

8. At the end of the year, the diploma group was superior in self esteem to the skill and control groups.

9. No other significant changes in self concept were found.

Measures of Intelligence

Verbal IQ. Two standardized intelligence tests, one "verbal" and one "nonverbal," were administered to the subjects. On the verbal intelligence pretest, the mean IQ scores of the experimental and control groups were well within the normal range of intelligence, although they were lower than the general population average of 100. As Table 19 shows, the mean pretest scores of the three groups fell within a narrow range, with the control group scoring slightly higher than either of the experimental groups. Statistical analysis demonstrated that the small differences among the groups were not significant.

TABLE 19

Pretest and Posttest Intelligence Scores

Group	N	Mean Verbal IQ pre-test	Mean Verbal IQ post-test	Mean Verbal IQ difference	Mean Nonverbal IQ pre-test	Mean Nonverbal IQ post-test	Mean Nonverbal IQ difference
Diploma	60	92.1	94.0	+1.9*	98.4	105.0	+6.6**
Skill Training	28	91.5	93.4	+1.9	99.2	103.9	+4.7**
Control	(20-63)[a]	93.4	89.0	-4.4	99.9	103.0	+3.1**
Significant difference among group scores		No	Yes**		No	Yes*	

a
A range of Ns is reported, since different numbers of subjects took some tests (see Appendix A).

*
Statistically significant difference at the 95% level of confidence.

**
Statistically significant difference at the 99% level of confidence.

Both of the experimental groups improved their mean verbal IQ scores from pretest to posttest. Both of these groups increased their scores by the same amount (1.9 points), but the increase was statistically significant for the diploma group and was not significant for the skill training group. This situation was probably caused by two factors: (1) the skill training group was smaller than the diploma group, and (2) its standard deviation was larger than that of the diploma group. This would lead to the tentative conclusion that both of the experimental groups may have increased their levels of verbal intelligence.

The rise in the score of the diploma group took on added significance when it was found that the dropouts from this program were higher in intelligence than the dropouts from the skill training program. Thus, despite the fact that the diploma group lost more students with relatively higher IQs its average IQ level still rose. (No differences between the two groups of dropouts were found on any of the other tests.)

The control group's mean verbal IQ score dropped from pretest to posttest. This result was not expected. It adds a measure of confusion to the analysis of and conclusions about the changes in intelligence brought about by the experimental manipulations. Some technical implications of this result are discussed in Appendix A.

This drop in the control group's score is larger (4.4 points) than were the gains of the experimental groups, producing a discrepancy among group scores which was statistically significant beyond the 99 per cent level of significance. Thus, at the beginning of the experiment the experimental and control groups were at approximately the same level of intelligence. At the end of the experiment, the two experimental groups had higher mean IQ scores than the control group.

Nonverbal IQ. On the pretest for nonverbal intelligence, the scores for all groups were much higher. As can be seen in Table 19, the average pretest scores for all three groups were very close to the general population average of 100. This can be taken as an indication that young people from low socio-economic and scholastic orientation levels tend to receive depressed IQ scores when evaluated by means of verbally weighted intelligence tests. As with the verbal test, no real pretest differences among the groups were detected.

All of the groups increased their mean scores from pretest to posttest, and these differences were found to be statistically significant. This general increase appears to be a function of the test itself, rather than a true increase in intelligence. It is suspected that a "practice effect" was at work, since the puzzles and mazes which compose the test may be easier to solve when presented for the second time. However, in spite of this general increase for all groups, a statistically significant difference among group posttest scores was detected, where none had existed on the pretest. This difference is

accounted for by the fact that the diploma group increased more than the other groups. Thus, in terms of nonverbal intelligence changes, the diploma group profited more from the experimental manipulations than did the skill training and control groups.

In sum, no real differences in intelligence between the experimental and control groups were found at the start of the experiment. Any differences found at the end of the experiment may therefore be attributed to the effects of the experimental manipulations. It was found that both of the experimental groups increased their IQ test performance, in relation to that of the control group, and that the diploma group may have received greater benefit in terms of IQ change than did the skill training group.

Measures of Academic Achievement

Three standardized achievement tests were administered. The two experimental groups were tested for reading level, arithmetic computation, and arithmetic concepts. The control group received only the reading and arithmetic computation tests.

The mean scores of these tests, reported in terms of grade-achievement levels, are found in Table 20. As would be expected, the general trend is toward low levels of scholastic achievement. Although individual scores varied widely, the group means tended to cluster around the sixth and seventh grade levels of achievement. Reading scores generally were higher than arithmetic scores.

On all three achievement pretests, statistical analyses could detect no significant difference among the diploma, skill training, and control groups. Differences of more than one-half grade level were found between mean scores on some of these tests, but the distributions of scores within the groups were such that the obtained differences were too dependent upon chance variations.

The pretest-to-posttest changes were all in favor of the diploma group. Its greatest advances were on the arithmetic scales, but even the smaller increase on the reading test was large enough to be significant. The skill training and control group did not improve their performance significantly on any of the achievement tests. In comparing across groups on each of the posttests, it was found that the diploma group was at significantly higher grade-achievement levels than were the skill

TABLE 20

Pretest and Posttest Scholastic Achievement Scores
(Reading, Arithmetic Computation, and Arithmetic Concepts)

Group	N	Mean Reading Score[a]			Mean Computation Score[a]			Mean Concepts Score[a]		
		pre-test	post-test	difference	pre-test	post-test	difference	pre-test	post-test	difference
Diploma	60	7.59	8.35	+0.76**	6.20	8.08	+1.88**	6.51	7.76	+1.25**
Skill Training	(26-27)	7.61	7.48	-0.13	6.62	7.26	+0.64	7.12	7.37	+0.25
Control	(57-58)	7.06	7.43	+0.37	6.66	6.72	+0.06			
Significant difference among group scores		No	Yes*		No	Yes**		No	Yes*	

[a] Scores reported in terms of grade-achievement levels.

* Statistically significant difference at the 95% level of confidence

** Statistically significant difference at the 95% level of confidence.

training and control groups.

Attitudes Towards Self

All of the subjects, including the regular high school graduates were pretested and posttested for self evaluation level. Scores pertaining to this variable were obtained from the Self Esteem Inventory and from two scales of the Adjective Check List (ACL). These scores are reported in Table 21. In this table, the column labeled "Favorability Towards Self" contains scores from the "Favorable" scale of the ACL (number of favorable adjectives chosen as self-descriptive), the "Unfavorability Towards Self" column contains scores from the "Unfavorable" ACL scale (number of unfavorable adjectives chosen), and the "Self Esteem" column contains the results of the Self Esteem Inventory. For comparative purposes, the scores of the regular high school graduates control group are also included in the table.

On the "favorability" scale, no real differences were found among the four groups on the basis of the pretest scores. All of the groups appeared to be at about the same level of favorability toward self and, contrary to popular expectations, the dropout groups were not significantly lower than the graduates. On the unfavorability scale, significant pretest differences among the groups were found. However, this difference is accounted for by the regular high school graduates, who, as would be expected, were lower in unfavorability when compared with any of the dropout groups. Among the dropout groups, themselves, no real differences were apparent. A significant difference was also found on the self esteem pretest, where the skill training group had a high self esteem score and the regular high school graduates were on a lower level with the diploma and dropout control groups.

Thus, on the pretests, no real differences in mean scores on the Adjective Check List scales were found for the three groups of high school dropouts. On the favorability scale, the regular high school graduates were at about the same level as the dropouts, whereas on the unfavorability scale the regular graduates appeared to be less unfavorable to themselves than were the others. On the Self Esteem Inventory, the skill training group had a significantly higher score than the other dropouts and the regular graduates.

TABLE 21

Pretest and Posttest Self Evaluation Scores

Group	Favorability Towards Self[a]			Unfavorability Towards Self[b]			Self Esteem[c]		
	pre-test	post-test	difference	pre-test	post-test	difference	pre-test	post-test	difference
Diploma	46.2	49.0	+2.8*	53.3	50.4	-2.9**	40.1	44.3	+4.2
Skill Training	44.5	46.0	+1.5	51.6	52.9	+1.3	49.4	39.0	-10.4**
Control	44.6	43.5	-1.1	53.1	52.2	-0.9	36.0	33.0	-3.0
High School Grad	48.6			46.8			38.4		
Significant difference among group scores	No	No		Yes**	No		Yes*	Yes*	

[a] From Adjective Check List (Favorable) scale: Number of favorable adjectives chosen as self-descriptive.

[b] From Adjective Check List (Unfavorable) scale: Number of unfavorable adjectives chosen as self-descriptive.

[c] Mean score on Self Esteem Inventory, corrected for lies.

* Statistically significant difference at the 95% level of confidence.

** Statistically significant difference at the 99% level of confidence.

On the ACL posttests, the diploma group significantly increased its favorability score, and decreased its unfavorability score, from its pretest levels. Although these changes are statistically significant, they are not large enough to give the diploma group a significant advantage when compared to the skill training and control posttest scores. This may be due to some factors inherent in the way the standard scores are derived, rather than to the actual performance of the subjects, as is explained later in Appendix A. The regular high school graduate group was not included in this comparison, for no posttests were given to these people. But when the posttest scores of the dropouts are compared to the pretest scores of the regular graduates it appears that the dropouts' favorability was approximately the same as that of the graduates, and their unfavorability had not dropped to the graduates' level.

An interesting reversal, however, shows up in the posttest scores on the Self Esteem Inventory. The skill training group, which had the highest pretest self esteem, underwent a large drop in its score. At the same time the diploma group increased its score by a rather large, but statistically non-significant, amount. Thus, on the pretests, the skill training group had the highest level of self esteem, while on the posttests the diploma group was highest on this variable.

The results on attitudes towards self are difficult to interpret, for they are inconsistent. Both of the tests which were used (Adjective Check List and Self Esteem Inventory) should be measuring approximately the same thing. But, from the obtained results, this does not appear to be the case. One thing is consistent--on both tests the attitudes towards self of the subjects in the diploma group appeared to improve. But as for the relative placement of the groups along a continuum of scores, especially on the pretest, the results of the two tests do not agree. In addition, the scores of these tests do not intercorrelate well either on pretest or on posttest, as Table 22 illustrates.

The low reliability figure (.42) for the Self Esteem Inventory would tend to create suspicion concerning its measurements. But from other observations of the programs, the self esteem results seem to be valid. The high attrition rate in the skill training program, the frequent change of teachers, and its institutional atmosphere (see Chapter VI) could be factors leading to a large drop in the self esteem of the students. In

addition, the results of the student interviews (which were completed at the end of the programs) indicate that the skill students were less favorable than the diploma students in attitudes towards self. (See Chapter VI)

TABLE 22

Intercorrelations of Measures in Attitudes Towards Self

	Self Esteem Inventory	ACL (Favorable)	ACL (Unfavorable)
Self Esteem Inventory	42	10	06
ACL (Favorable)	16	64	-45
ACL (Unfavorable)	-05	-58	61

Lower triangle - pretest intercorrelations

Upper triangle - posttest intercorrelations

Diagonal - pre-post intercorrelations (reliability coefficients)

Decimals omitted

Summary

At the beginning of the experimental programs, a series of pretests demonstrated that there were essentially no differences among the three groups of dropouts (diploma, skill, and control) in terms of IQ and scholastic achievement. In terms of attitudes towards self one test showed no difference among the groups in favorability-unfavorability, and one test showed the skill training group to have a higher level of self esteem than the diploma or control groups.

After a year of experimental treatment, the diploma group had improved its scores significantly on all of these tests. The sole exception to this statement occurred on the self esteem test, where the average score of the diploma group improved to an extent which was large, but not statistically significant. Neither the skill training group nor the control group improved its average score significantly on any of the tests except the nonverbal intelligence test, where a "practice effect" probably led to improvements in all scores. On the self esteem test, the average score of the skill training group fell to a level below the pretest level of the diploma group.

At the end of the experimental programs, both the diploma and skill training groups had significantly higher verbal IQs than the control group. The diploma group was significantly better than the skill and control groups on every other test except the favorability-unfavorability towards self measures, where no difference among the groups was found.

It is concluded that the diploma program was successful in improving the measured intelligence, academic achievement, and self esteem of its students, while the skill training program was unsuccessful in achieving these results.

Given these results with respect to the differences in the outcomes of the two experimental groups, it is natural to inquire into the reasons for these differences. It is in response to this basic question that the remainder of this report is concerned. In Chapter V, an analysis of student interviews is presented in order to learn about their goals and their evaluations of the programs in which they participated.

Chapter VI attempts to set forth the attitudinal tones of the two experimental programs in an effort to seek some

explanation for the differences in effects on the students. Chapter VII, still concerned with this issue, explores the role of the teachers in each of the programs. This analysis is based on extensive interviews with the teachers.

CHAPTER V

THE STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMS

To supplement the data gathered through testing, exit interviews were held with the subjects. These were conducted both with the subjects who completed the programs and those who withdrew. These interviews had two main purposes. The first was to obtain the opinions of the subjects about the programs. The second was to examine the effects of participation in the program on the self concepts of the subjects.

The interview results verify the test results and the impressions of the personnel associated with the project. The interview responses indicate that the diploma program was seen by its subjects as more supportive and accepting. The analysis of the self-concept questions suggests that the diploma program did lead to improvement in the self-confidence of those subjects who completed it.

This chapter is divided into two main sections: in the first the subjects' opinions of the programs are presented; in the second some inferences as to the effects of the programs on the attitudes towards self of the subjects are drawn.

The numbers in the tables in this chapter are low. As Table 18 in Chapter III indicated, not all the program subjects were interviewed. And because of the semistructured nature of the interview, not all the questions were asked of each respondent. Hence the N's are not only low, but they are different in different tables. For these reasons the percentages reported must be regarded as tentative. However, a chi square analysis was conducted for all the tables. Where this analysis yielded a significant value, it can be assumed that the difference shown in the table is greater than would have been found by chance.

THE SUBJECTS' OPINIONS OF THE PROGRAMS

The Tone of the Programs

As had been stated many times in this report, it was the opinion of the personnel associated with the project that the diploma program was the more successful in providing a supportive environment for the students. The interview results clearly confirm this impression. The tables reported in this section point up the differences in the subjects' opinions most sharply. Many other questions were asked but they are not reported. These other questions were concerned more with the operational aspects of the program and less with overall evaluations. (The interview guide is reproduced in Appendix B.)

The difference between the skill training and diploma programs that most impressed the personnel associated with the project was the degree of concern shown for the students on the part of the school personnel. This report is largely an attempt to examine this difference and to determine where it resulted in different effects and why. The conclusion arrived at was that the difference stemmed mainly from the attitudinal tone of the program as created by the administration and as reflected by the teachers. This conclusion was confirmed by the results shown in Table 23.

Table 23 lists the coded responses to the open-ended question, "Were there any things, in particular, that you liked about the Penn State program?" References to the tone of the program--the way things were run--and to the teachers were made by almost half of the diploma graduates and by almost none of the skill training graduates.

Another indication of the greater concern is shown in Table 24. The subjects who participated in the diploma program were much more likely to discuss a problem with a teacher or counselor after leaving the program. These tables indicate the subjects were aware of the differences in the attitudinal tone of the programs.

TABLE 23

Main Things That Graduates Liked About the Programs

	Program Graduates	
	Diploma	Skill
	%	%
A chance to improve oneself	24	26
Administration, atmosphere	24	0
Teachers	21	4
Everything all right	18	22
Particular course	6	39
Convenience of time, location, etc.	6	8
Total	99	99
Number	33	23
Chi Square	15.90	
Degrees of Freedom	5.	
Probability	< .01	

TABLE 24

Willingness of Program Graduates and Dropouts to Take a Problem to a Teacher or Counselor After Leaving the Program

	Program Subjects	
	Diploma	Skill
	%	%
Yes, would take problem	61	26
Qualified, might	17	56
No, would not	22	17
Total	100	99
Number	41	23
Chi Square	11.19	
Degrees of Freedom	2.	
Probability	< .01	

The Utility of the Programs

While the tone of the programs seemed to be the most important variable in their relative success, it was not the only variable. The subjects' perceptions of the value of the course of study also influenced their attitudes. The diploma program was seen as the more useful (Table 25).

TABLE 25

Attitudes of Program Graduates and Dropouts Towards Future Usefulness of Programs

	Program Subjects	
	Diploma	Skill
	%	%
Program will help	69	32
May help	14	56
Will not help	17	12
Total	100	100
Number	42	41
Chi Square	16.38	
Degree of Freedom	2.	
Probability	< .01	

The goal of the high school diploma apparently possessed much more incentive value than the opportunity for skill training. Table 26 indicates that approximately one-third of the diploma graduates thought that attending classes every night was a chore, but the goal made it worthwhile. None of the skill training graduates gave a similar response.

TABLE 26

Attitudes of Program Graduates Towards
Going to School Every Evening

	Program Graduates	
	Diploma	Skill
	%	%
Sometimes a chore but thought of goal	30	0
Glad, looked forward to going	26	29
Neutral or equivocal	26	12
Glad, better than doing nothing	19	35
Was a chore or became a chore	0	24
Total	101	100
Number	27	17
Chi Square	13.63	
Degrees of Freedom	4.	
Probability	< .01	

The value of the content of the courses was related to attitudes towards the length of the program (Table 27) and to the decision to withdraw (Table 28). The skill training graduates were more inclined to think the program was too long. And about one-half reported that they withdrew from the skill training program because it was not worthwhile or run correctly. None of those who withdrew from the diploma program gave these reasons.

As an indication that the psychological tone and utility of the programs were the important variables Table 29 is presented. This table shows the attitudes of both the graduates and dropouts towards the buildings in which the two programs were conducted. The diploma students did not perceive their building favorably. Conversely, the skill training students were favorable towards their building. There was little difference between the graduates and dropouts of the two programs in these attitudes. These results suggest that physical facilities had little influence on the success of the programs.

TABLE 27

Attitudes of Graduates Towards Length of Programs

	Program Graduates	
	Diploma	Skill
	%	%
Too long	19	50
Just right or not long enough	81	50
Total	100	100
Number	26	18
Chi Square	4.63	
Degrees of Freedom	1.	
Probability	.03	

TABLE 28

Primary Reasons Subjects Withdrew From the Programs

	Program Dropouts	
	Diploma	Skill
	%	%
Job made it difficult	35	9
Took too much time from family or social life	26	19
Terminated by administration	22	12
Sickness or transportation difficulties	17	16
Did not think program was worthwhile or run correctly	0	44
Total	100	100
Number	23	32
Chi Square	15.44	
Degrees of Freedom	4.	
Probability	< .01	

TABLE 29

Attitudes of Program Graduates and Dropouts Towards Their School Buildings

	Diploma Program		Skill Training	
	Graduates	Dropouts	Graduates	Dropouts
	%	%	%	%
Building was bad	31	44	11	3
Neutral	62	52	32	24
Building was good	8	4	58	72
Total	101	100	101	99
Number	26	25	19	29
Chi Square	1.10		1.52	
Degrees of Freedom	2.		2.	
Probability	.60		.50	

All of the results presented in this section portray a favorable picture of the attitudinal tone of the diploma program and a less favorable picture of the tone of the skill training program. In the next section, the analysis attempts to determine whether the "successful" program produced positive changes in the self concepts of its students.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PROGRAMS ON ATTITUDES TOWARDS SELF

Self concept refers to the individual's picture of himself--the collection of characteristics that he will accept as self descriptive. An individual's self concept is learned through experience with success and failure and from the opinions significant other people in his environment hold of him. For the reasons reviewed in Chapter II, it seemed likely that the self concepts of the dropouts would be generally negative. Their lives, in general, have been a succession of failures in school, jobs, and often marriage. Faced with these experiences it would be extremely difficult ot maintain a positive self concept.

Most social psychologists consider self concept to be an important moderator of behavior. The expectation of success with which an individual enters an endeavor influences his willingness to continue in it. If the individual has had a history of failure, he has a low expectation of success. He will often take advantage of opportunities to fail in the new situation thus confirming his self concept and resulting in the phenomenon referred to in Chapter II as a "self-fulfilling prophecy."

It was considered important to attempt to maximize the subjects' success experiences in the experimental programs. It was anticipated that this success would serve to counteract the failure expectations and thus would tend to keep the subjects in the program. The opinions of the diploma graduates reported in the previous section indicate that a supportive environment was created. The results discussed in this section suggest that this environment did lead to improvement in the attitudes towards self of the subjects who completed the diploma program.

In the analysis of the goals and values of both graduates and dropouts of the two programs a consistent pattern emerged. This pattern showed the groups had much the same goals in life, but that the graduates of the diploma program differed from the others in their belief in their personal ability to achieve their goals. In other words, they were less hindered by what has been labeled "powerlessness." These are feelings that one cannot influence the forces that control his life. Such feelings have been said to be characteristic of many disadvantaged families (Gladwin, 1961).

Apparently the subjects who were graduated from the diploma program were less prone to this syndrome. A problem of interpretation arises. With the data available, it cannot be determined whether the difference was caused by the experiences of the diploma graduates in the program or due to the characteristics of those subjects who completed the program. That is, was the difference due to the effects of the program on its subjects, or the selectivity of the program, or some combination of the two? To answer this question it would have been necessary to have interviewed the subjects both before and after the program. The test data are of this type and, therefore, statements about the effects of the program on test performance can be made. The interview data, however, are limited to after the program and causality can only be inferred.

In this section the data that indicate feelings of powerlessness are presented. The analysis in each case compares the diploma graduates to all other subjects who were interviewed. This comparison is used because of the different pattern of responses of the diploma graduates. The response of the other three groups--the diploma dropouts and the graduates and dropouts of the skill training program--were all quite similar. To conclude the section the reasons are presented on why it is thought that the differences reflect the effects of the diploma program more than they reflect its selectivity.

Goals

The graduates of the diploma program did not differ from the other subjects in their overall goals in life. The chief values of all of the subjects are material possessions and affiliative virtues. The idea of success consists of having a good paying job, a car, and a home. But affiliative virtues, such as being a good spouse or parent and being able to get along well with people, are considered the most important things in life. When the question was phrased, however, in terms of what the subject personally wanted out of life achievement goals were mentioned more frequently than affiliative. Table 30 compares these two sets of responses. The diploma graduates, in response to both questions, put greater stress on individual achievement, but the differences were not significant.

Tables 31 and 32 reveal similar patterns. The graduates of the diploma program were more inclined to think that education beyond a high school diploma was necessary, and they were more likely to aspire to higher level jobs. Once again, however, these differences were not significant.

Expectations of Achieving Goals

A majority of the students pays at least lip service to the idea that anyone can reach his goals by his own efforts. Almost everyone said they thought that hard work and planning pay off. Two-thirds said that anyone who wanted to could graduate from high school or complete post-high school education. These answers indicate that the subjects have been exposed to the traditional American values. There is some evidence, however, that they question whether these values apply to them personally. Over 60 per cent, for example, have doubts about how much control they have over their future, and about half sometime feel that they are getting a "dirty deal" (the actual words used in the question) from life.

TABLE 30

Most Important Things in Life and Personal Life Goals of Program Subjects

	Program Subjects: Diploma Graduates		Program Subjects: All Others*
	%		%
Most Important Things in Life			
Family, affiliative values	65		59
Individual achievement	31		23
Hedonism, other	4		18
Total	100		100
Number	26		61
Chi Square		3.22	
Degrees of Freedom		2.	
Probability		.21	
What Do You Want Out of Life			
Family, affiliative values	32		37
Individual achievement	61		42
Hedonism, other	6		21
Total	99		100
Number	31		62
Chi Square		4.44	
Degrees of Freedom		2.	
Probability		.11	

* Includes dropouts from the diploma program and graduates and dropouts from the skill training program.

TABLE 31

Amount of Education That Program Subjects Consider Necessary

	Program Subjects	
	Diploma Graduates	All Others*
	%	%
High school diploma	36	55
More than diploma	64	45
Total	100	100
Number	22	60
Chi Square	2.24	
Degrees of Freedom	1.	
Probability	.13	

* Includes dropouts from the diploma program and graduates and dropouts from the skill training program.

TABLE 32

Level of Job Program Subjects Would Like to Obtain and Actually Expect to Obtain

	Program Subjects		
	Diploma Graduates		All Others*
	%		%
Like to Obtain			
Blue collar job	14		25
White collar job	86		75
Total	100		100
Number	28		59
Chi Square		1.38	
Degrees of Freedom		1.	
Probability		.25	
Expect to Obtain			
Blue collar job	19		31
White collar job	52		25
Don't know or no job	29		44
Total	100		100
Number	21		57
Chi Square		5.46	
Degrees of Freedom		2.	
Probability		.06	

* Includes dropouts from the diploma program and graduates and dropouts from the skill training program.

The graduates of the diploma program answered the questions reported above in much the same way as all the other subjects. On some other questions, however, the diploma graduates revealed more confidence in their ability to control their future. Table 32 showed that almost all the subjects would like to obtain white collar jobs, but more of the diploma graduates actually expected to obtain them.

Three other tables point up more sharply the greater confidence of the diploma graduates. Table 33 shows that they were more sure of their ability to make long-range plans. The diploma graduates were also more likely to enroll in another educational program if they had the chance, and they were more certain they would complete the program if they did enroll (Table 34). Finally, Table 35 shows that the diploma graduates were more likely to spend their free time in self-improvement activities which were oriented to some future usefulness.

TABLE 33

The Opinions of the Program Subjects on the Extent to Which One Should Plan for the Future

	Program Subjects	
	Diploma Graduates	All Others*
	%	%
Short term or none	20	51
Long range	80	49
Total	100	100
Number	15	53
Chi Square	4.54	
Degrees of Freedom	1.	
Probability	.02	

* Includes dropouts from the diploma program and graduates and dropouts from the skill training program.

TABLE 34

Attitudes of Program Subjects Towards Enrolling in Another Program and Their Expectations of Completing Such a Program

	Program Subjects	
	Graduates	Others*
	%	%
Attitude Towards Enrolling		
Has definite plans to enroll	19	0
Probably would	81	86
Probably would not	0	14
Total	100	100
Number	27	57
Chi Square	14.39	
Degrees of Freedom	2.	
Probability	< .01	
Expectations of Completion		
Would finish course if enrolled	93	63
Not sure would finish	7	37
Total	100	100
Number	14	46
Chi Square	4.54	
Degrees of Freedom	1.	
Probability	.02	

* Includes dropouts from the diploma program and graduates and dropouts from the skill training program.

TABLE 35

Favorite Free-Time Activity of Program Subjects

	Program Subjects	
	Diploma Graduates	All Others*
	%	%
Social (sports, dancing, etc.)	29	58
Self-improvement or reading	35	12
Non-social and non-educational	35	30
Total	99	100
Number	31	64
Chi Square	9.31	
Degrees of Freedom	2.	
Probability	< .01	

* Includes dropouts from the diploma program and graduates and dropouts from the skill training program.

From these results, there is reason to believe that the diploma graduates had more confidence in themselves. It appears that the diploma program was the more successful in fostering this confidence. However, it is uncertain whether this confidence was produced by the program or whether the subjects who graduated had this confidence before they entered the program. It may be that those subjects with belief in their ability to control their future completed the program while subjects who lacked this confidence dropped out.

Logically either explanation is acceptable. From other data available about the subjects and programs, it seems more likely that the diploma program did produce increases in self-confidence. First, the subjects assigned to the two experimental programs were drawn from the same population of dropouts and their family backgrounds were similar. Second, the test results indicate that, though the groups were comparable at the start of the study, the diploma graduates improved on most of the measures

while the other groups did not. The third and final reason is related to the attitudinal tone in the separate programs. The tone established in the diploma program was supportive and accepting of the student. This should have maximized the opportunities for enhancing self concept and self-confidence. The tone in the skill training program, for reasons to be discussed in Chapter VI, was not supportive. There was little that was conducive to producing increases in self-confidence.

Although the data are not conclusive, they do suggest that the diploma program produced some positive changes in the self concepts of those subjects who completed it. These changes appear to have been related to the subjects' attitude towards their ability to influence their future.

SUMMARY

It is relatively easy to state whether or not the programs were favorably regarded by their students. It is much more difficult to state whether or not the programs had any effect on the attitudes towards self of their students. Realizing all the hazards of this type of judgment, the data suggest that the more successful program, the diploma program, yielded increased self-confidence in those subjects who completed it.

The diploma graduates had succeeded in a major endeavor at which they had previously failed. They had succeeded in achieving the first major goal that our society sets for young people--the high school diploma. This accomplishment apparently caused the diploma graduates to have increased confidence in their ability to influence their own future. The personal change that sometimes occurred was best expressed by one graduate of the diploma program:

> Sometimes earlier it seemed a chore going to school, but then, on my own, I changed completely. I started learning. I started realizing I was getting something out of it. And I figured, 'Man, I'm going to get that diploma.' Now, if I reach this goal, maybe I can reach some more in life. When you keep stopping, stopping, stopping, you'll never get nowhere.

CHAPTER VI

THE ATTITUDINAL TONE OF THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS

The general objective of this study was to evaluate the effects of the attainment of the high school diploma on the subsequent employment experiences of young school dropouts. To receive a diploma the subjects had to attend a special school to acquire the required credits. To control for the effects of the education the subjects received, as distinct from the diploma itself, a second group of dropouts was given training in vocational skills. It was recognized that special efforts would have to be made to retain the students in these programs.

A review of previous studies of the characteristics of dropouts led to the conclusion that the students were often forced, in subtle but effective ways, to leave school. The investigators were convinced that, before attempting to teach the students, it was necessary to bring about certain attitudinal changes on the part of these students. It was impossible to measure all of these attitudes precisely but the most important ones seemed to involve attitudes towards oneself and attitudes towards school.

The teaching of subject matter, although important, was considered secondary to the fostering of a sense of personal worth and of values more appropriate to the larger society. It was thought that individuals who had faced failure and social rejection would not begin to work realistically toward goals within society until they could see themselves as acceptable members of society.

Methods of producing such changes are still more a matter of art than science. The method used in this study was to attempt to develop a non-threatening school atmosphere where the student would feel accepted. It was hoped that in such an environment the anxiety, fear of failure, and rejection which

formerly led to avoidance responses in the regular school setting would be overcome. Once these negative reactions were removed it was anticipated that more positive responses would replace them. It would then be possible to reinforce the more positive responses and to make them part of the individual's self-concept and value system.

The role of the reinforcing agents was assigned to the administrators, counselors, and teachers. The actual reinforcements were to include the personal acceptance and respect for the students as individuals, the assignment of tasks with high probability of successful completion, and personal recognition and praise for efforts to learn, to attend regularly, and to participate in class discussions, among other things.

Actions which often are cause for dismissal in a regular school, such as absenteeism and disrespect to teachers, were to be treated as symptoms rather than as problems in themselves. Strict rules regarding attendance or behavior were not to be set. Each case requiring special attention was to be handled on an individual basis.

Such was the general approach of the program. It was developed in discussion among the University personnel, consultants, and the staff actually responsible for the programs. It was an ideal that was not always met in practice. The differences in retention rates, attendance, and standardized test results document the relative success of the diploma program and the relative failure of the skill training program. These results reflect the differences in the attitudes of both the administrators and teachers in each of the programs. The administrator and most of the teachers in the diploma program were basically sympathetic towards the students. The administrator and most of the teachers in the skill training program were not. These attitudinal differences were reflected in a variety of ways that were communicated to the students. The students' response, in turn, was quite understandable: where they felt accepted, they participated; where they felt rejected, they withdrew.

This chapter discusses the role of three of the agents who influenced the attitudinal climate, either favorable or unfavorable, in which the programs operated. These three agents were the administration, the counselors, and the University. The most important agents, the teachers, are not discussed here. Their role was so important that a separate chapter is devoted to it.

formerly led to avoidance responses in the regular school setting would be overcome. Once these negative reactions were removed it was anticipated that more positive responses would replace them. It would then be possible to reinforce the more positive responses and to make them part of the individual's self-concept and value system.

The role of the reinforcing agents was assigned to the administrators, counselors, and teachers. The actual reinforcements were to include the personal acceptance and respect for the students as individuals, the assignment of tasks with high probability of successful completion, and personal recognition and praise for efforts to learn, to attend regularly, and to participate in class discussions, among other things.

Actions which often are cause for dismissal in a regular school, such as absenteeism and disrespect to teachers, were to be treated as symptoms rather than as problems in themselves. Strict rules regarding attendance or behavior were not to be set. Each case requiring special attention was to be handled on an individual basis.

Such was the general approach of the program. It was developed in discussion among the University personnel, consultants, and the staff actually responsible for the programs. It was an ideal that was not always met in practice. The differences in retention rates, attendance, and standardized test results document the relative success of the diploma program and the relative failure of the skill training program. These results reflect the differences in the attitudes of both the administrators and teachers in each of the programs. The administrator and most of the teachers in the diploma program were basically sympathetic towards the students. The administrator and most of the teachers in the skill training program were not. These attitudinal differences were reflected in a variety of ways that were communicated to the students. The students' response, in turn, was quite understandable: where they felt accepted, they participated; where they felt rejected, they withdrew.

This chapter discusses the role of three of the agents who influenced the attitudinal climate, either favorable or unfavorable, in which the programs operated. These three agents were the administration, the counselors, and the University. The most important agents, the teachers, are not discussed here. Their role was so important that a separate chapter is devoted to it.

to counteract their anticipation of rejection for personal or academic reasons--a source of anxiety which is often well founded on past experience. Relating involves caring. It presupposes an empathy between student and teacher which enables the reticent and troubled youth to confront his instructor with his problems, aspirations, and failings because he knows that he will not be rejected or censored.

The success of some teachers in expressing this concern is evident in the question with which several students confronted a former teacher on the street: "Why haven't you come back to visit us? Don't you care about us anymore?" The most vital thing that the teacher can communicate is that he cares. Unless the student can experience the acceptance and support of his teachers he cannot overcome the anxiety and hardships imposed by returning to school in a society which has heretofore rejected him.

Two Teachers Compared

To give a more concrete sense of what the terminology "ability to relate" actually encompasses, this discussion presents approaches to the students by two teachers. One of whom, though he lacked formal training, was one of the most sensitive and insightful teachers in the program, and one of whom was least successful.

The successful instructor (in the skill training program) joined the faculty at one of the schools late in the year when attendance in one class had fallen off considerably. He successfully increased attendance and actually taught the students where previous instructors had failed because he realized that he had to reach the students before he could begin to stimulate them to accept discipline and to learn. His comments on the taped interviews express most eloquently in their simplicity his philosophy, his approach to the youths, and his success. For the first three nights that he taught he had only one student and every night after a couple of hours the boy would disappear until the instructor "got to him" by buying a new battery for his radio. After that the student stayed every night until class ended.

Buying a battery was not the only unorthodox means this teacher employed to reach his students. All of his approaches to the students were original for, as he comments, he never went to the administration with problems:

> I always handled them myself. I was worried at first that I couldn't get to the boys to work with me. I used to think about how I would work them around my way. A boy would come in at night and be a little short of cash and at the break the two of us would have a glass of juice from the machine and I'd pitch him a dime and say 'Go on down and get something and bring me back something.' And this way they got, maybe too personal and too friendly with me, but they seemed to do everything I asked them after that.

He soon discovered that the way to relate to these youths was to meet them on their own level. He observes:

> When I started the kids were so wound up I didn't know how to get to them. But when I took off my tie and became a worker with them things started to smooth out better.... I mentioned they would call me by my first name, being that I was in there as a tradesman going to teach them stuff that I knew. And we could talk man to man more. I felt that I could get more response out of the boys by coming to their level and letting them call me by my first name.
>
> Instead of coming to class with suit and tie I came to class like I came off the job, giving them the idea that they don't have to wear hip boots to do this job. And I'd get to do the work right with them--I'd lay down on the floor and work right with them....When I was working they'd lean on my shoulder and stuff like I was a 'big brother.' It didn't bother me. I encouraged it.
>
> When they were working and couldn't get it to work, instead of pushing them aside and getting in myself, I would more or less just lean down on them and point to the problem. I didn't want to have no barrier between them. I was trying to get them to ask me stuff. They got friendly at this. Kids would holler (teacher's first name) from one end of the hall to the other.

He felt a sincere committment to relate to these youths as a fellow worker and he projected this by every action in the classroom. In his willingness to meet them more than half-way he allowed them to use his own work tools. He simply told them that he needed the tools the next day for work. The students always carefully picked them up and put them away after class. None of his tools ever disappeared or were damaged. This attitude contrasts with that of many of the other technical instructors who were convinced that the students would frequently steal or destroy equipment and supplies.

This unorthodox and sensitive teacher was one of the most successful members of the staff because he perceived the vital need for an effective bond with his students and because of his willingness to confront them on their level, man to man, to treat them as co-workers. Once he took off his coat and tie and got down on the floor with them he discovered that these belligerent and school-spurning youths quickly identified with him as a big brother and would work for him earnestly and respectfully, for they could sense the affection, concern, and respect with which he regarded them.

In contrast to these efforts to reach the students was the condescending attitude of another instructor in the skill training program which made it impossible for him to relate to these students. This teacher, who taught for approximately half the year, was prejudiced against lower-class individuals, lacked any insight into their personalities, and stereotyped them as lazy, immature, and destructive. His answer to any problem was to kick the student out of the class, and preferably out of the program as well. In teaching he never attempted a personal approach, but rather "threw the book" at the students. Naturally he elicited a negative reaction, both personally and as a teacher, from the students. Throughout the interview he complained that these students were to blame, that they were uneducable, that they were too immature, that there was nothing that he as an individual could do about it.

His basic class prejudice may be inferred from comments which came out incidentally in the course of his commentary: for example, "You're dealing with a class of people you're always going to have." He continued in other sections of the interview to make the distinction of "these people" from other people, projecting his fatalistic conviction that they were different, distinct from other categories of people, and basically unchangeable either personally or academically. He attributes all the

problems in discipline and teaching to the students themselves, never considering the possibility that some of the responsibility rests with him. Throughout the discussion he stresses repeatedly the students immaturity, impatience, and inability to learn, without once mentioning the possibility that he might have contributed to the problem. It is obvious from the following quotes about the students and their reactions, that he had established no rapport with them whatsoever. They are always "these people" or "they" in contrast to the references of the successful teacher:

> If an appliance doesn't work it takes patience to fix it, patience which these people do not have. These people didn't want to be lectured to....Their attention span was very short. You had to keep them busy or they'd get into mischief. They're very immature.
>
> I felt that was one of the reasons they're in the position they are in now. When you'd give them a project they'd work in it a short while, but you'd have to remind them, show them, and tell them what to do. If you relaxed they'd find other ways to amuse themselves.... This was partly due to their lack of motivation, application, plus their God-given ability and unfortunately they didn't have much. They didn't inherit too much.
>
> A lot of people feel you can't spoon-feed students. They've got to have original desire to learn something themselves. This goes back to individual differences. Some of the students felt that they could get it by osmosis.

His method of solving discipline problems with the students was very simple. He would eject the troublemaker from the classroom. He would "take the student by the arm, escort him to the door, and send him down to the counselor to see if he'd give him a talking to." As he comments, "this would iron things out for a while, but it recurred."

His attitude towards the students is evident in his commentary on the ineffectiveness of counseling with these lower-class individuals. Basically he was convinced that these youth were hopelessly unmalleable. He expresses this sense of the

futility of dealing with such students in a more subtle way by expressing his general disapproval of counseling and his conviction that counseling does little good.

> These people have their habits. Their habits are well ingrained by the time we get them and you're not going to see a great change in their personality just by having a short interview.

His solution to problems with students is similar to that of a number of other unsuccessful teachers. Since the problems, in his mind, originate with the students themselves, the best solution is to screen carefully the students before allowing them into one program so that students with personal and academic difficulties are eliminated, and to drop any students from the program who cause problems. He was particularly assertive in suggesting that this was the best solution for one of his most difficult students. Needless to say, the purpose of the program was to assist as many of these students as possible and the automatic elimination of some from the program initially would distort the entire purpose of the program.

This teacher's attitude and approach, his inability to identify with the students, to understand them, to appreciate them, and to see their problems, affected the students. They reacted to his condescending and insensitive approach with hostility and rebellion. He found that he was constantly faced with discipline problems and a lack of interest in his teaching and the subject matter. Students attempted to get away with anything they could, inside and outside of class. He found that constantly:

> They were horsing around, acting like juveniles, like elementary students really. They were throwing things around. That's too dangerous in a shop situation, really.

Students refused to clean up after class and left the shop in a state of disorder. They loitered in the halls, were distracted by the girls in other classes, and during breaks took great delight in scooting down the halls on chairs with rollers, much to the distress of the teacher.

The contrasting results of the successful and unsuccessful teacher, it should be noted, came about while teaching the same material to many of the same students. The difference was in the

ability of the successful teacher to relate to the students and to show he was interested in them as individuals. The teacher who did not attempt to relate to them often communicated, in subtle ways, his basically negative attitude towards the students. He was unable to see beyond the facade of belligerence and toughness with which the dropout confronts a rejecting world. They, in turn, reacted defensively with unresponsive and often hostile behavior. Thus, the students fulfilled the teacher's expectations of delinquent behavior, immaturity, and poor ability, thus creating a vicious cycle of negative personal interaction. The successful teacher was able to break this cycle by perceiving and relating to each student as an individual and not as a stereotyped "dropout."

These two examples serve as the opposite poles of a continuum of ability to relate. The following discussion considers some components of this ability including the teacher's insight into the characteristics of the student, the student-oriented approach, the willingness to be self-critical, and the acceptance of the role of counselor and listener.

Insight

It is impossible to relate to an individual without developing some understanding of his needs and problems. Relating successfully is contingent upon insightfulness and sensitivity to other human beings. Any instructor working with dropouts or potential dropouts must be aware of their attitudes and reactions, and he must disengage himself from his middle-class expectations of behavior. Many of these students constantly cope with severe personal, financial, and family problems. The instructor should be sensitive to these difficulties and should confront the classroom problems which arise from them with toleration and understanding.

There are numerous specific problems of which any teacher must be aware. For example, the teacher often represents the threat of failure or of oppresive authority to the dropout, and the student reacts with fear and rebellion. Secondly, the teacher must be aware of the sense of inferiority and inadequacy with which many of these pupils must constantly cope. Third, the anxieties, the mental blocks, and the frustrations created by inability to perform the basic skills of reading, writing, or computing are frequently expressed in physical ways or by withdrawal. An awareness of the defense mechanisms by which the students cope with these problems is essential. Lastly, the teacher must be aware of the student's basic inability to identify

with middle-class values until he has been confronted with some success and acceptance in the middle-class scholastic environment.

To clarify what is meant by "insight" the comments of some of the most sensitive teachers concerning these four examples of difficulties inherent in any group of high school dropouts are presented.

Fear of failure is one of the most precarious problems with which a teacher must cope. A scolding for lack of knowledge or a test which seems too difficult, may drive the student once more out of the school building.

It was insight that permitted one teacher to accept the reticent, sullen, and quietly belligerent behavior of one of his most withdrawn students. He interpreted this stance as the youth's defense when confronted with the dreaded teacher who had always represented the basis for failure and rejection. The instructor was content with the comprehension of material apparent in the student's class notes and never challenged or chastised him.

This fear of failure is generated by the sense of scholastic inadequacy which is a part of the self-concept of the vast majority of these students. This problem is especially acute among the Negroes who, as one teacher comments, at first felt "pressured" not to participate in class because of their sense of incapability "not realizing that we all suffer from the same inadequacies."

Another teacher always confronted the youths in the shop with easy tasks and problems; otherwise he "lost them."

> They couldn't do it, got disgusted, and quit. Five years ago when they were younger would have been the time to catch them. They're big men now. They stand up and look at you eye to eye. They don't want you to know that they aren't capable of doing a certain program, a certain job.

He was aware of the humiliation and despair of these physically mature boys when they were forced to admit their inadequacies and failings and thus he made every effort to help them save face. He would feign ignorance of spelling of words that the student didn't know himself, and would help him find his errors as a co-worker rather than by pointing out his mistakes.

THE ROLE OF ADMINISTRATION

In planning the two programs it was decided to concentrate on the diploma program. There was concern that if the courses that were required in this program were similar to those the students had been subjected to in other schools, they would have been driven out of the program. As a result, considerable planning went into the content of the courses and the methods of instruction to be used. Besides these problems, many other arrangements, such as obtaining a suitable building and hiring an administrator and staff, had to be worked out.

It was assumed, at first that the skill training program would present fewer problems. It was also expected that the nature of instruction in a shop setting and the immediate applicability of the subject matter would give this program strong appeal. In addition, the skill training program was similar to other programs that had been conducted under the Manpower Development and Training Act. The agency that was to administer the program had had considerable experience with this type of training.

As the two programs progressed, it was discovered that the actual situation was just the reverse of expectations. The content of the courses was not nearly as important as the atmosphere in which the programs were conducted. And the atmosphere was determined to a considerable degree by the attitudes of the individuals who administered the separate programs.

The administration of each of these programs is described in detail. These descriptions are not intended to be personally critical or praiseworthy of either administrator. But since the administration fell on the opposite ends of the spectrum, it was thought desirable to describe their attitudes and how these affected their activities and their respective roles. These examples illustrate the kinds of situations that can arise in an educational or training program involving disadvantaged youth and how the attitudes of the administrators can affect their outcomes.

The Skill Training Program

The administrator of the skill training program was basically hostile to the aims of the program, the students, and the personnel from the University. The questions that naturally arise are why did he become involved in the study and why did the University become involved with him?

He probably became involved because the program gave him an opportunity to increase the use of some of his facilities or because his superior, to whom he showed great deference, was greatly concerned about school dropouts. The University became involved because the attitudes described were not immediately evident to University personnel. In initial discussion with the administrator it was evident that he was not sympathetic with the problems of the young people who were to be the subjects of the study. The degree of negative feeling he had towards them, however, was not at first appreciated. In the course of the study these were revealed. His attitude was that these were worthless human beings about whom it was foolish to be concerned. He considered them to be incapable of learning. On occasion he referred to them as "animals."

These attitudes influenced his behavior towards the program and its students. He gave the students a minimum program. There were frequent changes in teachers. Equipment was in short supply or completely missing. Some nights the data processing class practiced key punching on previously punched cards. Some nights no cards were available. The situation reached the point in the radio and appliance repair class that some of the teachers brought in their own tools and equipment.

The teachers were given little or no direction or supervision. Some reported, however, that they were informed when hired that they should not expect much from the students because they were too dumb to learn anything. The teachers were hired primarily because they were qualified in the particular skill areas. No consideration was given to whether or not they had the personal characteristics to work with these students. The turnover of teachers was not at regular intervals as in the diploma program but when they became discouraged with attempting to teach under the prevailing conditions.

The students were to have been provided with instruction in basic academic skills, but little was done. The University attempted to bring outside consultants into the program but this was not permitted. In fact, attempts to influence the orientation of the teachers and the operation of the program were taken as personal challenges by the administrator. Operating the program at a minimal level, contrary to the desires of the University personnel, was his way of proving that he held the power--Penn State was not going to tell him how to run his program.

It is very likely that if this person, the administrator, had personally supervised the program, if he had been in the school building every night and in personal contact with the teachers, counselors, and students, the program would not have run the full year. (There is also the possibility that his attitudes might have changed but that seems hardly likely.) His influence would have been so negative that all the students would have stopped coming. As it turned out, he kept as far from personal contact with the program as possible. Another individual was hired to act as direct supervisor.

The direct supervisor was not hostile towards the students. In his regular job he was exposed to the problems under which the students lived. He did not expect them to overcome all these problems without some help. He saw the program as more than skill training, and was willing to accept its re-socialization aspects. He was, of course, influenced by the general negative climate that the administrator created. In the supervisor's case this climate was reflected in a desire to be "more strict" with the students. He did not want them "to get away with anything." He thought the counselors, who were responsible to the University and not to the administrator, were too quick to take the students' side and always found excuses for their behavior.

Still the supervisor's attitudes were so different from those of the administrator that they could hardly be conceived to be on the same continuum. They reflected entirely different ways of looking at the students and their behavior. The administrator saw basically "bad" people. The supervisor saw people with a host of problems.

In the interviews conducted with the administrators and teachers of the two programs the supervisor of the skill training program did not complain about problems of working with the students. He complained about the lack of support he received. He used the phrase, "I felt like I was operating by remote control." He had no authority to spend money. Every request made to him for equipment, a field trip, etc. had to be passed on to the administrator whom he frequently could not contact. When the requests were finally transmitted, typically no action was taken.

On a day-to-day basis, the supervisor was hampered by the lack of an office, telephone, and clerical assistance. There was no efficient way to communicate with the other members of the staff. The supervisor had to transmit personally all messages even about minor things such as attendance. He stated,

"I had to do every little thing, myself." He was asked to inform University personnel when he was encountering unusual difficulty but he was uncomfortable about doing this. He looked upon it as "going over the heads of a lot of people" and, reflecting the way the administrator hampered the program, he "wasn't too sure how effective this would have been."

In light of these problems it is a wonder that the skill training program did continue for a full year. Part of the reason it did can be attributed to the supportive role of the counselors. This will be discussed at greater length in a separate section. More important than the counselors, however, was the desire of the students who continued, about one-quarter of the total enrolled, for something better than what they had in life. The chapter on the student interviews, Chapter V, reveals they were disappointed in the program, but it was still something more than they had at present and they continued in it.

The Diploma Program

In the diploma program the roles of supervisor and administrator were combined in one person. The Superintendent of the participating school district turned over all of the administrative details to the individual he appointed to run the program. The Superintendent maintained final control over a few decisions, but authorized the supervisor to make most other decisions, including budget matters.

The combined administration-supervisor position proved to be a much more workable arrangement. It was workable, from the University's viewpoint, because the supervisor was sympathetic with the goals of the program. He did not view the University's efforts to help him organize the program as an attempt to usurp some of his authority. He entered into and was influenced by discussions with the consultants provided by the University. In working with the teachers he employed a participative rather than authoritarian type of supervision. The teachers were thereby involved in the decision making process. This involvement led to greater personal commitment to the program, because the teachers had a voice in deciding how it would be run.

The teachers in the diploma program were, in most cases, chosen with some care. The supervisor wanted teachers who, in his opinion, had the personal characteristics to work with the students. After these teachers were hired, the supervisor provided the support needed during the period when the teachers adjusted to the special needs and characteristics of the students.

The success of this approach was amply documented in the interviews of the teachers. Most of the diploma teachers revealed an initial rejection of the students which was replaced by a personal concern and interest in them as individuals.

In all ways the administrators of the two programs were direct opposites with regard to interest and support of their respective programs. Much of the strengths and weaknesses of these programs can be traced to their behavior towards them. If programs designed to keep special populations are to succeed, they must have the support of their administrators. If the administrator is not sympathetic to the program, his attitude will influence the operation of the total program and most directly the morale and attitude of the staff members.

THE ROLE OF COUNSELORS

In planning this project heavy emphasis was placed on the need to support the student in the difficult adjustment back to school. Dropouts, by definition, had withdrawn or were expelled from a hostile environment. Another school, it was thought, might stimulate the same feelings for anxiety, frustration, and fear of rejection these subjects had experienced before. It was anticipated that the school being planned would gradually extinguish these feelings by presenting the stimuli of a learning situation without the negative personal interaction. It was considered necessary to bring the subjects to a situation in which they expose themselves for a sufficient period of time for extinction of their negative reactions.

This process of transition was initially assigned to the counselors who were recommended because of their backgrounds and personal characteristics. They were selected because it was thought that they would be able to work with the subjects. This proved to be an accurate assessment. Their role, however, evolved during the course of the study. Counselors were not the main supportive agents, as it was originally thought they would be, but they were essential in a number of different ways.

In the diploma program the supportive function was carried mainly by the teachers. They had the most contact with the students. It was the quality of their interaction with the students that determined the way the students perceived the program. The teachers were concerned and the students saw the program in that way.

In the skill training program, in general, the teachers were not concerned and the students realized this also. In this program the counselors had more of a supportive role. They supplied the personal concern that was missing among most of the teachers. They also provided a continuity which tended to offset the negative effects of the frequent changes of teachers.

The counselors in both programs had four other functions: (1) recruitment, (2) contact with the control group, (3) counseling and guidance, and (4) spokesmen for the viewpoint of the students.

Recruitment

The counselors' role in recruiting subjects for the experimental programs and for the control groups was crucial. For the experimental program they recruited students who were referred by other sources and also through individual follow-up. Recruiting for the control group was done mainly by individual contact. When subjects were recruited, the nature of the project was explained and participation was requested. Group counseling sessions were held in the interval before the schools started for those students who agreed to participate. These were designed to maintain the interest and motivation of the subjects. The counselors attempted to have the applicants talk about their concerns and expectations regarding their return to school.

Control Group Contact

When the programs were operating, the counselors turned much of their attention to recruiting subjects for the control group. These were selected from the same lists as the experimental subjects. As an inducement for participation, the prospects were offered vocational counseling which was conducted by the counselors. As an additional inducement, the subjects were paid for attending each meeting.

Counseling and Guidance

Much of the counseling and guidance conducted by the counselors differed from the traditional. There was more reliance on informal, ad hoc contact which frequently took place in the hallway, at the soft drink machine, etc. Often these talks were not of a problem-solving nature but simply chats about cars, part-time jobs, sports, and other similar topics. The

informality of the counselors' approach was at times objected to by the teachers and supervisors, but the counselors were convinced that informal contacts were the best way of building rapport with these students.

The more traditional contacts were in the form of group counseling and guidance sessions and individual tests interpretation and counseling. Guidance consisted of giving the participants information related to occupations, educational opportunities, how to apply for a job, etc. Counseling was defined as those situations where the student could discuss anything he wished.

Group guidance and counseling sessions were held weekly. In the guidance session the counselors made a prepared presentation on some aspect of personal or career adjustment. Audio-visual aids, typically films, were customarily used. The counseling sessions were largely nondirective. The counselor attempted to maintain a continuity in the discussion. Personal problems and various psychological processes of adolescents and adults as well as political problems were often discussed.

In the first half of the year individual counseling and guidance sessions were not scheduled. A student initiated a session only if he desired it. Some students were referred to the counselors for poor attendance, negative attitude, poor class work, etc. In the second half of the year, individual sessions were scheduled to interpret the tests the students had taken and to discuss their future plans. These sessions were also held with the control group subjects.

Spokesmen for the Viewpoint of the Student

The fourth function of the counselors was not always appreciated by other members of the staff. This function was to act as spokesmen for the point of view of the students. Carrying out this function occasionally brought the counselors into conflict with the teachers and supervisors. When a student violated one of the rules of the school, the counselors tended to take the side of the student, even if they personally agreed with the teachers or administrator. They did this to provide another perspective on the issue in question to the other staff members. Most of the other staff members, however, were not familiar with this aspect of counseling and interpreted the counselors' actions as "coddling" or "finding excuses" for the student.

The counselors' advocacy of the viewpoint of the students together with their informal contacts with them led to some antagonism between the counselors and teachers. The teachers, perhaps with some justification, thought that they could chat with the students and lead group counseling sessions just as effectively as the counselors. Because the counselors consistently took the students' position, some of the teachers interpreted this to mean the counselors were "against" them.

The antagonism between the counselors and other staff members was never effectively counteracted. The teachers regarded the counselors as loafing. The counselors saw their major contribution as providing a tone of caring about the students.

More contact between the teachers and counselors should have been provided to remove some of this friction. Due to the nature of the programs, when teachers were not teaching, they were rarely in the building. There was limited opportunity for the teachers and counselors to get together informally. There was also little chance for the teachers to meet with the counselors to discuss special problems they were having with students. More time for both of these kinds of meetings should probably have been provided.

The counselors should have probably taken more initiative in explaining their function to the teachers and in offering to discuss problems with them. Because of the nature of the schools from which the teachers came, they were not acquainted with what an effective counselor actually does. These teachers saw counseling as something set apart from the "real business" of the school. The counselors played an integral role in the programs but in some ways failed to communicate the purpose of this role to the other staff members.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

While the University staff was responsible for the overall organization and direction of the project, the final control over the actual content and operation of the skill training and diploma programs was held by the participating school districts. The University staff was, however, able, with differing degrees of success, to influence the operations of the programs.

The influence of the University staff was most pronounced in the diploma program. As was noted in the section on administration, the supervisor of the diploma program was sympathetic with the goals of the project. He willingly entered into discussion with University personnel and consultants. Out of these discussions the underlying supportive approach of the project was developed and ways of implementing this approach were planned.

It is unlikely that this approach would have been followed if the University personnel had turned over all responsibility for the conduct of the program to the school district. Nor is it likely that there would have been as great a stress on non-traditional methods of teaching. There was reduced reliance on textbooks, recitations, and tests. There was greater emphasis on the active involvement of the students, on finding matters of interest to their personal lives. There were attempts to coordinate the separate courses. In one quarter, for example, the teachers of literature, English, and speech worked with a consultant, provided by the University, to coordinate their offerings. In another quarter, reading was taught as part of the study of problems of democracy. The content of problems of democracy was organized into domestic problems, international problems, and the nature of society. Each of these areas was taught by a separate teacher who coordinated his content with that being taught by the other two teachers.

The University helped to obtain permission for some of these innovations from the superintendent of the participating local school district and from the state office of public instruction.

These innovations were not revolutionary but they were definitely an improvement over the approaches used in most of the regular schools in the area where the study was conducted. They were not, however, the best that could have been devised. The purpose of the study was not to design a model school. The main purpose was to test the labor market importance of a high school diploma. To make this evaluation it was necessary that the school not push the students out of school, but it was not expected that this school would overcome all their academic and personal difficulties.

All in all, though, the personnel associated with the project considered the diploma program to be a relative success.

Other data tended to confirm this impression. The University staff was unable to develop a similar approach in the skill training program. As was described in the previous section, the administrator of this program blocked most of the University's attempts. The University was able, however, to prevent arbitrary expulsion of the students. It also provided two guidance counselors who were committed to the goals of the project, and were, to some degree, able to counteract the negativism of the administration. In addition, the University gave the skill training students the opportunity to prepare for and take the general equivalency examination for a high school diploma.

The inability to establish a supportive environment in the skill training program represented one of the major limitations of the project. It seems likely that if such an atmosphere had been established, the skill training program would have been the more successful, in terms of attendance and student reactions. The contents of the courses were directly related to the future goals of the students. The emphasis was on manipulative rather than verbal skill, and the instruction emphasized practical applications. All of these features should have added to the appeal of these courses. Unfortunately, most of the teachers lacked the ingenuity to capitalize on the special features of their courses, and the University was prevented from providing consultants who could have helped them do so.

SUMMARY

The attitudinal tone of the diploma and skill training program appears to have been the major determinant of their relative success and failure. The tone of the diploma program was supportive and accepting. The tone of the skill training program was not.

The tone of the separate programs was greatly influenced by the attitudes of their administrators. The administrator of the skill training program was basically against the program. This attitude was communicated to the supervisor, counselors, and teachers. He provided a minimal program which lacked even adequate equipment and supplies, not to mention curriculum assistance for the teachers. The administrator of the diploma

program was just the opposite. He identified personally with the success of his program and put his full energy into running it the best way he could.

The counselors in both programs helped to establish the attitudinal mood. They were concerned about the students and, through both formal and informal contacts, did their best to show this concern. They acted as spokesmen for the students in discussions with other members of the staff and provided customary counseling and guidance services.

The contribution of the University personnel to the attitudinal mood of the program was innovative. The University personnel led the diploma program to try different ways of reaching the students. In the skill training program, however, the University personnel were not able to lead the teachers to appreciate the problems which the students were confronting or to influence them to make special efforts to help these students.

CHAPTER VII

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL TEACHERS

Introduction

The results of this study indicate that the general atmosphere as reflected in the attitudes of administration and teachers and in their approaches to the student is the most crucial determinant of the success of any program geared to the training of high school dropouts, or for that matter, of any group of people who have faced problems and failures in our society, and who may represent future dropouts.

The purpose of this chapter is to contrast the successful and the unsuccessful teachers in the program. A composite picture of the effective teacher and the less effective teacher was developed from taped interviews with the instructors in the program. Teachers were evaluated as either successful or unsuccessful on the basis of ratings of 25 categories concerning teacher attitudes, behavior, and effectiveness. For an explanation of these ratings see Appendix C. The unsuccessful category included teachers who fell into an "average" bracket because it appeared that the general effect of instructors who were only "average" was detrimental to a program which required a highly specialized approach to the type of student enrolled in the experimental program. As a result of the ratings eight teachers were categorized as successful and 14 were classed as unsuccessful, including eight ineffective and six average teachers.

In the following sections the characteristics of both the successful and the unsuccessful teachers are isolated and examined in an attempt at clarification and explication although it is obvious that these characteristics are basically inseparable, as they interact with each other. There appeared to be three crucial

aspects of the teacher's relationship with his students: (1) his ability to relate to them personally, (2) his ability to teach them, and (3) his attitude towards them.

(1) The major correlates of ability to relate to the student-oriented approach to teaching, insightfulness, personal flexibility, tendencies to critical self evaluation, and willingness to assume the role of a "listener" and even of counselor when necessary.

(2) The instructor's success as a teacher depends upon his flexibility and creativity in approaching the teaching situation, his personal dynamism, and his willingness to expend effort and energy beyond the minimum required.

(3) The attitudes which the teacher brings to the classroom are fostered and reinforced by his personal characteristics and his interaction with the students. His success in approaching the youth as a teacher and as a person is contingent upon the projection of a positive, accepting, and caring attitude. Any negative emotions on his part are inevitably communicated to the students in subtle but lethal forms. The examination of attitude will focus on the regard the teacher has for his students personally, socially, and academically.

As indicated, "reaching," teaching, and attitude are so closely interrelated that their separation is in a sense artificial and unrealistic. A teacher with a negative attitude cannot relate to his students and a teacher who cannot relate to his students, especially youths with personal problems and learning difficulties, cannot effectively teach them. For the present analysis, however, it is essential to attempt to isolate certain of these characteristics in order to understand them fully. Consequently, on the following pages, these qualities are examined in detail, granting that these constellations of variables constantly interact and influence each other and thus in actuality are inseparable.

In describing successful and unsuccessful teachers it is relatively easy to discuss in detail the characteristics of successful ones. Many excellent instructors manifest a majority of the personality traits discussed. However, the unsuccessful teacher is far more difficult to pin down, especially on the basis of taped interviews with the teachers themselves who naturally attempt to present themselves in the most favorable light possible. Consequently, drawing out the ineffective teachers and their characteristics was far more difficult. But, the evidence must come from the teachers themselves. Their lack of insight, flexibility,

and concern was most apparent in the comparison between their interactions with the students and with the successful teachers. The juxtaposition was indeed striking. Many teachers openly discussed superficial rapport with the students, inability to communicate, and outdated, non-stimulating teaching techniques simply because they lacked the insight and the awareness that these measures were faulty and that they had failed with the students. Others, in attempting to say what they believed the interviewer wanted to hear, made rigid, ignorant statements which indicated far more aptly the stagnant, prejudiced nature of their approach to life and to the students. Some of the negative attitudes drawn from the tapes are based on sketchy comments, or "slips" and thus are subject to inference, rather than solid documentation. No instructor sitting before a microphone is going to say that he dislikes Negroes, or that he considers lower-class individuals less worthy. Enough can be inferred, however, from occasional slips, and the general tone of the interviews, to substantiate the evidence in the section devoted to teacher attitudes.

No one teacher manifested all of the negative characteristics which will be discussed on the following pages, just as no one teacher possessed all of the good qualities. Many of the teachers classified as unsuccessful have one or more detrimental traits and a complex of varying degrees of other traits. Thus, the following picture of an unsuccessful teacher is a composite one drawn from the negative characteristics of all of the less successful teachers. It represents no one individual.

RELATING TO THE STUDENTS

In isolating the teacher's ability to relate to the students the focus is upon his success in developing a rapport with the students, talking with them, laughing with them, counseling them, reaching them on their own level. The art of reaching people, of eliciting an effective response from them, is perhaps synonymous with the ability to communicate an effective response to others--to communicate concern, interest, and affection. This requires an authentic response of one human being to other human beings. There can be nothing condescending or superficial in the communication. It must be genuine and unqualified. To prevent these students from dropping out again the teacher must be able to project his acceptance, concern, affection, and support

This same teacher also found that this sense of inadequacy predominated other aspects of the youths' lives, sometimes even interfering with learning. One of his younger and smaller students related to him and identified with him as a "big brother" and would do constructive and careful work for the instructor when he was alone in the room. When the other students were present, however, his sense of inadequacy in terms of the high valuation of manliness and the "sissy" nature of school stressed by his peer group, caused him to do little work, because he wanted to prove that he was strong. The instructor was aware of this and tried to handle the problem with understanding.

This sense of inadequacy generates a great deal of frustration and anxiety in the scholastic situation. As one of the instructors who concentrated on reading problems points out, quitting may have been a better alternative than staying in high school for many of these dropouts. By leaving school they relieved themselves of the anxiety and frustration resulting from the confrontation of senior high school reading materials.

Other teachers found that the teasing of other students could cause personal blocks which prevented the youths from performing to capacity. If students were paired to work together on a mechanical repair project, for example, the smarter boy would get angry and tell the less able, "You dumbhead, move out!" But, if the "dumbhead" worked by himself, he could work very hard for the teacher. One such youth even succeeded to his delight in tearing down a conventional machine and putting it back together so it would run.

The frustrations of these youth are frequently vented by physical activity, and a perceptive teacher must discriminate between aggressions which are directed towards others in a harmful way and those which are attempts to "let off steam." One teacher understood the frustration and need of a student to prove his manhood by pounding on machines with a hammer, and by talking and acting big. He handled these problems gently but firmly in an effort to teach the boy control.

An understanding of these coping behaviors which the students utilize in handling their emotions is essential to any successful teacher. The reading instructor saw in many of these students the same problems he confronts in his remedial reading classes in the elementary grades with the "culturally different" child. He saw the same defense mechanisms, the mannerisms, the rebellious and hostile facade, the anti-intellectual attitude towards schooling of the subculture, and even the same reading

problems. The difference frequently was only a matter of age, for many of these older students were coping with the same problems, attitudes, and reading difficulties which they had faced in the primary grades.

The realization that middle class values are basically foreign to this group is also important for the teacher. One of the Negro teachers who confronts many similar problems in the 95 per cent Negro school in which he regularly teaches pointed out that these students need to sense acceptance, affection, and concern before they can identify with the instructors and begin to incorporate some of the middle-class values and attitudes which are essential to functioning in society. These students have failed before in the society and they need to find acceptance and success in the school before they can begin to aspire realistically to economic and social goals in everyday life. The students in this program were able to identify with their teachers, and to take on some of the responsibility for making the program a success because they realized that the teachers were faced with new situations and new problems just as they were and that they too were sometimes uncertain and groping at straws. Above all, they realized that the faculty was earnestly trying to reach them and to help them.

One of the basic problems in the dropout-teacher relationship is that basically both parties are confronting an individual from an alien subculture. The following comment from the teacher cited above captures aptly the scope of this problem.

> Most dropouts are from low economic backgrounds. Many educators don't live in these areas and lack understanding of these students. Before the teacher can do an effective job he must learn to understand them. They dropped out because they couldn't fit in a middle-class valued school. They don't know what you're talking about. Their standards of morality and their aspirations are totally different. They frankly tell you that they don't understand the teachers and vice versa. This school's (i.e., the experimental program) value system was closer to their need, was more sensitive to their feelings. We got closer to their system of values because we have less rigid requirements. Lack of discipline is a component of their daily living.

> Parents are concerned with functional things--clothes and food are the big problems. 'Future' to parents or children doesn't include college though they may pay lip-service to it. Among their peer groups and parents it is difficult to get food and clothes. They function at the so called 'lower levels.' Democracy doesn't mean anything. Their conept of freedom is 'I can do what I want to do.' Theory, philosophy, academics, don't reach them.

The above comment succinctly states the problem of the teacher confronted with the dropout or potential dropout. Insight into the non-middle-class world of the student is essential. Awareness of the fear and frustration with which they face academic work, and of the tremendous personal sense of inadequacy which haunts many of them, of their frequently immature defense mechanisms, and of their alien value system are vital tools for any teacher who wishes to reach these students.

In contrast to the comments of the sensitive teachers who had many ideas as to why the students in the program had been dropouts, the less successful teachers did not attempt to understand them. A typical interview with a teacher who lacked insight contained many superficial attitudes and answers to questions about the students, their motivations and problems. One teacher when asked what brought the students into the program comments:

> That I cannot understand, because I don't have the background for it. First, I heard they were on public assistance. Second, I heard the state unemployment service encouraged them, and third, some of the boys had girlfriends here and wanted to be with them.

The students naturally reacted negatively to teachers who were insensitive to their problems and who made no attempt to understand them. Such teachers commented on the unenthusiastic response of their classes and the need to do all the talking themselves. The sensitive teachers, who taught these same students, praised their interest and enthusiasm.

Another equally detrimental variety of insensitive teacher is the individual with an approach to life that includes archaic, pat attitudes towards people, their nature, their problems, and

how to deal with them as well as rigid and unchangeable approaches to students, to teaching, and to life in general. Such an individual functions this way not only in the classroom, but in all his personal interactions with people. He is incapable of modifying his behavior for he views his environment through a set of filters which provides neat answers for all questions. Such an instructor can have a very detrimental effect upon individuals with such an abundance of personal problems and concerns and with overwhelming learning problems which must be coped with in the classroom. He is incapable of interpreting or adjusting to the reality of the present moment. He automatically analyzes his environment in the same rigid patterns which he has always employed.

It is not difficult to detect this type of thinking and personal interacting from a taped interview with the subject. The following are comments of one such individual. Throughout the interview this instructor attempted to impress the interviewer with his broadminded acceptance of the students and his understanding of their problems. His personal rigidity was such, however, that what resulted was a statement of his failure that showed he lacked the sensitivity and awareness to realize the picture he portrayed of himself. Stereotyped statements, rigid thinking, and dichotomies of "black and white" extremes were typical of his commentary throughout the tape. In the following quote he seems to be attempting to win the approval of the interviewer by commenting that the dropouts are the better students, that the nondropouts are the "bad guys." He comments:

> Nine times out of ten they (dropouts) are not dummies. The real dumb kids will stick it out and not cause any trouble. The teachers will pass them. But the kid with spunk, who asks questions, causes trouble, makes some of the teachers burned up. Some teachers don't want to answer questions, but these are the kids you want to play along with, they're the ones who will amount to something, not the ones who sit in the corner. My best behaved students have turned into murderers, suicides, robbers. They're antagonistic to society, the loner types. But they're not leaving school though they're not worth a hoot outside.

The ludicrous nature of this extreme overstatement can be explained by a desire to please an interviewer whom this teacher perceived as a representative of Penn State-Research-Government,

etc. This individual, however, probably expected it to be accepted at face value. This expectation alone indicates the level of his interpersonal sensitivity and insight.

Typically the uninsightful teacher advocated methods of dealing with the students in the classroom and in discipline situations which were completely counter to the goals of the program. He was convinced that the techniques he used with regular high school students, which were probably equally ineffective, were most appropriate to this group of students. Generally, there were two specific methods of dealing with the students suggested by such teachers. A common solution for coping with discipline problems in their regular classes was to use physical punishment, or generally "rough up" the student. In the classroom, condescending pep talks, intended to bolster spirit and encourage performance, were typical of several instructors.

Teachers who advocate the physical intimidation of students generally have excellent rationalizations for doing so. One teacher who advocates giving the student "a good smack" now and then comments:

> Too often they have somebody soft and easy with them. They should be knocked around. You can tell them how important something is but it just doesn't register. But you can see them ten years later and they'll say 'why didn't you beat me up when I wanted to quit?'

The detrimental results of this approach were mentioned by successful teachers, particularly one who admitted that he had driven some students out of his regular high school through the use of physical punishment. Most of the instructors who said they used this type of punishment in their regular classes reported no need to do so with the students in the program. They said there were few occasions to do so, and the students, being older, "might not appreciate it."

Pep talks were also carefully avoided by the successful teachers because of their connotation of discrimination and condescension. Any effort to encourage the students was on a person to person basis. Successful teachers carefully cultivated a sense of worth and potential on the part of the students by treating them as people and as equals, rather than by talking to them as if they were younger or inferior to their instructors. One unsuccessful teacher proudly related his one technique for

reaching the students--a weekly half-hour pep talk. Aside from this activity he concentrated narrowly upon the subject matter. He was convinced that he helped to keep some of the students in school by this approach. He repeated, week after week, the same encouragement such as: "I see you are doing a little better each week. Don't give up. I know you'll have to be absent sometimes, but try to keep it up." He would also give them examples that illustrated the necessity for working for what one received in life.

In subtle, sensitive expression, many of these ideas were indeed beneficial to the students. However, these were not naive high school students. They were world-hardened people who had faced considerable hardship in their lives. This superficial attempt at communicating with the students may have salved the conscience of the teacher and made him feel that he had done his share with them. It if doubtful if it could have had any positive effect. At best, it might have been taken with sarcasm by these students, each of whom needed to be accepted as a person in his own right and respected and understood.

These pep talks reflect the unsuccessful teachers' tendency to treat these students as if they were of high school age. Many of the unsuccessful teachers advocated no discrimination between these students and their usual classes. They were unwilling to admit that these people required different treatment. They seemed unaware that these youth had confronted failure again and again in society, that they were older and more world-wise and that they considered themselves misfits. One teacher specifically recommended: "If you want students to buckle down you should treat them like regular high school students."

One of the basic premises of the successful teachers is that these students were not like secondary school pupils, that they must be treated as individuals, as adults, as people who have lived, have experienced, and were aware. One of the major reasons for the success of the diploma program was that it did not resemble the high school situation in which many of these students had been unable to function.

The unsuccessful teachers seemed unaware of the distinction between these students and regular high school students. They were unaware of the non-middle-class world of the student, of the bewilderment the youths faced when confronted with the values, attitudes, and behaviors taken for granted among the middle-class. They did not and could not sense the fears and frustrations which drove many of the students originally from the scholastic situation

and which continued to affect them in the new situation, frequently causing defensive, belligerent, or withdrawn behavior on the part of the students. They had no perception of the sense of personal inadequacy which caused the students to hide behind immature defense mechanism and overcompensatory swaggering behavior. The uninsightful teacher functioned only on the superficial level, never seeing the depth of problem and personality in the students, and thus, never coping with it or responding to it.

Student-Oriented Approach

One of the more successful teachers pointed out that the basic quality of a good teacher is that he is student-oriented. He defined a good teacher as one who is "pupil-centered rather than content-centered." Certainly this is an inherent quality of the "relating" teacher, for a content-oriented teacher would never concern himself with developing personal rapport. This simply means that the good teacher concentrates on the students and their problems, needs, and learning difficulties rather than on covering material or meeting academic standards. He tailors the subject matter to fit the needs of the students, aiming to instill the desire to learn and to provide the tools for the acquisition of further knowledge in the non-scholastic situation. Many of the truly successful teachers found that the presentation of subject matter itself was peripheral to the inculcation of a sense of personal worth, faith in ability to succeed, desire to learn, and certain other middle-class values which facilitate acceptance in our society.

The subject-oriented teachers on the other hand, focused their efforts on injecting academic knowledge into the students. High test scores, good recitation, and neat and organized work papers were the type of feedback which they found most satisfying. Many of the unsuccessful teachers could not derive even this satisfaction from their students, for they were unable to inspire or interest the students, or to enthuse them to work for them. The solution of the academically geared teachers when confronted with students with learning or discipline problems was to weed out those who could not meet certain standards of proficiency and behavior. The students who caused disturbances, were slow learners, or had other difficulties were not seen as people needing extra help, but as obstacles who made the teaching of subject matter more difficult. The key to success, which many unsuccessful teachers stressed as one of the main failings of the program, was to supply sufficient workbooks, suggested syllabuses and readymade tests. These instructors, in general, were unable to draw on their own resources and were thus convinced that such teaching materials were of primary importance.

Such teachers were far more concerned with the routine of the educational process--workbooks, recitation, tests, marks, etc.--than they were with helping the student to learn. They believed their job was to present the material. It was the students' job to learn it. They clung to these ideas despite numerous attempts to explain to them the special learning problems which were characteristic of these students. One instructor commented typically:

> This was a learning situation. We weren't there to pamper and coddle them.

Another asserted:

> You can't spoon feed these students. They've got to have the original desire to learn something themselves.

Since many of these students obviously did not have this desire, the subject-oriented teachers thought the solution was to eliminate them from the program. One teacher commented:

> They (his class) didn't have the basis to do this kind of work. The administrators should have given selection of students more thought.

Some instructors never bothered to approach their students individually. They automatically judged and labeled them at first glance and never attempted to re-evaluate the situation. For example,

> I gave up on one boy quickly because I felt he would drop out. I can spot the bad ones the first day. There's something about them that I can tell.

Teachers who perceived students in this way usually act towards them in a manner that causes their expectations to be fulfilled.[1]

---

[1]Since the writing of this chapter, this observation has been verified by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1966) who have demonstrated experimentally the effects of the expectations of teachers upon the academic achievement of their students. For a further discussion see Chapter II of this report.

The student-oriented teachers were aware of the tendency of their students to anticipate failure in their academic efforts. They, therefore, spent considerable time structuring their courses to provide success experiences. When testing the students, for example, they gave them the choice of "easy" or "hard" tests, made sure there were questions that everyone could answer, provided additional questions that could be answered for extra credit, and so on.

Instead of suggesting that the students be selected more carefully or dropped from the programs, the successful teachers felt a personal commitment to help each student to succeed. They considered this program to be a last chance for many of the students, and hence tried to the best of their ability to assist the students to acquire the attitudes and skills that society requires.

All of the successful teachers found that instilling these broader social and personal attitudes was far more important than cramming history, or arithmetic, or biology into the students' heads, or demanding rigid attendance and absolute grading systems. These teachers found themselves more frequently than not outside the realm of pure academics and in the area of life itself.

Critical Self Evaluation and Personal Flexibility

The most striking difference between the successful and unsuccessful teachers was the degree to which they were critical of their own shortcomings. The successful teachers admitted their initial negative reactions to the students. They told of the problems they encountered in attempting to interest and to motivate the students, and of the frequent sense of personal frustration they experienced. When discussing these problems, the successful teachers focused on the teaching process and the ways in which traditional education had failed these students. The unsuccessful teachers, however, were convinced that all of the problems stemmed from the characteristics of the students -- their lack of intelligence, poor academic skills, immaturity, negative attitudes, etc. These teachers rarely referred to any of their own personal deficiencies. Typically they used the same teaching methods they employed with their regular students. The ineffectiveness of these methods was attributed to the low ability of the students.

Most of our successful teachers evaluated themselves critically in the course of the program. In their willingness to look at themselves honestly, to admit their mistakes, and to

attribute their inability to reach the reticent or hostile youth to their own inadequacies, they were able to build the foundations for a flexible and creative approach to the students. Several recalled regretfully minor incidents when they reacted quickly and irrationally which they were determined not to repeat. One teacher grabbed a student who was chronically a petty grievance to him and pushed him by the coat collar against the blackboard in a moment of irritation. As he comments "I frightened the boy though I didn't really mean to. Well, maybe I did at first, but I was sorry that I had. Although I will say he did straighten out. He understood the language." Another, finding himself confronted with an irate, belligerent youth who was arguing over trivialities, "unfortunately" lost his temper and angrily labeled the student's comments as stupid and irrelevant in front of the class.

These teachers re-evaluated their own actions and relationships with their students every time that they personally reacted negatively to a situation, and thus they became more sensitive and accepting. Many of the instructors found themselves changing both personally and as teachers under the impact of contact with these students.

Many found grounds for severe criticism of their approach to the students and to their own teaching prior to the experience of participating in this program. One teacher admitted that in the past he had actually contributed to the problems which caused students to leave school. As he comments:

> In the regular high school I'm known as a disciplinarian as such. I'm just a big bad guy and those fellows who fall out of line I have a tendency to straighten out physically or otherwise--lose a tooth or have a discipline session after school. ...These students had always been a problem. I had never been able to reach them in any other way. 'Either you stay after school or I'll bend you over the desk I'll lay the wood to your gluteus until you've seen the light.' In some cases I've found that this only tends to make them even more stubborn, more resistant to change... I felt that I had failed a number of them, that I wasn't able to give them anything and old forms of discipline just were not satisfactory,

were not reaching them. The kids were just moving further away from the school itself and I may have been a factor in their actually leaving.

This same teacher comments that he had become quite narrow-minded and he is grateful for the personal upheavals which were precipitated by involvement in the experimental program. Now he relates, with satisfaction that his regular high school students tell him that he is "getting soft." Similarly, another teacher comments that though he probably will not lose his "sternness" in dealing with students in mass in the halls and cafeterias and assemblies, that "sternness" has been much softened in the classroom situation because of this experience with the dropout program.

Other staff members relate that they have become more insightful, less rigid, and more concerned with the students, especially the slow ones. As one teacher comments:

> This program has helped the teaching situation in the regular public schools. We were forced to adjust to situations here with which we were not familiar, situations which we were inclined to dismiss in the public school. Before, if you had a situation with a kid you would say 'well, that's it.' Now there is a change in attitude and you would say 'what caused it, and what did I do?' Personally I feel that I'm a better teacher for it.

Many teachers found themselves asking the question

> Are <u>they</u> incapable or are <u>we</u> incapable of reaching them?

Many found the answer rather disconcerting.

> I suddenly became very aware of my inadequacy. Suddenly down here [i.e., the experimental program] I'm aware that I'm teaching individual human beings. I'm frustrated with reading, and other things. There must be some way to reach them. I have become more human. I have been helped as much as anyone by this program.

> I haven't been a successful teacher--I know it--not in a textbook situation. When you talk to these kids they seem to take what you say more seriously. I just feel, maybe, I could have done more.

These are the comments of a teacher who, it was generally agreed, was among the best if not the best teacher in the program.

Several admit that they had gotten into a real rut as teachers in the regular public schools. Many have transferred some of their experimental techniques to the regular school situation. Discussion groups, small impersonal groups, individual instruction of slow students, laboratory work, and other more exciting experiences for the non-college-prep students have all been incorporated into the public school teaching of these dedicated men. All left the program with a strong sense of gain, both as persons and as teachers.

This tone of personal concern, of frankness, of a willingness to evaluate one's reactions and methods was lacking among the unsuccessful teachers. Instead of talking about teaching, they discussed the characteristics of the students. Instead of mentioning their own personal faults, they complained of inadequate texts and workbooks. Instead of describing how the program had affected their regular teaching, they reported that their approach was the same in both settings. Self-criticism rarely occurred during the interviews of the unsuccessful teachers.

Neither was there any mention by the unsuccessful teachers of the need to assume the role of concerned listener which is discussed in the next section. It was only the better teachers who perceived the need of the students to discuss their personal problems and it was only these teachers who had the type of relationships with their students that made such discussion possible. Consequently, the following section does not compare the successful and unsuccessful teachers. Instead it is concerned solely with comments of the successful teachers.

Counseling and Listening

The teacher who related successfully to the student usually found himself falling naturally into the role of sympathetic listener, and frequently of counselor. For these youth were seeking someone to talk to, someone who understood and accepted them. As one teacher who wished to continue this type of work pointed out

> I'm not a social worker, but there's a lot that can be done by just talking to these kids. I'm so doggone close to the kids. I told [the administrator] one time that I couldn't take too much of this because you get too wrapped-up [so] that you couldn't even teach.

Having someone who would listen, who was concerned and interested, was a vital aspect of the program. Many of these students had severe personal, family, and financial problems which, aside from any scholastic difficulties, frequently interfere with their attendance and their concentration. Many never had anyone on whom they could depend for support and guidance and many had also faced rejection because of their problems. As the students developed a rapport with their teachers they naturally turned to them to discuss their problems. Often students would just wander up to talk after class. All the better teachers agreed that the students needed a great deal of personalized attention and they attempted to cater to that need. Many teachers felt that they had more personal contacts with the students than did the guidance counselors themselves.

As one of the teachers points out, the counseling role of the instructors contributed greatly to the success of the entire program:

> I talked to at least half on a personal basis. There wasn't anything planned. It was just kind of a natural thing. I would be there and they would walk up and start talking. This doesn't happen in a regular school. You see, this is what I mean when I say that these kids were very eager; and I think they're eager because they have found some people who will listen to some of their problems and to what they have to say and in these cases we were listening and this meant a big thing to them.

Another instructor sees this need for the counselor-teacher as springing from the emotionally deprived environments from which many come. "These kids have no ear at home. They respond to the listening teacher. Teachers need to feel them out, and their problems."

Often the successful teacher took a counseling approach with students who were disrupting the classes. One teacher confronted a youth who was constantly moaning and groaning, reading the bulletin boards, talking and making other disturbances in class by calling him up at the end of the period and asking, "What the hell's the matter with you?" He found himself facing a shaking, livid youth who raved that he couldn't stomach the course and that he had a very bad temper. In an impromptu counseling session the instructor, unintimidated by his belligerence, successfully impressed upon the student the need for self-control and social conformity in a certain situation which the student applied in the classroom and hopefully generalized to other situations. "At the end of the session the student was much better. We understood each other. He didn't like school any better, but he understood that there should be a bit of control on the part of the individual."

Several other teachers approached students who were chronically late or who fell asleep in class with a concerned and non-critical tact only to discover that these students had serious problems which interferred with their schooling and which made their tenacity in the program truly remarkable. One teacher confronting a boy who was always late by inquiring "How come you're so tired each night?" The boy replied that his father was an alcoholic which made it necessary for the boy to support the entire family by holding a full-time job. He believed, despite his severe personal and financial problems, that a diploma would considerably ameliorate his difficulties. With his immediate problems the teacher at first couldn't "get through" to him. But he found that, by being willing to listen to his student, he quickly became quite willing to divulge information, to talk things over, to make this a thrashing ground for his problems.

Another teacher relates an incident with a student who was self-conscious because he came to school directly from work and always had grease under his nails. He approached the teacher one evening to apologize for falling asleep in class. The teacher, realizing the physical drain and determination of this student, suggested that he go ahead and sleep in class when he was tired. Needless to say, these teachers, with their sympathetic, reasonable concern aided these students in overcoming the obstacles to attending school.

A good teacher need not necessarily assume the role of counselor. One of the most dynamic and successful young teachers reluctantly accepted the role of listener, but always avoided the role of counselor. "I don't believe in getting personally

involved with the students so I never pry or talk about it. I prefer to keep a distance." When approached by students who wished to discuss their problems this teacher would simply reply with relevant small talk, communicating to the student that the problem was understood and that the student had the teacher's sympathy, but that the teacher could do nothing about the problem.

In a program such as this it is evident that at least some of the teachers must be willing and able to assume the role of counselor and listener. These students had a strong need to express themselves and draw some of their burdens outside of themselves and present them to others who expressed interest and concern.

Conclusion

Hopefully, the excerpts from the teacher interviews on the preceding pages have portrayed what is meant by relating to the student. The intent was to present a composite picture of the successful teacher as he develops and cultivates a rapport with his pupils and to contrast this with the approach of the unsuccessful teacher. The components of the ability to relate were divided into insightfulness, student-oriented approach, self-evaluation and personal flexibility, and counseling and listening functions. This division while admitted somewhat artificial, was used for clarification. This categorized analysis was intended to facilitate the understanding of those aspects which are inherent in the ability to relate to school dropouts or potential school dropouts.

In general, the successful teachers exhibited all four aspects, while the unsuccessful teachers showed none of them. The successful teachers attempted to understand the characteristics of the students and the reasons for their attitudes and problems. They were concerned with the student and sought ways of helping him to learn and were less concerned with the presentation of material. They were willing to admit their personal faults, negative reactions, and the lack of an ability to reach the students in meaningful ways. They constantly tried to develop more successful ways of making their subject matter more interesting to the students. And, they reported talking to the students on a person to person basis. These types of behavior were never mentioned in the interviews with the unsuccessful teachers who revealed stereotyped attitudes concerning the nature of the students, who were not self-critical, who lacked flexibility in

their teaching methods (which were subject-oriented), and who never achieved a relationship in which the students approached them with a personal problem.

TEACHING THE STUDENTS

The topic of relating to the students has been presented before the discussion of the more immediate task of the instructor--teaching subject matter--because the analysis indicates that a teacher who focuses upon subject matter to the detriment of personal interactions cannot be successful. Admittedly the division between "reaching" and "teaching" the student is again somewhat artificial but necessary for the sake of clarity. The successful and unsuccessful teachers in the role of teacher per se will be examined in this section. Successful teaching involves three basic attributes aside from those discussed under the topic of relating to the student. These include: flexibility and creativity, personal dynamism, and willingness to exert effort.

Flexibility and Creativity

Flexibility and creativity are essential to success in teaching youth who have failed because of personal problems and learning difficulties. The rigid, academically-geared American education system tends to ignore and reject the maladjusted youth. Many of these dropouts associate the school with failure and rejection. Others who have grown up in an environment which places little value on education find the school dull, boring, and useless. To retain these students, teachers must develop fresh, exciting approaches to teaching techniques, including the selection and presentation of subject matter as well as flexibility and ingenuity in grading systems and testing.

Many of the conventions and regulations which bind secondary education in this society simply cannot be applied to a program for dropouts or potential dropouts. They require an unconventional, flexible approach. As one teacher points out,

> They need to be in a 'non-high school' situation. These kids are older, more aware of the bad things in life. Half the high school kids are still completely optimistic. These kids have been knocked

> around. They could never put up with the stupid rigamarole of public education.

Many teachers in attempting to maximize individual contact and attention for each student found themselves using a great deal of discussion and informal grouping. They tended to avoid straight rows of chairs and constant lecturing. They concentrated more on discussion, directed thinking, and the exchange of ideas because these students had a strong need to be heard and to have their opinions accepted.

One of the first discoveries of the teachers was that it was essential that they reconstruct their course format in order to present the students with materials of high personal relevance. Many found that academic abstractions were lost on these students, yet they took great interest in topics which they could identify with themselves or with those around them, even when the topics were very difficult and involved new concepts and ideas.

These students placed no value on abstract concepts, but they became excited and involved in subjects that they could apply to themselves and to their lives. One of the teachers who has a keen sense of the effects of home environment upon these youths commented that he had great success with topics which were close to them, such as the boy next door who was in Vietnam. Problems to them included such immediate considerations as the price of milk. Since most of their kin were among the ranks of workers, they had great interest in union-management problems and other problems which affected them.

> If you get involved in theory, in academic abstractions, you lose most of them in a hurry. Most of these young people come from non-academic environments. Academic aspirations are practically non-existent. They seem to have a practical attitude towards education: 'Will education get me a better job, a better home life?' They relate education specifically to living conditions.

One of the science teachers quickly discovered that the topics which were close to home were overwhelmingly the most successful. He wanted "to give them a sugar coated pill, without the bitter aftertaste." The students were particularly fascinated with subjects such as birth defects, genetics, and human biology. They were far more interested in facts than in the superstitions which many of them had always believed, for now <u>they knew</u>, now

they were aware, and now they could explain and predict. The instructor was amazed to discover how little most of the students knew about simple biology. They found it hard to realize that their organs were similar to those of frogs. Typing their own blood was the highlight of the term. Even the most needle-shy was so entranced that they participated. Students were absolutely amazed to discover that their blood was not special, that it was the same type as certain other members of the class. Those with rare blood types were incredulous and proud.

Students also delighted in bringing in their pet rabbits, guinea pigs, and fish to science class, much like elementary students. The learning experience was in the maintenance of the animals and the building of cages and terrariums.

All of the teachers who concentrated on topics which were close to the interests and experiences of the students were successful. The same general principle applied in the art class as well. The students, including the huskiest and the most hostile-looking young men, enthusiastically made useful items like ashtrays, rugs, and mosaic table tops, but had no use for "art for art's sake." They always had to sense that they were working towards a useful goal. When confronted with anything more abstract, such as sculpturing, they quickly lost interest.

It should not be inferred from the above discussion that what the teachers were actually doing was watering down course material to elementary levels so that the subject matter would be palatable, for this frequently was not the case. Bringing topics close to home does not imply simplifying the materials. For example, one teacher, when confronted with the Problems of Democracy book found the section on "Now you are a big man ready to face the world" so inapplicable to these life-hardened youth that he taught them basic sociology instead. He tried to present sociology as it applied to them. He used the caveman, and the institution of the family, to discuss why the male did not go over the hill to the next woman. He integrated these concepts with the students' contemporary relationships within society. The test results were amazing. They had completely mastered a new vocabulary and set of concepts because it was something that had meaning for themselves.

In all of these examples the crucial element was presenting the student with materials that he could relate closely to himself. Bringing abstractions down to the every day level made them exciting, interesting, and applicable. The students were learning things they could use and apply in daily life.

One serious problem with which the teachers had to cope was a fear of tests and grades. The successful teachers used various means of getting around this problem. One teacher, for example, graded his students on the basis of improvement rather than on an absolute basis. He used no letter grades during the term. Working on the theory that students would be more encouraged if they were confronted with their successes rather than their failures, he developed a progress profile for each student and approached them with "Have you improved?" and "Can you do better?" To alleviate test anxiety, he let them decide whether they would have "easy" or "hard" tests. This procedure amazed these students who had never before been given any choice. The instructor commented that, though the tests were certainly not easy by any standard, the label helped the students to overcome their blocks to examinations and even challenged them so that they felt compelled to answer even non-compulsory questions because they were so "easy." All of these creative approaches to teaching contributed to making school something the students wanted to come to rather than a drudgery or a source of anxiety.

Those teachers who were unsuccessful in relating to the students were equally unsuccessful in teaching them. Teaching dropouts requires sensitivity and perception as well as flexibility. The instructor must be able to alter his teaching techniques and approaches in terms of the subtle cues and messages he receives from his interactions with the students.

The unsuccessful teachers showed little evidence of creativity or flexibility in teaching. They tended to use the same lesson plan they had repeated with other students they had taught in the regular high school. They considered the most serious problem in the program to be the absence of a set text, standard tests, and lesson plans that they could follow without thought or effort. Some taught above the heads of the students, never revising their programs to the needs of the youth. Others underestimated the students' abilities and taught them nothing. The experiences with the program had little or no impact upon their regular teaching or upon them as people. Many commented that the students were very discouraged, showed no interest, or actually caused discipline problems in class.

One (it should be kept in mind that the same students were being taught) instructor in the diploma program taught with the same lesson plans he had used throughout his school career. Another teacher in the skill training program said that he too used the same outline for night classes which he used during the day, varying it only by going more slowly with these students. Another teacher

began teaching theory with little or no actual shop work. Later, when the administration pointed out that many students were dropping out of the program in discouragement, the instructor switched completely to practical work, which was equally confusing to the students.

One teacher who grossly underestimated the ability of the students was so disconcerted by how little the students knew that he decided that his primary goal was to teach them the major cities of the United States. He spent most of the course on these dry details and yet was very disappointed with the test results. This teacher had observed, as had many of the best teachers, that the students were interested in events that were recent and that were close to them. He had obtained the best response in class talking about the depression which the students had heard about from their parents. In spite of these observations, he was convinced that his prime accomplishment was his effort to teach major cities. He blamed the students for their poor test performance.

An instructor in skill training was also convinced of the basic inability of the students. He thought that the course of study suggested by the administration was too advanced for "these people" because it involved physical laws and mathematics with which the vast majority of the students could not cope. This particular teacher found that they would not work if he reviewed arithmetic or started talking about algebra. He also commented that the program had the best possible equipment, but that it was far too advanced for the students. In contrast, another teacher who taught these same students later commented that he used all the equipment available and needed more materials and equipment in order to continue teaching the students.

Another teacher complained that: "All I could do was lecture. There was little student participation." This teacher and others like him were convinced that the key to success in the program was to develop standard tests, workbooks and homework assignments for the students. In fact, he continually emphasized that such measures would be the key to success with the students. Another commented

> Down here I missed a good textbook. They wanted to borrow an old junky text from the high school. I had to practically make my own course. There weren't enough books. I used work sheets. It made extra work for me and may have looked cheap to them.

Actually this particular teacher gave the students the same worksheets he had used in his many years of teaching in regular school. He did no extra work, but found the lack of texts a good scapegoat for the academic problems of the students. His commentary is full of rationalizations such as "work sheets look cheap."

Several teachers found a good scapegoat in the unavailability of a course outline. Instead of constructing one themselves, they assumed the responsibility for an outline rested with the administration. As one commented,"Some nights I had to scratch to find enough for them to do. I could have used an outline."

The dearth of flexibility among these teachers is evident in the absence of change in teaching patterns or personal approach. Many of the best and most creative teachers found themselves confronted with great personal upheavals as well as dynamic changes in their regular teaching techniques. The program had little or no impact on the lives or teaching of less sensitive teachers. One explained: "This work didn't affect my regular teaching. It's on a different plane." Similarly another comment, "Nothing I taught here had any effect on my teaching regular classes. They were different subjects."

Personal Dynamism

Personal dynamism is an essential characteristic of any teacher who is attempting to get material across to students who basically lack interest in school.

All of the better teachers were very dynamic, interested, active people who communicated forcefully their enthusiasm and concern. Dynamism is perhaps best illustrated by the techniques one of the teachers utilized to arouse his class: talking loud and soft, writing with both hands, walking among and between them, up and around all the time, addressing them individually, making spelling errors, kicking the desk, knocking over books, and rolling the wastebasket down the aisle when the class seemed to be slipping into a coma.

The dynamism of another teacher is evident in the response that she received from the students in the classroom.

> I looked forward to coming here. For once I have run into a group that likes to do what I like to do. As a group they are as enthused about this kind of work as I am. It's fun!

In fact, this teacher felt that she would rather teach these students than regular school. She comments that she would be so tired after school that she wanted to go to sleep, but once she confronted these eager, excited students she would become so immersed in teaching that she would forget her fatigue.

Other teachers impressed the students by forcefully handling discipline problems, or by actively taking interest in personal difficulties. The personal dynamism of the teacher permeated every aspect of his role with the students. Many of the best teachers communicated a great deal through their energy and activity both in the academic and the personal sense.

The unsuccessful teachers, on the other hand, lacked personal dynamism. They were unable to motivate the students or to give them a sense of direction or purpose. They made no impact. They could not communicate the value of what was happening to these students. Thus, they frequently faced discouraged, frustrated students. One classroom incident aptly projects the sense of futility. The instructor comments, "I gave them a series of problems for calculation but they said 'what's the use of doing this. It's not going to do us any good anyway.'"

Another sympathetic and interested teacher, who was simply unable to communicate in a dynamic fashion, described the difficulties he faced in the classroom.

> At times I wasn't getting across to the students. Maybe it was my fault. Maybe it was the material...Some classes were bombs. I tried talking about song form in terms of the Beatles and Brubeck but they had no background. These kids never got out of the junior high rock and roll phase...I laid an egg the first class by assuming they knew something about music. Often I wondered if I was accomplishing anything. I wondered if I deserved my paycheck.

This instructor simply could not present the material in a dynamic, interesting fashion. He could not get across to the students even with materials with tremendous potential. He apparently tended to dampen the spirit of the class. One class period he attempted to have a dance class. The situation was dead--like an afternoon social, with the girls on one side and young men on the other--until he left the room. Then everyone started dancing and having a good time.

Effort and Involvement

Many of the successful teachers found themselves far more involved in the program both emotionally and physically than they had originally anticipated. Most of them contributed significantly more to the project than was required of them. Many became so involved with the students and their problems that the demands were a real drain on them physically and emotionally. They found themselves distracted from their regular work and daily living by constant examination of the students and their relationships with them. One of the most personally and emotionally involved teachers expressed his feelings as follows:

> I spent more time preparing for this program than for my regular school. It was both physical and mental. This program disturbed me even more, to the distraction of my regular program. There is no rut, no groove here... The normal situation is a whale of a lot easier and less taxing than this program. It's like ice cream as compared to beef--they're both good but one is harder to get down. The pressure here was the needs of the group itself. There could be no baloney here. Everything had to be concrete. These kids were two-time losers... I left the program with mixed emotions. I was happy to be rid of the burden, as concerned as we all were.... These kids are on their second and probably last chance. It's more important that the job be the best job.

Another teacher echoed the same sense of the burden of responsibility implicit in working with these students:

> I am more comfortable in the regular high school. I'm a god in a high school. Everything is nice and orderly. You work on a 'percentage get it' basis. Here I have to use even more personality to teach. I wanted to keep these kids, help them to be interested, and see them get the material. You can't goof off with these kids. You can fake it in high school; send the kids to the library for a week. Here you have to work all the time. Also, I'm comfortable

with grades there, but not here....This program has made me uncomfortable. I could do more in the high school.

All of these teachers sensed acutely, and often painfully, the desperate plight of these youth, and found themselves forced by their own conscience to do more than simply their best. As one teacher aptly expressed it: "I felt that whatever I could give them would be better than what they had." The successful teachers realized that they had to make school interesting and worthwhile to these students in order to prevent them from dropping out again and diminishing the possibility of a good future. "I wanted to make them want to come," said one teacher, "They were not a captive audience. It taxed the individual teachers to make them want to come."

All of the dedicated staff members discovered early that they had to discard their usual lesson plans and start from scratch, utilizing their ingenuity and spare time to plan lessons more appropriate to this group of people. Frequently, they had to play it by ear and be ready to adapt to new situations as they arose. Some commented that they spent hours in informal meetings with fellow teachers discussing the students and ways to reach them. One group of teachers in particular set up a coordinated curriculum with reading skills, science, literature, and social studies.

Obtaining equipment and materials in an experimental program on a limited budget is inevitably a problem. Many teachers found themselves searching out materials on their own time. English teachers collected paperbacks from the local bookstores; the art teacher carefully planned and purchased art supplies for two terms of work; teachers at the technical school, when confronted with limited appliances in the repair shop, recruited appliances from other students and faculty and also solicited old machinery from manufacturing companies; science teachers made their own laboratory tables and equipment such as terrariums so that the students could have access to more equipment than the budget allowed.

The concern, the interest, the awareness that this was the last chance for many of these youth spurred the good teacher into constant rumination and activity outside the classroom.

Most of the unsuccessful teachers basically lacked the interest and the concern with the program to make an effort beyond the minimum required. They did not become wrapped-up in the problems of the students, they did not begin calling them "their kids," as did the successful teachers. They were no closer to,

and often less in contact with, these students than those in their regular classes.

Many of the poorer teachers complained that this job was too difficult and that they preferred to work with their regular students for this reason. One teacher commented:

> My regular job suits me best, I don't think I'd want to be a full-time teacher for this type of group. It's too strenuous to have to get a new group in, start weeding them out. It's easier to teach a regular group. They have a better background.

This teacher not only finds the effort too great, but also lacks involvement to the degree that he is among the advocates of flunking out and selecting people carefully.

Some of these latter teachers alleviated part of the work load by getting the students to do their work for them, rationalizing, naturally, that this was far more beneficial to the students. One teacher had a real system worked out:

> I'd give them a job and see who did well. Then I'd let them help the other students. They liked this. The teacher coming around they wouldn't be as comfortable with me as with someone from their own class.

While this could be a useful technique, if carefully supervised, there was little evidence that the necessary supervision was provided.

Lack of effort was evident with several of the teachers in more concrete forms. As mentioned before, several used the same lesson plans they used with regular students. Another said that he gave the same test to these students at the end of the term that he gave to his high school students for two months of work.

Little effort implies a lack of involvement in the program and the students. This is borne out by the difference in comments between these instructors and the successful teachers. One such disinterested teacher commented "I know the students better at the regular school because I have them for a longer period of time." (Contrast this with the intensive concern and involvement of some of the other teachers.) This same attitude was expressed by

another teacher who reported that the staff seldom sat down to talk over problems because they did not have enough time, because "most of us were working two jobs and had to go home and get some sleep."

ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE STUDENTS

Regardless of his efforts to mask them, negative attitudes on the part of the teacher towards his students are inevitably projected in subtle but nonetheless lethal forms; particularly, because students as sensitive to rejection as these sensed any undercurrent of disapproval or of condescension. Naturally they will react as they have always reacted to rejection and disfavor with hostility and withdrawal. Consequently the attitude of the teacher is one of the most crucial variables which contributes to the success or failure of any program attempting to cope with people who have failed socially, personally, or academically in society. One of the inherent qualities of the successful teacher is a positive and frequently overwhelmingly accepting attitude towards the dropout. The attitudes of some of the most valuable teachers in the project are discussed in the following paragraphs.

During the first few weeks of the program the successful teacher developed an overwhelmingly positive attitude towards the students, even if his original impression was negative. Working with these youth, showing interest and concern, even if at first it was on a more superficial level, he quickly discovered that the students opened up eagerly and warmly when confronted with acceptance. The budding relationship between teacher and student gradually elicited the best in their respective personalities and they became better people for the experience.

Several teachers, confronting these students for the first time, were literally horrified. As one instructor vividly recounts, "The first night that I walked in I knew that I had made a mistake... My heart stopped, dropped, and I could see myself engaged in fisticuffs with 35 different boys all coming at me at once--belligerent Negroes, terrible tough whites, and snotty girls."

Another, who eventually taught through the complete program, initially was thoroughly frightened and convinced that neither he nor the program would last. He honestly reconstructs his middle-class revulsion in the following comment:

> After I left that meeting I wouldn't have given the program a year. They were surly. They didn't seem to be receptive at all. Some of them seemed rather unclean, dirty. The social attitude we have towards this type of person in regards to morals and 'what have you' is strong. You knew that many of those girls were out because of pregnancies--one, two, perhaps three times. You knew some of the people had scrapes with the law. I wouldn't have given them the distinction of being human beings. Their learning potential seemed to be nothing.

Yet these same two teachers became among the most ardent supporters of these students, their students. The teacher first quoted became keenly, desperately aware that this was their last chance, and he was determined to do everything he could for them. He felt that he was under tremendous emotional and physical pressure in the program because of the needs of the group. There could be no "baloney" here, for these kids were two-time losers. The other enthusiastically related that these kids were so eager--like elementary kids, always waving their hands--because they have found someone who would listen to them and to their problems.

Many teachers were impressed by the maturity, determination, personality and intellectual capacity of the students. The depth of their admiration and affection for these youth is evident in the degree to which they became involved with them. Many teachers discovered that they felt more concern for these students than for their regular high school students, and this concern helped them to be more sympathetic and sensitive. They realized that many of these students, faced rejection by family and society for pregnancy out of wedlock, for scholastic failure, or for delinquent actions, were discouraged, alienated, and lost. The teachers saw that after several years of failure the students were grasping at straws in their attempts to find a place in society. They were determined to give their best to these young people.

Many teachers related with great concern and amazement the overwhelming problems of students working full-time supporting their parents and family, and still managing to spend that extra four hours a day in school. Some were truly incredulous when commenting on the endurance of their students. They found that: "...these kids are more motivated than regular students; they're more worldly-wise. They are motivated by their own physical

situation and by the type of program." Many teachers were surprised to discover that the range of intelligence of these students encompassed both bright and slow students. They found their ability generally higher than they had anticipated.

Working and interacting with these people they discovered that they had admirable personal characteristics. As one teacher, who reflected the attitudes of all the successful teachers, commented, "These kids have tremendous problems and tremendous personalities. I was lucky to teach them. [They have] something above the ordinary--they stuck it out." One of the youngest instructors made an interesting comparison between these youth and her own companions:

> The maturity of the students is greater here. They have had some serious responsibilities forced upon them. They are serious. They are more in touch with reality than many of my young friends. Many have other people dependent on them. My own peers don't have these problems.

Teacher attitude in some cases was crucial to the handling of discipline problems in ways which did not alienate the student and possibly contribute to his withdrawal from school. For example, one boy, convinced that he was the only student in class who was ready to work, hoarded all the classroom supplies, and when forced to surrender them, threw his own work out the window. When instructed to retrieve it, he returned empty handed, claiming he could not find them. Although the teacher felt compelled to take some form of disciplinary action, and therefore asked the supervisor to talk to the youth, she handled the situation with understanding and, privately, with some amusement. She realized that he felt that he had been wronged. As she commented in the interview, "He is really a darling boy, but he's rambunctious. He's more childish than the others, and younger." Certainly an insensitive and heavy handed approach to this student could have been damaging. Parenthetically, this same teacher recalls that the first few days of class, when she first saw some of the "hoody" students, she wondered whether or not she would make it out through the alley to her car.

Perhaps the key to the positive attitude of these teachers is that they perceived these students not as stereotypes but as people, struggling with more problems and burdens than most, and they, as teachers, extended their hands to help. To them these students were special. They were hard workers, they were

enthusiastic, they were persevering and determined. Many of the students had ability; all of them had desire. These teachers admired the students and thus there was nothing condescending or derogatory in their approach. They saw each one as an individual and thus there was no room for stereotyping or prejudice. Through their sensitive, insightful efforts they brought out the best in these youth, and responded with the best in themselves.

In contrast to this acceptance of the students found among the successful teachers, the unsuccessful teachers tended to hold one or more of four basically negative attitudes all of which served to lower their regard for the students. The first of these attitudes was that the program was useless--a waste of time and money. The second was class or color prejudice. The third was heavily stereotyping people and putting them into pat categories. The fourth, and last, was a general condescension towards the students.

One such teacher made it amply clear in a less than subtle way at least three times during the interview that he considered the entire program a waste of money. His own comments are revealing:

> This program was an experimentation. You learn from it. Some people think the money is wasted and ill-spent. But a lot of it is wasted in industrial experiments, too, but you learn from it....Some teachers felt it was a waste of money. But I can't say that everyone felt this way. If I thought it was a complete waste of money I wouldn't come over here and talk to you. [Incidentally, the teachers were paid for the interview.]

Some teachers held this attitude towards the programs because they were convinced that the students could not be improved, or at least that the majority of them were beyond help. Because of this attitude some of them expected little of the students, an expectation which the youths naturally fulfilled. One instructor commented, "I think it was a general feeling of everyone out there, an undercurrent--'They're dropouts, don't expect too much from them.'" Needless to say this attitude severely handicapped students and teachers alike. Comments such as "The dead wood weeds itself out" or "The students should have been selected better, or screened" indicate a whole pattern of attitudes and approaches which were detrimental.

Prejudice was one of the least obvious of the negative attitudes expressed. Racial prejudice particularly was heavily disguised, since it is no longer popular to proclaim such attitudes. Class prejudice was more prevalent, particularly among those instructors who themselves had moved from lower-class background to a marginal position in middle-class society. These people tend to be irritated by those attitudes and behaviors they consider to be the cause of low status in society. Such teachers implied that it was through their own efforts they rose from lower-class backgrounds. If the dropouts would only work hard, pay attention, come to class regularly, etc., they too could rise.

The prejudiced expectations towards colored students are evident in the following comment of one teacher. "Some students were smarter than I thought. Some of them were colored people, too. I was afraid some of the colored people might be below. But some of the colored were better than some of the white." Pat phrases about colored people being equal, or the same, or better than the white students, or about treating the students the same regardless of color were typical of many of these teachers. Many of the phrases were a little too pat. Class prejudice was more evident, as is obvious in the following quote:

> You're dealing with a class of people you are always going to have. It's subject to environment and heredity, I suppose. It's partly a lack of motivation and application plus their God-given ability and unfortunately, they don't have much. They didn't inherit much.

Typically, the unsuccessful teachers stereotyped the students instantly, thus eliminating any chance of close interpersonal interaction and automatically distorting and hampering the attempt of the student to make an impression upon the teacher. Whereas the attitudes of the successful teachers were changed radically, among the poorer teachers, the stereotyped idea of a dropout was unchanged despite the experience of interacting with the students. This stereotype is evident in the comments of some of the more rigid teachers:

> They have common characteristics. I notice their common mode of dress--shirt tails hanging out, no socks, and now long hair, the Beatles' style. I've observed them at the pool halls. They're not making any

> effort to better themselves. They're living for today, period....Dropouts generally have low ability, and are lazy, but not hopeless.

The perfect example of stereotype of the most insidious, uninsightful, and dangerous variety comes from one instructor who was trying to impress the interviewer with his high opinion of, and interest in, the students. This passage has already been quoted but it warrants repeating:

> Nine times out of ten they [dropouts] are not dummies. The real dumb kids will stick it out and not cause any trouble. The teachers will pass them. But the kid with spunk, who asks questions, causes trouble, makes some of the teachers burned up. Some teachers don't want to answer questions but these are the kids you want to play along with, they're the ones who will amount to something, not the ones who sit in the corner. My best behaved students have turned into murderers, suicides, robbers. They're antagonistic to society, the loner types. But they're not leaving school though they're not worth a hoot outside.

Any instructor with such rigid, pigeon-hole answers to questions is a serious detriment to these students in the classroom. "Dumb kids," "dummies," and "nice kids" are constant words in his vocabulary. Other examples of stereotypes were the trite cliches which the interviewer received from some teachers. One, in attempting to explain his conception of the basic philosophy and outlook of the program said: "The idea that I'm here to help you be a better person...like a religious conversion. Jesus says 'you must be born again.'"

One of the most detrimental attitudes towards the self concept of the student is condescension. Several teachers developed the habit of giving little pep talks to students. One replied, when asked why the students stayed in the program: "I think I helped a little. I'd keep telling them to keep it up. I can see an improvement every week. You get nothing for nothing. I know you'll have to be absent sometimes, but try to keep it up. I tried to stimulate them to come by doing this about a half hour each week." Another teacher constantly lectured his colored students: "I would tell them not to have self-pity. [I told them.] I have placed colored people in jobs in the day program, but no

one's going to hand it to you." These constant patronizing pep talks, despite all good intentions, have a demoralizing effect on the students when they are repeated and repeated. The way to help these students is by more subtle methods. The pep talk approach assumes a childlike nature on the part of the students which was non-existent. They have seen and lived too much to respond to this type of exhortation.

Another teacher attempted to reach the student's level by constantly using Negro slang, tone quality, and accent when addressing them, no doubt in what he perceived as an effort to "come down to their level." He even did this for the interviewer's benefit, apparently feeling that it was clever. These students need models whom they can approach rather than individuals who approach them in a patronizing fashion.

As a rule, among the unsuccessful teachers, the general evaluation of the students was poor. They considered them to be immature, unmotivated and lazy, of inferior personality and ability. One teacher commented,

> The group wasn't initially too much different from school children of their age. These kids had a more varied experience, not necessarily the best kind of experience. Many had problems in their family, some had children. Many of them did not have husbands. Talking to them didn't seem different from high school students.

Another comments that his students were very immature: "Their attention span is very short. You had to keep them busy or they'd get into mischief. They are very immature. I felt that was one of the reasons they're there in the position they are now." These descriptions stand in sharp contrast to those given by the successful teachers.

The poorer instructors typically also saw the students as lacking in motivation and determination. They blamed their attitudes for any problem in the classroom. One teacher comments,

> There are at least five or six in each class who are sincere about going on in school and their attendance is good so they're bound to get ahead, but the others thought 'maybe I'll go two or three days a week and they'll hand me a diploma and I can always use that.'

This instructor had little awareness of the complex problems and attitudes that prevented so many of the students from coming to school and he attributed them to laziness. This teacher has the same attitude about another student who was trying to obtain a high school diploma so that he could go to the General Motors Mechanics School. This teacher felt that this student was trying to find the easy way to a high school diploma. What other ways were open to the youth is questionable. This teacher's general evaluation of the students was: "This group lacks the desire to learn. I have to motivate them and pick up the threads of learning from five or six years ago."

These poorer instructors also felt that the students were lacking in basic ability. As one teacher put it: "These students didn't have the basic ability or patience." Thus, many of these instructors, as mentioned previously, advocated weeding out the students so that those with the ability would remain. In general, they assumed that they were not capable of high quality work.

These basically negative attitudes seemed to stem from a lack of sensitivity to people and a lack of understanding of the factors that cause people to act as they do. Many teachers were at a loss to deal with anything as complex and challenging as these students. Many were frustrated by the intangible nature of success, and the lack of pat answers and easy results. One teacher exemplified these characteristics when he was asked how satisfied he was with what he had accomplished in the program:

> House painting is satisfying. You can stand back at the end of the day and see what you've done. You often wonder how much I accomplish and what influence I have at the end of the school year. You can't put your hand on the rewards. You can only say 'I hope I did a little.'

SUMMARY

This chapter attempted to describe the attributes of successful and unsuccessful teachers in the teaching of school dropouts who, for the most part, came from the disadvantaged segment of our society. These attributes include: (1) an ability on the part of the teacher to relate to students; (2) his ability to teach them; and (3) his attitude towards them.

It was noted that the ability to relate to the student included a student-oriented approach to teaching, insightfulness, personal flexibility, a tendency to initial self-evaluation, and a willingness to assume the role of a "listener" or of a counselor.

"Teaching success" depended on flexibility and creativity in approaching a teaching situation, personal dynamism, and a willingness to expend effort and energy beyond the minimum required--that is, a high level of professionalism.

Attitude requires a projection of a positive, accepting, and caring personality in a personal, social, and academic sense.

In general, the teachers in the skill training program did not exhibit these characteristics. The diploma program included both types of teachers.

These conclusions are consistent with those set forth in Chapter II, which explains what received theory tells us about dropouts. In effect, the experimental program can be looked upon as a re-affirmation of the knowledge described in Chapter II.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

To this point the various activities and results of the experimental programs have been presented in separate chapters. This chapter attempts to bring these various aspects together. There are two main sections in the chapter. The first section summarizes the approaches and results of the two experimental programs and presents the reasons why they were not equally successful. The second section presents certain recommendations which are designed to make schools more suitable agencies for the assistance of young people who come from poverty environments.

SUMMARY

Basic Assumptions and Approaches

In developing the experimental programs it was recognized, on the one hand, that the diploma program and the skill training program had to be typical of their type so that the results of the research could have realistic application. On the other hand, it was also recognized that since the programs being developed were for students who had dropped out of school, some changes would have to be made in existing philosophy, organization, and methodology or too many of the factors that operated to cause students to drop out the first time would remain to operate again and cause them to drop out of the experimental programs. The goal was to have a least fifty students in each program at the conclusion of the instructional period.

The basic assumption was made that students and teachers would not derive satisfaction from an instructional situation

and therefore, would not remain a part of it unless positive interpersonal relationships were developed. The term "interpersonal relationships" as used here is meant to represent the cumulative effects of all human interaction within any particular situation. In its report to the President in November 1966, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children found teacher-pupil relationships the single most significant factor in determining the success of summer programs for disadvantaged students. Their findings are summarized as follows:

> In distinguishing those classrooms that favorably impressed consultants from those that appeared poor, the explanatory factor most frequently observed was the difference in the quality of relationships--the rapport--between teacher and child. [Wilson, 1966, p. 3, emphasis in the original]

> Above all the factors in improving education... one was identified by observer after observer as a necessary ingredient in substantial change--and the greatest hurdle standing in the way of change. This is the quality of the relationship between the teacher and the child. In speaking of this ingredient, the observers were not alluding merely to the techniques of teaching, although that factor, too, got its share of attention. The differences between success and failure in projects they visited, the observers said again and again, pivoted on the subtle aspects of mutual understanding, commonness of purpose, and warm human contact between teacher and pupil which they described by the word 'rapport.' [Wilson, 1966, p. 15]

During the development of the high school diploma program, efforts were made to structure each instructional situation to create opportunities for the development of positive interactions. There were many links in the chain of interaction that began with the University and relationships between members of the project staff. These included: the project staff's relationships with the administrators of the program; the administrators' relationships with the teachers; the teachers' relationships with each other; the teachers' relationships with the students; and, finally, the students' relationships

with each other. Considering what is known concerning school rejection by the culturally deprived, it seems safe to assume that any failure in this vital chain of relationships could have resulted in the creation of conditions conducive to school rejection. Similar efforts were made in the skill training program, but because of the administrator these were not successful. This problem is discussed at greater length below in the subsection titled "The Importance of the Administration."

In the planning of the programs it was recognized that young persons who are the products of a poverty culture commonly have a weakness in verbal ability. Their environment seems to produce a different approach to learning. Verbal abstractions have little relevance and communication takes place through a greater variety of physical means. There is a need to manipulate objects, tools, and equipment. Sensory learning--seeing, hearing, feeling, tasting--is more compatible than learning through vicarious verbal experiences.

Unfortunately the culturally disadvantaged student is continually exposed to school experiences that require the use and development of his lesser abilities. The child is required to spend most of the time doing the things that he can do least well and is required to view problems and reach solutions through means which are least compatible to him. Under these conditions it is not difficult to understand why failure is common and why negative attitudes develop. It also is easy to understand why a teacher faced with certain required outcomes set by his superiors and also faced with students who constantly fail in their attempts to achieve these outcomes can become most negative toward the failing students. The reaction of both the teacher and students to their mutual frustration represents the nadir of student-teacher relationships. These experiences produce the negative attitudes and learning deficiencies which result years later in school withdrawal.

It was anticipated that the subjects recruited for this study would bring these problems back to school with them. The first order of priority was thus to overcome these negative attitudes. Once the student no longer regarded the teacher as an enemy, the process of overcoming educational deficiencies could begin.

The interview and test results that were reported in Chapters III, IV, and V indicated that the expectations on which the programs were based were well-founded. The subjects were

predominantly from poverty environments. There was considerable family instability with approximately one-third of the sample living on welfare. While most of the subjects reported they had had academic difficulties in school, the major reasons for leaving school involved discipline infractions.

The test results confirmed the interviews. The achievement tests showed the subjects' average performance to be at an elementary school or junior high school level--considerably below that of an average high school student. They performed at this level even though their mean tested IQ, both verbal and nonverbal, was well within normal limits. This discrepancy between ability and achievement indicates the degree to which the schools had failed to teach and these students had failed to learn in the traditional setting.

Part of the reason for this failure rests in the verbal demands of the schools interacting with the verbal deficiency of the students. While both the mean verbal and mean nonverbal IQs were within normal limits, the nonverbal IQ was significantly higher. This finding confirmed another expectation as to the characteristics of the subjects. Because of their verbal deficiencies, the emphasis on traditional lecture-textbook type courses was to be minimized and methods that stimulated student involvement were to be stressed.

Teaching methods that brought forth student participation served another purpose. They provided the teachers with opportunities to demonstrate their interest in and concern for the students. The successful teachers were able to communicate this interest and concern.

All the Teachers Were not Effective

The critical variables that separated the successful from the unsuccessful teachers were primarily attitudinal. The teachers who worked effectively with the students cared about them as individuals. They had insight into the personal characteristics and motivations of the students and were aware of the difficulties many of them were trying to overcome. This awareness caused the successful teachers to put extra effort into attempting to communicate with the students. The students responded to this obvious involvement on the part of the teachers. Instead of avoiding the learning situation--a response that they had learned in previous school settings--they responded to the teacher and found they could, indeed, learn.

Before learning could take place, however, the negative attitudes and anxieties aroused by the school situation had to be overcome. And these attitudes were very reasonable when considered in light of the regular school experiences of these dropouts. To them school had been an unpleasant experience where they had been constantly reminded that they were less important and less worthy than their more academically adept classmates.

The teachers who were aware of these attitudes were able to counteract them. They designed their courses so that the students could master the subject matter. They understood that the students' initial belligerence was a defense against expected frustration and rejection. Consequently, the students' latent hostility did not bring forth counter-hostility on the part of the teacher. The long cycle of mutual expectations of failure and rejection on the part of both the teachers and the students was finally broken. In other school settings these expectations had brought forth the kind of behavior that confirmed the expectations. The successful teachers were able to break the cycle by not acting towards the students as other teachers had in the past. They accepted and reacted to each student as an individual rather than as a "dummy" or "trouble maker."

In general the unsuccessful teachers were not able to accept the students as individuals. They responded to the stereotype of the dropout rather than to the separate students they taught. They ascribed the dropouts' difficulties to character defects which could be overcome by personal deligence. Since these teachers believed the problem lay with the nature of the student, it was the responsibility of the student to make any adjustments necessary for them to benefit from the program. But basically these teachers had little faith in the ability of the dropouts to make such adjustments. They believed that the dropouts' limited natural ability and lack of initiative prevented them from doing so.

These basically negative attitudes towards the students reduced the effectiveness of the teachers who held them. These teachers complained of obtaining little response from the students. The successful teachers, on the other hand, remarked about the enthusiasm of their students. The poorer teachers were skeptical of the worth of the program. The good teachers saw it as a "last chance" for students that the regular school had failed to serve. The poorer teachers taught these students in much the same way they taught their regular classes and learned little

from their participation in the program. The better teachers constantly attempted to find new ways to reach the students and found that their regular teaching was being affected.

In short, the successful teachers, so rated both by their supervisors and from their taped interviews, were concerned about the students and interested in the program. Their concern was communicated to the students. The students responded to this concern by actively cooperating with the teacher, and the learning experience was no longer a conflict with the teachers on one side and the students on the other. Instead, both were partners in a mutual venture.

The Two Programs Were not Equally Successful

The supportive atmosphere and the concern of the teachers were not established to the same degree in both of the programs. All data indicate the diploma program was the more successful in terms of these criteria. The retention rate was more than double (52 per cent in the diploma program to 23 per cent in the skill program). The test results showed the diploma graduates improved their reading and arithmetic skills while the skill training graduates did not. The measures of self-esteem showed the same differential pattern with some evidence that the self-esteem of the skill training graduates actually decreased during the program.

The interviews with the graduates also confirmed the greater success of the diploma program. The diploma graduates were more convinced of the future usefulness of the education they had received. When the subjects were asked what it was they liked about the program, one-fourth of the diploma graduates mentioned the general tone and administration. None of the skill training graduates volunteered this response.

Experiences in the diploma program, the most important of which was successfully completing it, appeared to have increased the self-confidence of the diploma graduates. A series of questions on future intentions and expectations revealed that those subjects who completed the diploma program were more convinced than any of the other subjects of their ability to control their own future. These kinds of changes, while very difficult to substantiate, were the overall goals of the experimental program.

Why Was the Diploma Program More Successful?

The Importance of the Administration. A weighing of all the available data points to the difference in the attitudinal tone or "atmosphere" of the two programs as one of the major reasons for the difference in their relative success. This difference in tone appeared to stem largely from the different attitudes of their administrators towards the value of the programs.

The school administrator is the bridge between society and the classroom. His attitudes towards culturally disadvantaged students and his interpretation of his responsibilities to them as communicated by him both to the community and to his teachers may significantly influence how his teachers teach. In summarizing the findings of their study of administrative relationships Guba and Bidwell (1957) clarify this process:

> To a considerable degree, then, the operation of an organization seems to be dependent upon the perceptions of the organization's administrators. Innovations in organizational procedure, changes in organizational structure and shifts in personnel, for example, all proceed largely from the administrator's evaluation of the effectiveness of these aspects of his organization. Insofar as such ratings are a function of his own frame of reference and modes of perception, then those factors contributing to the administrator's world-view, such as his structure of needs, his reference-group identifications, and his values, all have import for the ways in which he will delineate the organization's goals and structure its activities. [pp. 65-66]

Unfortunately, many of those in positions of educational leadership do not appear to understand the problems of students from backgrounds of poverty, or to accept, as part of their professional responsibility, the education of the public and its specific representatives to the educational needs of these students. Educational leadership tends to react; it does not act. As a result, public education remains largely irrelevant to the needs of the culturally deprived student.

By the time the disadvantaged student arrives in secondary school, he has reacted to the inappropriateness of his educational experiences and the evidence available indicates that he has developed a powerful set of negative attitudes towards almost everything associated with school. It may be assumed that if teachers and administrators identify strongly with the middle-class standards and values that perpetuate the existing educational establishment, they will reject the culturally disadvantaged student as being unworthy, incorrigible, or incompetent. The teacher who identifies more strongly with his culturally deprived students than with administrators, who possess predominantly negative attitudes towards the disadvantaged, is likely to be at constant odds with the school and its administration. Regardless of how energetically teachers apply their professional skills, they cannot bridge the gap between disadvantaged students and middle class expectations.

How can teachers feel positive towards students if, by their inability to function in the traditional school environment, the disadvantaged students cause the teachers to fail to achieve the expectations of the administration and of the community? The teacher of the disadvantaged, unless supported by an agency like the U.S. Office of Education, representing an authority viewed as higher than the local school district, is often caught, therefore, between student needs and administration demands. Teacher frustration and negativism are inevitable in this situation.

It would seem most appropriate that the first step in building an effective educational program for economically deprived students should be to secure the leadership of administrators who have positive attitudes toward these students and who are deeply concerned about their problems. These administrators must be willing and able to work toward significant changes in the level of understanding and in the attitudes of both the professional staff and the community. It must be recognized that, in order to provide appropriate educational experiences for disadvantaged students, it will be necessary to make basic changes in school organization and curriculum. It will be necessary to develop new standards to replace the externalized standards represented by traditional testing and grading practices and procedures. These traditional practices include: the expectation that students will reach certain levels of development at specific times; the view that students will spend most of their time listening, reading and writing; the idea that classrooms are quiet study areas where primarily sedentary activities take place. Where administrators fail to work toward

changes in these expectations and the value systems that underlie them, teachers of the disadvantaged are faced with doing the impossible.

During the development of the diploma program, many meetings with teachers were devoted to the exploration of various aspects of the organization of the traditional high school. The values that underlie these traditional procedures and practices were reexamined. Through these discussions, the teachers were able to understand that the University staff and the administration of the school understood the condition of the disadvantaged and desired to adjust the school program to their needs. Teachers developed the understanding that the administration had different expectations concerning the conduct of the educational program, the evaluation of student progress, student conduct, attendance, etc., than usually are encountered. Teachers freely reacted to each other's ideas and influenced them. One of the most difficult problems to overcome was the need, expressed by some of the teachers, to cling to the more middle class oriented methods of evaluation. They were afraid, at first, that students might not "earn" their diplomas. It is clear from the analysis of teacher attitudes that this concern did not persist.

The cumulative effect of the staff discussions that were held was to liberate teachers from the feelings of guilt, inadequacy, and failure that might have developed had they incorrectly judged administrative expectations and tried to approach their classes with their habitual attitudes and expectations. They were freed from the fear of disapproval that they might have experienced when they contemplated doing something new or different. In this way, a climate of acceptance was firmly established before teachers and students even met. Efforts were made to prevent those situations from developing which could compel teachers to reject students.

The situation was completely reversed in the skill training program. Soon after the program was in operation it became apparent that the administrator was not in sympathy with its aims. He held basically negative attitudes towards the students and, when interviewing prospective teachers, it was occasionally reported that he made these views known.

There is other evidence of these attitudes besides the personal experiences of those associated with the project. The report published by the agency that conducted the skill training

program provides an example. Thirty-three of the 81 pages in this report are devoted to reports by social workers on students who had poor attendance in the skill training program. The general tone of these reports is that the extensive personal and family problems of these students made it impossible for them to attend more regularly. To quote the summary of these reports:

> In summary, social service investigations of the attendance problems...revealed that all of these students were poor risks for such a project. The opportunity offered them was not really wanted or appreciated in most cases. A few had legitimate reasons for being absent and may return to school. The majority, however, had little or no interest in the program and had no particular goals. The families seen were the typical chronically dependent ones with long histories of such things as welfare existence; juvenile court records; unemployment; illegitimacy; and inadequate coping patterns. Children from these homes have been conditioned to self-defeating behavior and are poor risks in a rehabilitation program based only on an environmental plan they were expected to carry out in an independent way.

This summary undoubtably accurately portrays the attitude of the students when they were contacted. These contacts were made in June, July, and August 1966.[1] But by this time the program had been in operation from nine to eleven months. The initial interest which had led the students to enter it had long since disappeared.

---

[1]Since the visits of the social workers were conducted so late in the program, it appears that they were conducted not in an attempt to aid the students but merely to provide an explanation for the poor attendance and high attrition in the skill training program. The inclusion in the final report of the reports of the social workers on each student visited also appears to be an attempt to attribute the reason for the poor performance of the skill training program to the characteristics of its students.

The "self-defeating behavior" referred to in the quotation was amply stimulated by the attitudes of the teachers, the lack of equipment and supplies, and the repetitious nature of the instruction. The students found once again that what society promised and what it delivered were much at variance. The expectations of frustration and rejection, that initially the students were motivated enough to overcome, were only too well confirmed. Instead of the program providing the support necessary for continuation, it supplied the conditions that brought forth the students more accustomed behavior of failure and withdrawal.

It is true that many of the problems which these students manifested required more help than the project was able to provide. The diploma program, despite its more supportive atmosphere, had an attrition rate of 48 per cent. This is significantly less, however, than the 77 per cent attrition rate in the skill training program. The test results show that this difference cannot be attributed to differences in the characteristics of the students assigned to the two programs. The difference in the effectiveness of the two programs apparently was mainly the result of the differing attitudes of their administrators and the majority of their teachers towards the students.

Most of the remaining 48 pages in the final report of the skill training program represent further attempts to blame the students for the program's lack of success.

The report includes copies of warning letters sent to students with poor attendance, correspondence with a proprietor of a luncheonette concerning the behavior of students who waited there for the school bus, a letter complaining about the behavior of the students from a student who withdrew, and recommendations that are so at odds with the actual operation of the program as to be ludicrous. For example, it is stated: "It became apparent that courses of this nature require exceptionally well trained teachers with considerable flexibility, ingenuity, and motivation." It did not appear that any attempt was made to provide such teachers. Another recommendation was that, "Academic courses (reading, writing, math, etc.) be 'built-in' as part of the occupational training." The attempts of the University to introduce such instruction were specifically rejected by the administration. There are also 14 pages of pictures with captions that just do not fit with the negative tone of the rest of the report: "A delightful pause after solving a complex problem in wiring and trouble shooting," is an example.

The Importance of the Attitudes of the Teachers. Out of the eight teachers in both programs who were rated as successful, seven were from the diploma program. In the diploma program all the students were exposed to these teachers. Each evening of school was divided into four periods and each period was taught by a different teacher. The successful teachers were thus able to offset any negative effects of the less successful teachers. In the skill training program the arrangement was different. The students had the same teacher for four and one-half hours. In addition, the one successful teacher in this program taught for only about one-third of the year. He demonstrated that these students could be reached, but there were not enough teachers in this program with his abilities.

The qualities that made some of the teachers successful were not related to their technical competence. They were related to the way these teachers viewed the nature of people. The common sense interpretation of human behavior, which characterized the ineffective teachers, is not adequate for an understanding of the behavior of people whose life styles differ radically from one's own. If an individual is attempting to understand the behavior of someone who comes from a similar environment, evaluating the other person's behavior in terms of one's own can be instructive. But to apply one's own frame of reference to an individual from a different culture can be vastly misleading. This seems to have been one of the crucial problems which the unsuccessful teachers could not overcome.

The view which helps one to understand human behavior sees it as the result of specifiable antecedents which lead to predictable consequences. It recognizes the way in which an individual's environment conditions his total perception of the world. It realizes that people often act in response to motives of which they themselves are not totally aware. And, while it acknowledges that people must be held accountable for their actions, it takes the position that at the time an act is committed it is the only one possible.

This view, of course, is drawn from modern behavioral science. Many of the teachers in the diploma program held this view, and it added to their effectiveness. Not that it alone was the answer. Some teachers revealed in their interviews that they regarded behavior within this general framework and yet they were not effective. And, though none of the skill training teachers viewed behavior in this way, one, because of the nature of his own personality, was able to work effectively

with the students. But, other things equal, the teacher with this approach will be more effective than the teacher without it--especially when working with students from a different cultural milieu.

The ineffective teachers, in general, did not take the behavioral science view. Instead they tended to regard behavior as the result of the basic moral character of the individual. Behavior was viewed in terms of will power and personal determination rather than as the result of socialization to a particular set of cultural norms.

Why were there so many more effective teachers in the diploma program? A large part of the answer was due to the difference in the administration. The administrator of the diploma program selected teachers who he thought were capable of creating the proper mood in the classroom. He then worked with these teachers to help them create it.

There is no evidence the administrator of the skill training program made a similar effort. But even if he had made such an effort it would have been very difficult for him to obtain vocational teachers with the proper qualifications. State regulations require that the skilled trades be taught by journeymen and that the teachers of all vocational areas have some actual work experience. Many of these teachers have the minimum amount of college credits necessary for certification--those holding temporary certificates have less. College credits cannot insure that those who have acquired them hold scientifically valid conceptions of human nature. But they can insure exposure to some of the modern thinking in psychology, sociology, and education. If a teacher wishes to hold another view of human nature after such exposure, that is his choice. But the choice should be made with the knowledge that an alternative explanation is available. And when people are exposed to modern behavioral science, many accept it as more valid than the ideas they previously held.

Most of the ineffective teachers had another handicap which interacted with their limited understanding of human behavior. They came from socio-economic backgrounds where there was strong emphasis on upward occupational mobility. Families with this orientation stress the importance of hard work, conscientiousness, fulfilling responsibilities, postponing immediate gratification, planning for the future, etc. People who have internalized these values find the behavior of those from different backgrounds very irritating. The symptoms of poverty--unemployment, welfare, illegitimacy--are seen as a desire "to get something for nothing," as laziness, as self-indulgence. Poor people have a life style which the

upwardly mobile has been taught to fear worse than death itself. To the upwardly mobile, the fact that poor people live this way means that they must want to. If they did not want to, they would get a job, any job, and live a "decent" life.

It is true that most public school teachers, both vocational and nonvocational, come from the same type of family background. The difference in their attitudes appears to be related to the type of preparation they have received. The broad training which the college prepared teacher receives tends, in many cases, to counteract the effects of their background. Most of the successful teachers admitted in their interviews that at first they were repelled by the appearance and attitudes of the students. But since they were able to understand both the reasons for the students' behavior and their own reactions they were able to overcome their initial rejection of the students. The vocational teacher, particularly in the trade and industrial programs, who has not had the benefit of a broad preparation, enters the classroom with his class prejudices intact.

Ironically, it is vocational teachers who are being given the major responsibility for teaching poor people the way to earn a living. The emphasis in much recent legislation, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Economic Opportunity Act, is on teaching salable skills to people who presently have none. As this type of training has progressed, more and more attention has been directed to the "hard core" unemployed. These trainees are drawn from people living in a poverty culture. They exhibit all the traits which irritate and alienate their teachers. Their teachers, in turn, respond by rejecting the students, actually forcing them out of their classes, or else give up and do not attempt to teach. The student then either drops out and confirms his own self-image as a failure who should not try for a place in the larger society, or merely puts in time to qualify for the training allowance. If poor people are really to be helped something more is needed. That something is teachers who can reach students from a different culture because they can understand them. Methods of developing such teachers and more effective programs for the disadvantaged are discussed in the next section. Before that, however, two final observations relevant to the success of the diploma program are presented.

The Importance of the Diploma. It was apparent to the personnel associated with the project, and confirmed by the interviews of the graduates, that the anticipation of obtaining

a high school diploma had considerable incentive motivation. It represented to the students a tangible sign that they were going to achieve one of the major goals set for adolescents in our society. The possession of this certificate meant that they no longer would be classified as outcasts and failures. The students, of course, also hoped it would open doors to employment that had previously been closed. Beyond its practical value, however, was its psychological value. To these students it signified acceptance and approval by a previously rejecting society.

The opportunity to obtain skill training--at least of the type that was taught--apparently did not have the same incentive value. The students in the skill program were given the opportunity to prepare for and to take the General Educational Development test. Workbooks were provided and the students were allowed to work on these during part of their classes.[2] A special testing session was arranged for the participants in the study.

The reading problems of these students, however, made self-instruction quite difficult. The students tried, but the total program was not geared to prepare them for the test. They realistically concluded that their chances of learning enough to pass the test by their own effort were low. As a result of these factors, the GED diploma did not have the same motivating power.

The main ideas that this summary has attempted to present have been eloquently stated by John Holt in a review titled "Children in Prison." The following passage is quoted by permission of the New York Review (copyrighted December 21, 1967).

> ...the teachers...came from predominantly non-intellectual or even anti-intellectual lower-middle-class backgrounds, and they looked on education very much as another branch of the civil service. You didn't go into teaching because you loved learning or believed in its importance, because education meant anything to you or had done

---

[2] In the opinion of some of the personnel from the skill training program, these workbooks were the main reason that the students continued to attend during the summer months of 1966.

anything for you, or because there was anything you particularly wanted to teach, but because the schools were one place that a person without much in the way of ability, training, or connections could get in and, once in, could be sure, if he kept his nose clean and did what he was told, of staying in, until he retired with his pension. In other words, you went into education for the same reason that others went into the police or the Post Office or other parts of the civil service--because it was a safe, secure, and respectable way to move up a rung or two from the bottom of the socio-economic ladder.

Such people, going into teaching for such reasons, are likely, whatever their ethnic or religious backgrounds, to be poor teachers--and poorest of all for the children of our city slums. For one thing, they are generally uneasy about their own status, and consequently prone to overrate the importance of authority and control in the classroom, see challenges to their position and authority where none are meant, and to turn every personal difference or difficulty into such a challenge. For another--Edgar Z. Friedenberg has written often and well about this--they are likely to be bourgeois or commercial in their own values and attitudes, and thus both profoundly hostile to and threatened by the more aristocratic and anarchic values and attitudes of children, above all slum children. For another, they are likely to be neither very interested nor very interesting. They see education only as a way of "getting ahead," and since they have not got very far ahead, they are not very persuasive. To their unspoken or spoken advice, 'Study hard, and you can be like me,' their students answer silently (and not always silently),

> 'You creep, who wants to be like you?' Finally their recent escape from poverty tends to make them particularly contemptuous, fearful, and hostile toward those who are still poor--feelings they are not skillful enough to conceal even if they happen to wish to.

Despite the obvious depth of Holt's feelings he recognizes that the teachers are not solely at fault. The demands of teaching itself, even under favorable conditions; the rigidity and authoritarianism of most schools; the lack of freedom that teachers have experienced throughout their lives; all of these conditions combine to produce frustration and resentment which is directed at their students. And this frustration and resentment will continue as long as schools make demands upon teachers to bring both performance from their students that the students are incapable of producing under the prevailing conditions. In the next section some recommendations are made for changing these conditions.

DEVELOPING PROGRAMS AND TEACHERS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The theme developed throughout this report is that the traditional, middle-class oriented school cannot adequately serve youngsters from a poverty environment. On the basis of the results of the present study plus familiarity with the relevant literature, ways of changing schools to make them more responsive to the needs and characteristics of disadvantaged young people are discussed. These recommendations are grouped into the following topics: individualization of instruction, flexible grouping and scheduling, and teacher education.

Individualization of Instruction

Much has been written about the individualization of instruction. Unfortunately, the verbalizations have not been

reflected in action. Perhaps the concept is too difficult to translate into action but, on occasion, individualized programs have been developed. Perhaps there is a lack of real commitment. In many cases, lip service is given to the ideas. Many educators think individualization is a "good" or "nice" idea, but the changes that would result as individualization became a reality are not acceptable to them. It must be granted that much effort is required to overcome the inertia of habitual behavior.

Of course, individualization of instruction does not mean that each student is to be individually tutored. It does mean that necessary skills will be taught as they are needed and at the level of development of the student. It does mean that a significant portion of the content studied will be largely self-selected by the student. It does mean that the rate of movement through an activity or from activity to activity will be one that is comfortable for the student. Individualization of instruction seeks to protect the identity and integrity of each student by avoiding the compromising experiences of being required to participate in meaningless activities, or of having to keep up with a group that is moving faster than is comfortable, or of being expected to learn highly developed skills when their antecedent, less highly developed skills, have yet to be mastered. Individualization is particularly important for the culturally disadvantaged student. If the principles and technology of individualization were thoroughly implemented from the time the deprived child first entered school, it may be that much of the negativism that these students develop toward school and society could be avoided.

When instruction is individualized, the teacher plays quite a different role from the one he has played in traditional programs. Gone is the concept of the teacher as lecturer, as a talking book. Gone is the concept of the teacher as judge, as disciplinarian. The teacher no longer makes all the plans and all the decisions. To refuse students decision-making power is to tell them not to become involved. Deprivation of decision-making power adds to the very apathy and discontent that education seeks to overcome.

The teacher in an individualized program is primarily responsible for creating an environment full of rich and

stimulating opportunities to learn. Such opportunities may include provisions for traveling to visit points of interest, to observe an event or a process, to collect and record information, to come in direct contact with famous or influential individuals or groups, or to use special facilities. Equipment of many types also functions as a part of the environment and might include: typewriters, adding machines, calculators, printing devices of various sorts, tape recorders and phonographs, film strip viewers, various types of projectors, television equipment of all types, sewing, cooking and other homemaking equipment, tools of all kinds, art materials, microscopes, telescopes, and even books.

It must be emphasized that a program cannot be considered individualized unless much of the planning is shared by the teacher and students. Planning will be done with an individual student when only he is involved. Much group planning also will take place. It has been observed that disadvantaged students often know little about planning so that learning to plan may become a very significant activity. Planning not only involves planning activities but also developing codes of behavior and other social, interpersonal, concerns. Throughout his activities, the teacher of an individualized program must be expert at questioning. He must know how to draw out his students thinking and through his questions involve them so deeply in an idea that they, themselves, will begin to ask questions. Until students have formulated questions of great concern to them, they will not have sufficient motive power to work purposefully and independently.

For the culturally disadvantaged student, education must be an awakening. It is not nearly as important what is being studied as it is that the student is willingly and actively involved in studying something. In terms of the student's development, the process of learning about something is more significant than the facts or concepts that he develops. The process once learned can be applied over and over again in the continuous acquisition of knowledge. No legitimate question should be considered unworthy of study. The student's own "whys" are far more important than the stylized "why" of the textbook author. It is not surprising that a discussion of human blood in the integrated science class of the diploma program proved to be the most successful science experience. The students had to prove to themselves that such things as blood types exist. Even the most needle shy student was induced to prick himself for samples so that he could study his own blood. Students were

surprised to learn that a Negro and a white person both could have the same blood type. And the Negro students found this more difficult to believe than did the white students.

It is probably obvious at this point that the textbook is among the first victims of the change induced by individualization. Obviously, the mass oriented textbook with its logical presentation of the structure of an academic discipline is as out of place as a buggy on a super highway. Textbooks certainly may be included in the book collection but only when they have value as reference materials. As has already been indicated, all books and the reading activities associated with them should be greatly deemphasized when working with students from poverty backgrounds. This is not to say that reading skills should not be taught; they must be. This is not to say that books should be eliminated; students should have access to the finest, most interesting, and stimulating collection of books that it is possible to assemble. The important difference may be found in the chain of events.

The learning experience does not begin with a book, an unnatural place for the disadvantaged student to begin. The learning experience begins with a question or problem that may develop from experiences gained outside school or may develop from a discussion, demonstration, or other school originated experience. The question or problems may be explored in a number of ways with some form of experimentation at or near the top of the list of preferred types of exploration. Books and reading become part of this process when printed reference materials become the only practical way to answer a question or solve a problem. Indeed, it must be remembered that the nonverbal student, whether deprived or not, probably never will read for pleasure. Certainly, culturally disadvantaged individuals have not had experiences at home to cause them to value books and reading. For the disadvantaged student both natural and environmental factors, therefore, operate to make the suggestion of reading for pleasure a feminine, indeed, old-maidish cliche.

From this discussion, it should be clear that individualized instruction is not unguided, unplanned, or unstructured. It requires more and harder work on the part of the teacher than does traditional teaching and it presents a greater challenge to the teacher's professional competency. Individualized instruction is certainly not ever meant to represent a chaotic free-for-all. If ways are being sought to create situations where students

and teachers can aspire to continuously improving, productive and creative relationships, for the present this way of working may represent the best available solution.

Flexible Grouping and Scheduling

For individualized instruction to operate there must be flexible grouping and scheduling. The teacher must work closely with each student so that he can guide them into the most helpful group situations and assist him in planning the development of his ideas and projects. The teacher will keep careful records so that he can better follow the development of each student, spot areas of difficulty, and act effectively to help his students overcome their problems. As already described, the teacher must be prepared to listen to his students and to spend much time in discussions with both individuals and groups.

Because of the need for interaction with peers as well as with teachers, grouping is vitally important. On the other hand, when groups become too large, interaction may be inhibited or confused. Teachers and students cannot communicate with each other and relationships are stunted. Certainly, when students and teachers are from different social backgrounds, when students so desperately feel the need to have their individual identities recognized, when students feel negatively towards learning, school and teachers, it is extremely important that the number of pupils assigned to teachers be kept small enough so that sensitive and effective communication can take place. The argument that hiring extra teachers for the disadvantaged is too costly ignores consideration of what the costs may be if such teachers are not hired. Such bankrupt verbalizations and the do-nothing behavior that accompanies them are evidence of a total unawareness of the interrelationships between social phenomena and are professionally irresponsible.

Class size, of course, is not the only serious organizational problem encountered when developing programs for the disadvantaged. Inflexible grouping and rigid time schedules also represent artificial barriers to the development of relationships and may seriously interfere with communication. Rare is the secondary teacher who has not had a vital class discussion cut short by the ringing of a bell announcing the end of the period. The decision to ring the bell at that moment was made perhaps years before and with no possible knowledge of the conditions that would exist in that particular classroom on that particular day. This "logical" system of ordering time is a fine

example of the middle class oriented need to organize life into a neat and orderly outline not drawn from the rhythm and flow of life itself but imposed upon it.

The culturally deprived student with his rejection of formality, his needs for peer interaction and acceptance, perhaps his limited or underdeveloped interest patterns, his lack of self-confidence, and his lost curiosity is in particular need of opportunities to group and regroup as the situation requires. He may react quite negatively to some teacher or some groups of his peers and must have a way to move out of these situations. He may need to spend most of his time with one particular person with whom he can identify and to whom he can relate. He may need to spend time along or with a friend or two working with a particular piece of equipment, discussing an urgent or fascinating problem. Flexibility in grouping and in the use of time can permit opportunities for the culturally disadvantaged student to explore, to regain his lost curiosity, to overcome his apathy.

For many reasons, teachers also need flexibility of time and grouping. Probably the most significant reason is the need to be able to assign students to instructional experiences on the basis of actual student need for the experience and at the time that students are ready for such experiences. With a flexible organization of time, teachers can arrange to spend time with individual students. One of the most significant functions of the teacher may be to listen. Once the teacher has won the confidence of the culturally disadvantaged student, the teacher must be prepared to listen. Lack of a sympathetic and understanding listener is one of the most unfortunate deprivations of the disadvantaged student. He needs to talk, to verablize his feelings. It is through talk that language and ideas are developed and tested. It is from the reactions of those who hear us that we learn of our worth.

Flexibility of time and grouping also permit teachers freedom of movement. When the teacher is not always tied to a particular spot, he is freed to work with other teachers. Instructional planning and activities can be shared. The problems of individual students can be discussed. Ideas can be exchanged. Teachers who work in this way become more involved with their students. Sharing goals and working together towards them can make teaching much more exciting.

Because of the need imposed by the nature of the primary research to develop a diploma program not radically different

from high school general education programs now in existence, the diploma program followed a rather traditional high school curriculum. In the same sense, the skill training program may be considered typical of its type. While some may argue that success of the diploma program negates any need for further curriculum development, it must be noted that many students left this program as well as the skill training program. For them, these programs did not have sufficient value to outweigh the forces pulling them away. It certainly may be inferred that while research requirements dictated high school general education and skill training programs that were recognizably similar to those currently in existence, neither type of curriculum should be considered the ultimate in the arrangement of instructional experiences for disadvantaged students.

Teacher Education

It is to be hoped and could be assured through selection procedures that future teachers of the disadvantaged are humanistically oriented and have the capacity to empathize with others. It also would seem wise to make every effort to attract very able people to this difficult teaching assignment. The available evidence suggests that the more intelligent teacher is more likely to possess superior creative ability and, therefore, may be less conforming in his behavior. Because of this, he may be more likely to respond to different value systems and to be perceptive enough to detect the flaws in his inherited value system. It may be that students who demonstrate the capacity for active but constructive rebellion will prove the most satisfactory teachers of the disadvantaged. It is interesting to note that the teachers in the diploma program who appeared to be the most successful were, in their private lives, actively rebelling against one or more social forces in their own environments. Some had developed very negative feelings towards the prevailing educational establishment and this served as the bond of identification between them and their culturally deprived students. Both rejected school as they knew it before they joined the diploma program.

Given future teachers or teachers in-service who may come from upwardly mobile backgrounds but who also possess most of the desired traits or characteristics, it would seem that two areas of professional education are the most pertinent to preparation to teach the disadvantaged: First, knowledge of human development and behavior to help break down culturally inherited stereotypes and to provide a basis for understanding and identifying with students; and, second,

technological skills to create vital learning experiences. There is nothing new in these recommendations. Change will take place when the ways of attempting to provide these professional understandings and skills are reoriented away from middle class patterns and standards.

Much has been said about the values of practicum for future teachers. Student teaching is a well established fact in teacher education and other types of practicum are advocated. The critical issue is, again, that these experiences become ends in themselves. Desirable value changes do not take place regardless of the experiences that the individual has; they take place because of them. Only certain kinds of experiences can produce changes that will cause the teachers to be more accepting of the problems and behavior of the groups most limited socioeconomically. These experiences must be of the kind that will bring teachers and students together under circumstances where they must react to each other as individuals. For some teachers, the practicum experience might be to work with a very gifted teacher in a slum school; for another, it might be working in the children's ward of a city hospital. For another, it might be tutoring children of migrant workers or working in a day care center. Again, there are many possibilities. The fact is that teachers must have experience to provide a background powerful enough to generate questions worth studying. The quantity and type of experience should be decided on an individual basis through joint consultation between the future teacher and his teacher. Again, it may be argued that this could become a very expensive process. To fail to invest what is necessary to provide appropriate professional training for teachers, however, may lead to far greater expense as the problems of poverty become more severe and disruptive to our nation.

It certainly may be agreed that the education of teachers of the disadvantaged should include pertinent concepts from the social disciplines of psychology, anthropology, sociology, and economics. It does not follow, however, that teachers should automatically be required to take formal courses in these disciplines. Concepts should be developed as part of the process of seeking solutions to the student teacher's own questions and concerns or in the development of his plans and projects.

Too long have students of education gained the impression that few of their professors are willing to practice what they preach. It would seem logical to begin the education of teachers by placing them in a learning situation that is representative

of the type of situation they are to establish in their own schools. If teachers of the disadvantaged are to individualize instruction for their students, then instruction for teachers should also be individualized.

The value, or lack of value, of technical training for teachers has been the topic of much public debate. The fact remains that no profession functions without specific technical training. In a sense, the experiences already described are a part of the technical training for a career in education. But more refined and specialized training also is required. It may be granted that many of the skills of the superior teacher are developed on the job. It is extremely important, however, that the teacher new to the teaching of the disadvantaged possess the skills necessary to be able to experience at least limited success in his initial attempts. Without this success, the opportunity is created for the development of hostility toward students.

The concept of methodology, however, is archaic. Training teachers to teach reading or arithmetic or handwriting or grammar is as outdated and as superficial as the subjects themselves. The emphasis should be on the teaching skills, regardless of the subject. A compilation of these skills probably would include skills such as: the ability to question effectively, the ability to lead group discussions, organizational skills, etc. It is not necessary to identify the teaching skills that must be mastered but only to indicate the need to clarify these skills and to design around them the professional training of future and in-service teachers. Obviously, even students preparing to be teachers should not be required to study skills that they already have mastered.

Teachers who possess the basic personality characteristics that predispose them to sympathetic and humanitarian attitudes towards others, who have gained insights into the handicap of poverty, who have found a way to identify with the culturally disadvantaged, who have mastered essential teaching skills, and who also have creative leadership, flexible school organization, and an individualized curriculum, should be able to develop positive relationships with culturally disadvantaged students and through these relationships, contribute their share towards the relief of some of the problems of poverty.

REFERENCES

Allen, C.M. Combating the dropout problem. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1956.

Andrews, M.E. Reclaiming the dropouts. Minnesota Journal of Education, 1951, 31, 27.

Arbuckle, D.S. Counseling and dropouts: General considerations. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) Guidance and the high school dropout. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 176-192.

Arnholter, E.G. School persistence and personality factors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1956, 35, 107-109.

Ausubel, D.P. Effects of cultural deprivation on learning patterns. In S.W. Webster (Ed.) The disadvantaged learner. San Francisco: Chandler, 1966.

Ausubel, D.P., & Ausubel, P. Ego development among segregated Negro children. In A.H. Passow (Ed.) Education in depressed areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962. Pp. 109-141.

Barcus, N. The Detroit High School Leaver Project. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, October, 1964.

Bertrand, A. L. School attendance and attainment: Function and dysfunction of school and family social systems. Social Forces, 1962, 40, 228-233.

Blackwell, G. W., & Godwin, W.L. Social class and economic problems of adolescents. High School Journal, 1952, 35, 166-169.

Bloom, B.S., Davis, A., & Hess, R. Compensatory education for cultural deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.

Blough, T.B. A critical analysis of selected research literature on the problem of school dropouts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1956. No. 19,613.

Brav, S.C. Jewish family solidarity: Myth or fact? Vicksburg, Tennessee: Author, 1940.

Burchill, G. W., Jr. Educational needs of adult high school students as determined by tests of achievement. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1959. No. 59-6764.

Cantoni, L.J. Stay-ins get better jobs. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1955, 33, 531.

Cervantes, L.F. The dropout: Causes and cures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Chansky, N.M. Untapped good: The rehabilitation of school dropouts. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1966.

Clarke, A.D.B., & Clarke, A.M. How constant is the IQ? Lancet, 1953, 2, 877-880.

Cloward, R.A., & Ohlin, L.E. Delinquency and opportunity. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, A.H. Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Coleman, J.S. The adolescent subculture and academic achievement. American Sociological Review, 1960, 55, 337.

Coleman, J.S. The adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961.

Conant, J.B. Slums and suburbs. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Curry, R.L. The effect of socio-economic status on the scholastic achievement of sixth grade children. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 32, 46-49.

Dave, R.H. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables that are related to educational achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1963.

Davis, A. Social-class influences upon learning. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Della-Dora, D. The culturally disadvantaged: Educational implications of certain socio-cultural phenomena. Exceptional Children, 1962, 28, 467-472.

Dentler, R.A. Dropouts, automation, and the cities. Teachers College Record, 1964, 65, 475-483.

Deutsch, M. Minority group and class status as related to social and personality factors in scholastic achievement. Monograph No. 2, Society for Applied Anthropology, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1960.

Deutsch, M. The role of social class in language development and cognition. New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, 1964. (a)

Deutsch, M. Early social environment: Its influence on school adaptation. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) The school dropout. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 89-100. (b)

Deutsch, M., & Brown, B. Social influences in Negro-white intelligence differences. Journal of Social Issues, 1964, 20, 24-35.

Dillon, H.J. Early school leavers. New York: National Child Labor Committee, 1949.

Douvan, E. Social status and success strivings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 219-223.

Edgecomb, P. The poverty culture: A challenge to education. The Clearing House, 1967, 41, (April), 470.

Educational Policies Commission. Education and the disadvantaged American. Washington: National Education Association, 1962.

Educational Policies Commission. The education of teachers of the disadvantaged. NEA Journal, 1965, 54, (Sept.), 12-13.

Eells, K., Davis, A., Havighurst, R.J., Herrick, V.E., & Tyler, R.W. Intelligence and cultural differences. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Erikson, E.E. The concept of identity in race relations. Daedalus, 1966, 95 (1), 145-171.

Freedman, M.K. Part-time work experience and potential early school leavers. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 509-514.

Fulk, B.E., & Harrell, T.W. Negro-white army test scores and last school grade. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1952, 36, 34-35.

Fullmer, D. Working with parents; School counselor-parent-teacher interaction: A developing pattern. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) Guidance and the high school dropout. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 150-158.

Gill, L.J., & Spilka, B. Some non-intellectual correlates of academic achievement among Mexican-American secondary school students (juniors and seniors). Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, 144-149.

Gladwin, T. The anthropologist's view of poverty. Official proceedings, National Conference on Social Welfare. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Goodman, P. Compulsory mis-education. New York: Horizon Press, 1964.

Greene, B.I. Continuing education and the high school dropout. Adult Education, 1962, 12, 76-83.

Greene, B.I. Preventing student dropouts. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Groves, R.M. A national survey of vocational education programs for students with special needs. Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Undated.

Guba, E.G., & Bidwell, C.E. Administrative relationships. Chicago: The Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.

Guion, R.M. Personnel testing. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Haller, A.Q., & Butterworth, C.E. Peer influence on levels of occupational and educational aspiration. Social Forces, 1960, 38, 289-295.

Harlow, H.F. The formation of learning sets. Psychological Review, 1949, 56, 51-65.

Haubrich, V.F. Teachers for big city schools. In A.H. Passow (Ed.) Education in depressed areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. Pp. 243-261.

Hecker, S.E. Early school leavers in Kentucky. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1953.

Hermann, W.L., & Cottle, W.C. An inventory to identify high school dropouts. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1958, 6, 122-123.

Hollingshead, A.B. Elmtown's youth. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1949.

Hunt, J.M. Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Hunt, P.R. Job upgrading: Rehabilitation for the dropout. Phi Delta Kappan, 1959, 40, 219-220.

Jensen, A.R. Social class and verbal learning. In M. Deutsch & T. Pettigrew (Eds.) Social class, race, and psychological development. New York: Society for the Study of Psychological Issues, 1965.

John, V.P. The intellectual development of slum children: Some preliminary findings. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 813-822.

Kemp, B. The youth we haven't served. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Kitsch, D.E. Does retardation cause dropouts? California Journal of Elementary Education, 1952, 21, 25-29.

Knapp, D.L. Preparing teachers of disadvantaged youth: Emerging trends. Journal of Teacher Education, 1965, 16, (June), 188.

Kohler, M.C. Needed: Imagination to train youth for work. American Child, 1962, 44, 1-6.

Kornberg, L. Meaningful teachers of alienated children. In A.H. Passow (Ed.) Education in depressed areas. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. Pp. 262-277.

Krugman, M. The culturally deprived child in school. NEA Journal, 1961, 50, 22-23.

Larson, H.L. The five-school-project dropout study. Alberta Journal of Education Research, 1958, 4, 212-215.

Layton, W.K. Special services for dropouts and potential dropouts. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1953, 37, 72-76.

Lichter, S.O., Rapien, E.B., Seibert, F.M., & Sklansky, M.A. The dropouts: A treatment study of intellectually capable students who drop out of high school. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1962.

Los Angeles City School Districts. The dropout who returns to graduate from adult high school. Los Angeles: Author, Research Report No. 253, 1963.

Mack, A.R. A study of dropouts. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1954, 38, 49-51.

Maslow, A.H. Eupsychian management. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin-Dorsey, 1965.

McCandless, B. Environment and intelligence. American Journal of Mental Deficiencies, 1952, 56, 674-691.

McCollum, S.G. Summer institutes to stress special needs. American Vocational Journal, 1967, 42, (April), 47.

Merton, R.K. Social structure and anomie. In R.K. Merton (Ed.) Social theory and social structure. (Revised) New York: The Free Press, 1957. Pp. 131-160.

Miller, S.M. The outlook of working-class youth. In A.B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.) Blue-collar world; Studies of the American worker. Englewood cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964. Pp. 122-133.

Miller, S.M., & Harrison, I.E. Types of dropouts: The unemployables. In A.B. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.) Blue-collar world; Studies of the American worker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964. Pp. 477-492.

Miller, S.M., & Saleem, B. The neglected dropout: The returnee. Syracuse, New York: Youth Development Center, 1963.

Miller, W.B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, 5-19.

Miller, W.B. Preventive work with street-corner groups. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1959, 322, 97-106.

Mischel, W. Preference for delayed reinforcement and social responsibility. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 1-7.

Moynihan, D.P. The Negro family: The case for national action. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Myers, G.R. A study of factors and practices related to holding power in certain Michigan secondary schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1956. No. 16,753.

Office of Economic Opportunity. The quiet revolution: Second annual report. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Penty, R.C. Reading ability and high school dropouts. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Plunkett, M., & Riches, N. School and early employment experiences of youth. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 1277, 1960.

Polsky, H.W. Cottage six-The social system of delinquent boys in residential treatment. New York: Russel Sage Foundation, 1962.

Ray, W.S. An introduction to experimental design. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Reed, H.J. Counseling services for out-of-school youth. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) Guidance and the high school dropout. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 159-175.

Remmers, H. H., & Radler, D. H. Teenage attitudes. Scientific American, 1958, 198, 25-29.

Riessman, F. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Roessel, F.P. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory results for high school dropouts and graduates. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1954. No. 8138.

Rosen, B.C. Conflicting group membership: A study of parent-peer group cross-pressures. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 155-161.

Rosenthal, R. Pollyanna in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston (forthcoming).

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Teachers' expectancies: Determinants of pupils' IQ gains. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 115-118.

Rutledge, A.L., & Gass, G.Z. Nineteen negro men: Personality and manpower retraining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Schorr, A.L. The non-culture of poverty. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34, 220-221.

Schreiber, D. An introduction to the school dropout. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) Guidance and the high school dropout. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 1-23.

Schuller, H. The teacher of the disadvantaged. Journal of Teacher Education, 1965, 16, (June), 174.

Seidler, M.B., & Ravitz, M.U. A Jewish peer group. American Journal of Sociology, 1955, 61, 11-15.

Sexton, P. Education and Income. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C.W. Reference groups: Exploration into conformity and deviation of adolescents. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Siller, J. Socio-economic status and conceptual thinking. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 365-371.

Slotkin, H. New programs for dropouts. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1963-64, 12, 127-132.

Smith, E.A. American youth culture: Group life in teen-age society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1962.

Stuart, B.R. Factors in voluntary dropouts in selected public secondary schools in Oregon. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State College, 1955.

Super, D.E. Career development: Self-concept theory. New York: College Entrance Examining Board, 1963.

Super, D.E. Vocational development of the high school dropout. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) Guidance and the high school dropout. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 66-83.

Taber, R.C. The critical dilemma of the high school dropout. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 501-508.

Tesseneer, R.A., & Tesseneer, L.M. Review of the literature on school dropouts. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1958, 42, 141-153.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Education for a changing world of work, A report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

United States Office of Education. Educationally deficient adults: Their education and training needs. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Wallace, G.R. An analysis of job satisfaction of employed youth involved in an experimental school dropout rehabilitation program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966.

Wax, R.H. The warrior dropouts. Trans-Action, 1967, 4 (6), 40-46.

Weisbrod, B.A. Preventing high school dropouts. In R. Dorfman (Ed.) Measuring benefits of government investment. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1965. Pp. 117-171.

White, R.W. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-333.

Willis, C.G. A study of the effects of programmed human relations training on a selected group of high school dropouts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966.

Wilson, O.M. Report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. Washington: National Advisory Council, 1966.

Winer, B.J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Woellner, R.C. Early school leavers. School Review, 1951, 59, 511-515.

Wolff, M. Six months after. New York: Center for Urban Education, 1966.

Wrenn, C.G. Conspectus. In D. Schreiber (Ed.) Guidance and the high school dropout. Washington: National Education Association, 1964. Pp. 227-232.

TECHNICAL APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS OF MAJOR TEST RESULTS

For the purposes of this analysis, all subjects were classified according to their status at the end of the experimental school year. This was necessary because of the attrition, which led to instability of group membership throughout the program. Classifying the subjects according to their terminal status produced six distinct groups: diploma students, skill training students, "active" control subjects (those members of the control group who completed both pretests and posttest), "inactive" control subjects (those who did not complete posttests), program dropouts, and regular high school graduates.

Due to the difficulties of testing in this situation, complete data for all subjects were not obtained on all tests. Within each group some subjects were absent at both the original and the make-up testing sessions, with the result that the number of subjects actually tested in each group varied for each test. The most complete data were obtained for the diploma and skill groups, over whom the greatest amount of control could be exercised. The concepts section of the arithmetic achievement test was not administered to the control group, and the regular high school graduates received only the Otis IQ, Self Esteem Inventory (SEI), and Adjective Check List (ACL).

Correlational Analysis

Table A1 contains pretest and posttest intercorrelations and reliability coefficients for all of the tests. The pretest matrix is based upon data from all 352 tested subjects, while the posttest matrix and the reliability coefficients are based upon 151 subjects for whom posttest data were available.

The obtained reliability estimates varied between .61 and .81 for all of the tests except the Self Esteem Inventory.

These coefficients are much lower than the usual published figures (.85 to .95) for such tests. In spite of this discrepancy, it is believed that the obtained reliabilities are adequate for the present research purposes. This decision follows from the fact that, in the first place, the present estimates were obtained by the test-retest method, while the published figures for these tests are derived by the split-half method. In this study the concern was with stability of measurement more than with the internal consistency of the tests, which has already been amply demonstrated. Secondly, the present estimates were not inflated by Spearman-Brown or Kuder-Richardson "correction" formulas, as are the published figures. In the third place, the obtained figures were based upon the performance of high school dropouts and low-ranking graduates drawn from lower socioeconomic groups who do not perform as well in testing situations as middle-class students. And finally, the tests were to be used for statistical comparisons on a group basis, not for the prediction of individual performance, so that very high reliability was not necessary (see Guion, 1965, p. 46, for a discussion of this point).

Examination of the matrix in Table A1 also reveals that, on the whole, each pretest correlation was comparable in magnitude to its corresponding posttest correlation. This can be taken as another indication that the reliability (stability) of these measurements was adequate. In light of these considerations, it was decided that the obtained reliability of measurement was acceptable for the present purposes, in the present context. There was, however, one exception to this: the SEI. The estimated reliability for this test was .42, a figure which is too low to engender much faith in its stability of measurement.

Other problems were also encountered in using this test. Due to the nature of the tests which were used, it should be possible to derive two or three major factors from the correlation matrix which account for nearly all of the systematic variance in the obtained correlations. That is, three different kinds of tests were administered: intelligence, achievement, and self concept. Working from this basis, there should be a cluster of reasonably high intercorrelations between the intelligence tests, demonstrating that most of the systematic variance in the intelligence scores is accounted for by an "intelligence" factor. Intercorrelations between the intelligence scores and the other tests should be high only as far as performance on these tests is affected by achievement and self concept. The same kind of relationships should be present in the intercorrelations of the achievement tests and those of the

self concept measures. Of course, factor loadings would not be of large magnitude (and thus intercorrelations within factors would not be very large) because of the large amount of error variance found in the present measurements, as demonstrated by the low reliability coefficients. A factor analysis is currently being conducted to test for such relationships. The discussion that follows is based only on a subjective analysis of the intercorrelation matrix shown in Table A1.

Examination of Table A1 shows that the matrix is not as "factorially clean" as the preceding discussion would predict. There does not seem to be a pure intelligence factor, but the cluster of moderately high coefficients in the upper left quadrant points to a reasonably clear intelligence-achievement association. The verbal IQ (Otis) test correlates more highly with the achievement tests than it does with the nonverbal IQ (Beta) test. Thus, there appears to be a large component of reading and arithmetic ability involved in the pattern of verbal IQ scores. This, of course, is not a surprising result. The above pattern does not hold true for the Beta test. Here, the verbal IQ-nonverbal IQ relationship is somewhat higher than the relationships between the nonverbal IQ test and the achievement tests. However, some relationship does exist here. This leads to the conclusion that the verbal IQ scores were heavily saturated with reading and arithmetic components, plus a general intelligence component. On the other hand, performance on the achievement tests is determined to a certain extent by the general intelligence factor represented in the nonverbal IQ scores.

At this point, further difficulty with the self-concept measures was encountered, in that no semblance of a self-concept "factor" could be identified. The two ACL scales produced moderately high intercorrelations with each other, although the relationships were not as high as they theoretically should be. The SEI showed little or no relationship to either of these scales. In fact, it correlated more highly with verbal intelligence and reading achievement than it did with self evaluation.

One of the problems with the Self Esteem Inventory is associated with its method of scoring. In order to correct for "lying" (i.e., social desirability set) a separate scale is incorporated. One-fifth of the test items are "lie items" (e.g., I always do the right thing, I like everyone I know) which supposedly nobody can honestly accept as self-descriptive. These lie items are scored separately, and a "corrected" self-esteem score is derived via the following formula:

$$\frac{(\text{number correct}) \times 2}{\text{number of lies}} = \text{adjusted score.}$$

If a subject lies once on this test, he is not penalized; but if he lies two or more times, a heavy penalty is placed upon his score. Perhaps this penalty is too heavy. Further analysis of the present data, which is still in progress and which will be reported in full at a later date, suggests that use of the adjusted scores gives a greater spread of scores, but low reliability, while use of the uncorrected raw scores gives higher reliability, but a social desirability response set then becomes evident. It appears that better measurement can be obtained by ignoring the social desirability correction, but the obtained scores may then have less relevance for the construct of self esteem.

Pretest Results (All Tested Subjects)

The pretest results have been previously described, in summary fashion, for the groups (diploma, skill, and control) which were most directly relevant to the operation of the experimental schools (see Chapter III). At this point, the pretest analyses are presented for all subjects who are tested, including the high school graduates, program dropouts, and the inactive controls. After this has been accomplished, the next section will contain pretest-posttest comparisons of the experimentally-relevant groups in greater detail. For ease of reading, all further tables have been placed at the end of this appendix.

In Table A2 are presented the homogeneity of variance results for each pretest, following the procedure devised by Bartlett (see Winer, 1962, p. 95). For seven of the eight tests the chi-squared values were non-significant, indicating that the error variances of the sample populations did not significantly differ for these tests. However, in the following analyses, several significant differences in treatment variance were discovered.

The statistical analyses of the verbal (Otis) IQ test are presented in Table A3.[1] The mean scores of the various groups of high school dropouts tended to cluster together at a point lower than the mean of the graduates. The analysis of variance detected a statistically significant difference, and the multiple range test identified the graduate-dropout discrepancy as the major source of this difference. It was concluded that no real differences in verbal IQ were found among the groups of dropouts, and that the high school graduates had significantly higher pre-test verbal IQs than did the high school dropouts.

More than anything else, this is an indication of the difficulty encountered in matching the high school graduates (as a control group) with the experimental subjects. The original plan was to match experimentals and controls on the basis of race, sex, curriculum and IQ. However, the number of 1966 Negro graduates in the area was so small that a complete match was impossible. Sex and race were considered to be the most important variables for the purpose of the overall study, so curriculum and IQ matching was relegated to the status of a secondary consideration. (See Chapter III for the particulars of the matching procedure and its results.) In order to keep the IQ scores of experimentals and controls on approximately an equal plane, the high school graduates were drawn only from the lower portions of their graduating class, in terms of grade-point averages. As the figures in Table A3 indicate, the graduate control group ended up slightly higher on the IQ measure than the experimentals and the dropout control group.

The results of the nonverbal (Beta) IQ pretest are presented in Table A4. The mean scores are closely grouped together, very near the "defined" general population average of 100. The dispersion of scores within groups was quite uniform, as shown by the narrow range of standard deviations. The variance ascribable to treatment effects was very low, and the analysis of variance detected no statistically significant differences between groups. The high school graduates were not included in this analysis.

---

[1]The data for the inactive control group were removed from this analysis for two reasons: (1) only four members of this group took the test, and (2) the variance of this data was not in line with the other group variances on this test, causing the Bartlett test to approach significance (see Table A2).

A comparison of the results of the two intelligence tests, in conjunction with the correlational analysis, supports the widely-held belief that the IQ test performance of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds is depressed due to their lack of language skills. This comparison shows that, for each group of dropouts, the mean verbal IQ score is lower than the mean nonverbal IQ score. In addition, the standard deviations of the nonverbal scores are more nearly equal for each group, pointing to an increased uniformity among groups on this test. In the correlational analysis, it was found that the verbal IQ test contained large components of reading and arithmetic skills, while the nonverbal IQ test did not. While the obtained correlations do not show direction of relationship, the results of many other studies (see Chapter II) imply that the achieved skills influence the IQ score more than vice versa.

The analyses of the scholastic achievement pretests are presented in Tables A5 through A7. Here, the results are straightforward, in that no significant differences among groups were found for any of the tests. At the beginning of the experimental school year, the experimental and control groups were at uniformly low levels of reading and arithmetic achievement, as determined by the Stanford Achievement Tests. The subjects who dropped out of the experimental programs were originally at the same achievement levels as those who remained throughout the programs.

The results of the self-evaluative measures are less clear, since a discrepancy between tests was found. Significant differences between groups were found on all three measures of self evaluation. On the SEI (Table A8) the mean scores were widely divergent, ranging from 30 to almost 50, and the standard deviations were larger, creating a great deal of overlap between the group distributions. As the multiple range test indicates, most of the variation could be attributed to the skill training group, which scored higher than any of the other groups. This is an interesting finding, since no other pretest differences were found among the dropout groups.

Significant differences were also found on the other self-evaluative measures, the two scales of the ACL. These results are presented in Tables A9 and A10. On these scales, the significant differences are accounted for by the high school graduates, who received a higher mean score on the "favorable" scale and a lower mean score on the "unfavorable" scale. These differences are actually much larger than they appear in the tables, for the reported figures are in terms of T scores

(a type of standard score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10). The conversion of T scores to percentile ranks is non-linear, so that the reported ranges of 6.5 and 6.4 points in these tables represent a range of 20 or more percentile points.

Comparisons of Pretest and Posttest Scores

As has been previously mentioned, the pretest-posttest paradigm was utilized only with those groups directly involved in the experiment (the diploma, skill training, and dropout control groups). These were the only groups which received posttests. In order to clarify the relationships existing between the pretest and posttest scores of these groups, separate analysis of variance tests incorporating the pretest scores of only these groups are compared to analyses of their posttest scores. The analysis of covariance procedure is used for between-group comparisons of posttest scores. Sometimes called the "adjusted analysis of variance," this procedure adjusts the posttest scores for any differences which may have existed in the pretest scores, thereby controlling the posttest analyses for pre-existing differences (i.e., using the same base level for all groups of subjects). The statistical "goodness" of this adjustment is dependent upon the magnitude of the pre-post correlation, with higher correlations producing greater control. (See Ray, 1960, Chapter X.) In addition, two-tailed t tests were used to test the significance of the pre-post changes of each group on each test. Thus, for each test, a three-way comparison is made: (1) a between-groups pretest comparison, via the analysis of variance, (2) a between-groups posttest comparison, via the analysis of covariance, and (3) a within-group pre-post comparison for each group, via t tests.

Verbal IQ. The first of these three-way comparisons, for the Otis IQ test, is presented in Table A11. The pretest comparison demonstrates that there was essentially no difference among the three groups in terms of mean verbal IQ scores. Visual comparisons of the pre and post mean scores show that both of the experimental groups increased their scores, while the control group's score actually decreased by a large amount from pretest to posttest. Statistical analysis of these pre-post changes is found in the right-hand column of Table A11. Here it is seen that only the change made by the diploma group was statistically significant. The changes found in the scores of the skill and control groups, although as large as or larger than that of the diploma group in terms of absolute magnitude,

were not significant because of the smaller sizes of these groups and the larger standard deviations of their scores.

On the posttest analysis of covariance, the adjustments in the obtained mean scores were not very large, a reflection of the previous finding of no real pretest differences between groups. However, due to the pre-post changes in group scores, a significant posttest difference among groups was found. The multiple range test identified this difference as being due to both of the experimental groups having higher mean scores than the control group.

Nonverbal IQ. The comparisons for the Beta IQ test are to be found in Table A12. The pretest comparison found no significant differences between groups. The pre-post comparison found large, highly significant increases in IQ scores for all three groups. This large, general increase is undoubtedly due to a practice effect inherent in the structure of the Beta test. However, the increase in the mean score of the diploma group was greater than the increases of the other two groups. Thus, in the posttest comparison, a significant difference between groups was found. The multiple range test identified the difference between the scores of the diploma and control groups as the significant aspect of the comparison, but there is good reason to believe that the small size of the skill group was the major factor keeping the diploma-skill difference from being significant.

Reading Achievement. A preliminary inspection of the pretest mean scores on the Stanford reading test (Table A13) would indicate that the experimental groups started off at a slightly higher level than the control group. However, the analysis of variance found no statistically significant differences between the groups on this pretest. Pre-post comparisons indicate that the diploma students produced a large improvement in their reading level, a change which is highly significant, while the skill and control groups did not significantly change. The posttest analysis of covariance found a significant difference between group scores, in which the diploma group was found to be significantly superior to both the skill training and control groups.

Arithmetic Achievement. The results of the computation (Table A14) and concepts (Table A15) tests were quite similar. Pretest comparisons found no real differences between groups. On both tests, the diploma group significantly increased its achievement level, while no significant changes

were found for the other groups. Both posttest comparisons found significant differences between groups. On the computation test, the diploma group was superior to both the skill and control groups. On the concepts test, the diploma group was superior to the skill training group.

Self Esteem. On the SEI, the preceding pattern of no pretest differences among groups is broken. As the analyses in Table A16 show, a significant pretest difference was found, with the skill group at a significantly higher level of self esteem than the control group, and the diploma group midway between the two (but not significantly different from either). However, the standard deviations of all three groups were high, leading to a great deal of overlap in the distributions of group scores.

A pre-post comparison shows no real change in self esteem level for the diploma and skill groups, and a very large drop in the self esteem of the skill training students.

The analysis of covariance adjustment of the mean post-test scores was large in comparison to the adjustments obtained on the other tests. This follows from the fact that the only significant pretest differences were found on this test. In addition, the largest adjustment was on the score of the skill group, where the pre-post change was found. It should be pointed out, however, that the statistical "goodness" of the adjustment procedure is highly dependent upon the reliability of the measures. On the self esteem test, reliability was low.

Using the adjusted scores, a significant difference was found between the groups. The diploma group was found to have a higher self esteem score than the control group, with the skill group at about the same level as the control group but not significantly different from the diploma group. If the un-adjusted scores were used, the diploma and control groups would still be significantly different, but the skill group would be closer to the level of the diploma group.

The important result arising from this analysis is the contrast between the pretest and posttest ranks of the groups. On the pretest, the skill group was much higher in self esteem than the other two groups, but on the posttest the diploma group was highest in self esteem. During the experimental manipulations, a reversal of positions on this variable occurred. Some explanations of this finding are provided in Chapters V through VIII of this report.

Self Evaluation. The results of the "Favorable" and "Unfavorable" scales of the ACL were quite similar, as one would expect. On the pretests, no significant differences between groups were found. The diploma group showed a significant increase in favorability toward self (Table A17) and a decrease in unfavorability toward self (Table A18). No pre-post changes were found for the skill and control groups. Although the improvements in the scores of the diploma group were statistically significant, they were not large enough to product significant differences between the posttest scores of the groups.

TABLE A1

Intercorrelations of Test Scores

(Decimals Omitted)

	Otis IQ	Beta IQ	Reading Achievement	Arithmetic Computation	Arithmetic Concepts	Self Esteem	Adjective Check List (Favorable)	Adjective Check List (Unfavorable)
Otis IQ	72	51	79	65	60	33	11	06
Beta IQ	51	78	47	42	39	08	-05	06
Reading Achievement	69	50	81	61	51	26	09	02
Arithmetic Computation	47	39	54	70	60	23	23	-15
Arithmetic Concepts	55	41	56	71	61	13	21	-03
Self Esteem	20	10	27	14	14	42	10	06
Adjective Check List (Favorable)	06	05	05	04	02	16	64	-45
Adjective Check List (Unfavorable)	-01	01	-08	-02	-02	-05	-58	61

Lower Matrix - Pretest intercorrelations

Upper Matrix - Posttest intercorrelations

Diagnol - Pre-post intercorrelations (i.e., reliability coefficients)

TABLE A2

Pretest Homogeneity of Variance

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N Range*	Pretest Variance							
		Otis IQ	Beta IQ	Reading Achievement	Arithmetic Computation	Arithmetic Concepts	Self-Esteem	Adjective Check List (Favorable)	Adjective Check List (Unfavorable)
Diploma	60	70.1	128.8	3.92	2.55	3.05	430.9	107.6	87.2
Skill	26-28	105.2	105.2	4.63	3.50	2.43	557.6	137.0	199.4
Active Control	20-63	157.1	111.2	5.41	3.95	**	420.4	105.4	69.7
Inactive Control	4-18	47.6	110.2	6.37	5.99	5.87	427.8	116.8	81.1
Program Dropouts	57-68	130.0	141.9	5.45	5.05	3.89	476.3	99.3	98.2
High School Graduates	81-115	83.7	**	**	**	**	392.9	143.5	90.5
X^2		10.3	1.4	2.5	8.4	3.7	1.5	3.3	12.0
df		5	4	4	4	3	5	5	5
p.		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	<.05

* - Since the N in each group varied for the different tests, only a range of Ns is reported; the exact N for each test can be found in the following 8 tables.

** - No data available for these cells.

TABLE A3

Pretest Analysis of Variance - Otis IQ

(All Tested Subjects)*

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	92.1	8.4
Skill	28	91.5	10.6
Control (Active)	20	93.4	12.5
Program Dropouts	68	91.2	11.4
High School Grads	115	97.4	9.2

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	4	563.6	5.67	<.01
Error	286	99.3		
Total	290			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
High School Grad>Diploma	<.01
>Skill	<.01
>Program Dropout	<.01

* The inactive control group was excluded from this analysis due to the small number of cases (N=4).

TABLE A4

Pretest Analysis of Variance - Beta IQ

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	98.4	11.4
Skill	28	99.2	10.3
Control (Active)	63	99.6	10.5
Control (Inactive)	18	96.8	10.5
Program Dropouts	63	98.2	11.9

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	4	45.6	0.37	NS
Error	227	123.4		
Total	231			

TABLE A5

Pretest Analysis of Variance - Reading Achievement

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N	Mean Grade Level	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	7.59	2.0
Skill	27	7.61	2.2
Control (Active)	58	7.06	2.3
Control (Inactive)	16	6.79	2.5
Program Dropouts	59	7.30	2.3

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	4	3.80	0.76	NS
Error	215	4.99		
Total	219			

TABLE A6

Pretest Analysis of Variance

Arithmetic Achievement (Computation)

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N	Mean Grade Level	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	6.20	1.6
Skill	26	6.62	1.9
Control (Active)	57	6.66	2.0
Control (Inactive)	16	6.77	2.4
Program Dropouts	57	6.54	2.2

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	4	2.11		
Error	211	3.94	0.54	NS
Total	215			

TABLE A7

Pretest Analysis of Variance

Arithmetic Achievement (Concepts)

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N	Mean Grade Level	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	6.51	1.7
Skill	26	7.12	1.6
Program Dropouts	57	6.78	2.0

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	2	2.50	0.76	NS
Error	140	3.27		
Total	142			

TABLE A8

Pretest Analysis of Variance

Self Esteem Inventory

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	40.1	20.8
Skill	27	49.4	23.6
Control (Active)	63	36.0	20.5
Control (Inactive)	20	30.0	20.7
Program Dropouts	61	37.3	21.8
High School Grads	85	38.4	19.8

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	5	1062.6	2.43	<.05
Error	310	437.7		
Total	315			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
Skill>Control (Active)	<.05
>Program Dropouts	<.05
>High School Graduates	<.05
>Control (Inactive)	<.01

TABLE A9

Pretest Analysis of Variance

Adjective Check List (Favorable)

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	46.2	10.4
Skill	27	44.5	11.7
Control (Active)	54	44.6	10.3
Control (Inactive)	20	42.2	10.8
Program Dropouts	61	44.2	10.0
High School Grads	81	48.6	12.0

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	5	238.4	2.01	<.10
Error	297	118.4		
Total	302			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
High School Grad>Control (Active)	<.05
>Control (Inactive)	<.05
>Program Dropouts	<.05

TABLE A10

Pretest Analysis of Variance

Adjective Check List (Unfavorable)

(All Tested Subjects)

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Diploma	60	53.3	9.3
Skill	27	51.6	14.1
Control (Active)	54	53.1	8.3
Control (Inactive)	20	52.9	9.0
Program Dropouts	61	52.1	9.9
High School Grads	81	46.8	9.5

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	5	431.8	4.47	<.01
Error	297	96.6		
Total	302			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
High School Grad<Skill	<.05
<Control (Inactive)	<.05
<Diploma	<.01
<Control (Active)	<.01
<Program Dropouts	<.01

TABLE A11

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Otis IQ

		Pretest		Posttest			Pre-Post	
Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Adjusted Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t	p.
Diploma	60	92.1	8.4	94.0	94.1	9.9	2.43	<.02
Skill	28	91.5	10.6	93.4	94.0	13.7	1.38	NS
Control (Active)	20	93.4	12.5	89.0	88.0	11.6	1.69	NS

Pre-Post Correlation = 0.72
Regression Coefficient = 0.85

		Analysis of Variance			Analysis of Covariance		
Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	2	21.7	0.22	NS	297.8	5.18	<.01
Error	105	96.8			57.5		
Total	107						

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
Diploma > Control	<.01
Skill > Control	<.01

TABLE A12

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Beta IQ

		Pretest		Posttest			Pre-Post	
Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Adjusted Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t	p.
Diploma	60	98.4	11.3	105.0	105.7	10.5	8.16	<.01
Skill	28	99.2	10.3	103.9	103.8	11.5	5.22	<.01
Control (Active)	63	99.9	10.5	103.0	102.4	10.3	3.08	<.01
				Pre-Post Correlation = 0.78				
				Regression Coefficient = 0.78				

		Analysis of Variance			Analysis of Covariance		
Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	2	34.2	0.29	NS	162.3	3.88	<.05
Error	148	117.1			41.9		
Total	150						

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
Diploma > Control	<.01

TABLE A13

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Reading Achievement

Group	N	Pretest: Mean Grade Level	Pretest: Standard Deviation	Posttest: Grade Level Mean	Posttest: Grade Level Adjusted	Posttest: Standard Deviation	Pre-Post: t	Pre-Post: p.
Diploma	60	7.59	2.0	8.35	8.18	2.0	4.65	<.01
Skill	27	7.61	2.2	7.48	7.30	2.5	0.41	NS
Control (Active)	58	7.06	2.3	7.43	7.68	2.3	1.96	NS

Pre-Post Correlation = 0.81
Regression Coefficient = 0.84

Source of Variation	df	Analysis of Variance: Variance	F-Ratio	p.	Analysis of Covariance: Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	2	5.07	1.09	NS	7.86	4.76	<.05
Error	142	4.65			1.65		
Total	144						

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
Diploma>Skill	<.01
Diploma>Control	<.05

TABLE A14

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Arithmetic Achievement (Computation)

		Pretest		Posttest			Pre-Post	
		Mean Grade	Standard Deviation	Grade Level Mean	Adjusted	Standard Deviation		
Group	N	Level					t	p.
Diploma	60	6.20	1.6	8.08	8.33	1.8	10.78	<.01
Skill	26	6.62	1.9	7.26	7.01	1.8	1.74	NS
Control (Active)	57	6.66	2.0	6.72	6.56	2.4	0.36	NS
				Pre-Post Correlation = 0.70				
				Regression Coefficient = 0.89				

		Analysis of Variance			Analysis of Covariance		
Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	2	3.46	1.05	NS	46.98	27.08	<.01
Error	140	3.28			1.73		
Total	142						

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Difference	p.
Diploma>Skill	<.01
Diploma>Control	<.01

TABLE A15

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Arithmetic Achievement (Concepts)

		Pretest		Posttest			Pre-Post	
		Mean Grade	Standard	Grade Level		Standard		
Group	N	Level	Deviation	Mean	Adjusted	Deviation	t	p.
Diploma	60	6.51	1.7	7.76	7.90	1.9	6.78	<.01
Skill	26	7.12	1.6	7.37	7.32	2.2	0.73	NS
				Pre-Post Correlation = 0.61				
				Regression Coefficient = 0.80				

		Analysis of Variance			Analysis of Covariance		
Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	1	4.45	1.56	NS	13.22	6.00	<.05
Error	84	2.86			2.20		
Total	85						

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Difference	p.
Diploma>Skill	<.05

TABLE A16

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Self Esteem Inventory

Group	N	Pretest Mean Score	Pretest Standard Deviation	Posttest Mean Score	Posttest Adjusted Mean Score	Posttest Standard Deviation	Pre-Post t	Pre-Post p.
Diploma	60	40.1	20.8	44.3	44.2	23.4	1.37	NS
Skill	27	49.4	23.6	39.0	34.7	23.9	2.82	<.01
Control (Active)	63	36.0	20.5	33.0	35.1	21.6	0.74	NS

Pre-Post Correlation = 0.42
Regression Coefficient = 0.46

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.
Treatment	2	1704.2	3.80	<.05
Error	147	488.9		
Total	149			

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
Skill>Control	<.01

Analysis of Covariance

Variance	F-Ratio	p.
1542.2	3.58	<.05
430.6		

Duncan's Multiple Range Test

Significant Differences	p.
Diploma>Control	<.01

TABLE A17

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Adjective Check List (Favorable)

		Pretest		Posttest			Pre-Post	
Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Adjusted Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t	p.
Diploma	60	46.2	10.4	49.0	48.2	10.4	2.24	<.05
Skill	27	44.5	11.7	46.0	46.7	11.4	0.74	NS
Control (Active)	54	44.6	10.3	43.5	44.2	11.4	0.55	NS
				Pre-Post Correlation = 0.64				
				Regression Coefficient = 0.66				
		Analysis of Variance			Analysis of Covariance			
Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio p.	Variance	F-Ratio	p.		
Treatment	2	44.8	0.40 NS	172.8	2.42	NS		
Error	138	112.3		71.4				
Total	140							

TABLE A18

Pretest and Posttest Comparisons - Adjective Check List (Unfavorable)

		Pretest		Posttest			Pre-Post	
Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Adjusted Mean Score	Standard Deviation	t	p.
Diploma	60	53.3	9.3	50.4	50.3	9.3	2.76	<.01
Skill	27	51.6	14.1	52.2	52.9	14.4	0.11	NS
Control (Active)	54	53.1	8.3	52.5	52.2	8.0	0.79	NS
				Pre-Post Correlation = 0.61 Regression Coefficient = 0.60				
		Analysis of Variance			Analysis of Covariance			
Source of Variation	df	Variance	F-Ratio	p.	Variance	F-Ratio	p.	
Treatment	2	29.1	0.29	NS	75.4	1.15	NS	
Error	138	101.6			65.3			
Total	140							

APPENDIX B

GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWING STUDENTS WHO HAVE AND HAVE NOT COMPLETED THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM COMPARING ACADEMIC AND SKILL TRAINING

PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW

This interview will provide us with information concerning our experimental subjects, information which will help us discover what factors differentiate between those subjects who complete the program and those who do not. During the course of our project a number of subjects have left the program for various stated reasons, or have been dropped due to various behavioral problems or excessive absenteeism. These subjects will be contacted and interviewed in their homes. An exit-interview procedure will be used with the students who complete the program.

Although all of the subjects have undergone extensive ability, achievement, and personality testing, we feel that interpersonal interviews will enable us to find significant factors which these tests were not designed to investigate. Therefore, it is proposed that the interviews take the form of an informal discussion between interviewer and interviewee. These discussions will be tape-recorded, and the interviewers' questions will be as non-directive and open-ended as possible, so that we can obtain the subjects' own opinions, in their own words. The interview form consists of a series of topics to be covered, with appropriate subheadings which will partially structure the interview toward areas which seem to be important. Under each subheading a series of questions are provided which are to serve as guides to the interviewer in establishing rapport with the subjects and in guiding the conversation toward relevant areas.

As much as possible, the interviewer will refrain from asking specific questions; his major contribution will be in getting the subject to open up and freely discuss his experiences within the project and the factors in his personal life which may have influenced his decision to leave or to follow through to the program's completion.

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS

The materials which you have already been given describe the research project, the interview form, and our reasons for the interviews. All of the youngsters whom you will be interviewing are high school dropouts, and some of them have also dropped out of our program. Those who were enrolled in the academic (diploma) program attended the Market Street School in downtown McKeesport; those in the vocational skills ("trade") program attended the Steel Valley School, outside of town. Many of these dropouts are below average in verbal intelligence and will have difficulty expressing themselves. Patience and tact will be required to get them to open up and freely discuss their personal situations with you. Their ability to talk about themselves is at a low level, so it will be up to you to draw them out and support them throughout the interview. They come from poor backgrounds, in which the parents may be separated or may never have been married. Some of the unmarried girls may have children. Under no circumstances should you allow your personal reactions to such situations to be revealed to these youngsters, or to affect the interview situation.

The interview form, itself, should be fairly self-explanatory. Before attempting to conduct any interviews, you should thoroughly familiarize yourself with it. Take the form along with you on the interviews, so that you may refer to it from time to time, but do not attempt to read off a series of questions from it, verbatim, and expect to get anywhere with these young people. Rather, you should try to establish rapport with them, to set up an interpersonal situation in which they will feel free to discuss their personal lives, their problems, and the ways in which these have colored their experiences within our project.

There are nine general topics which we would like to cover during the interviews. The first three (Program, Family, and Friends) cover fairly broad areas. They have been divided into subtopics, each of which should be explored at some time

during the interview. However, it may not always be possible to bring these subjects up in this order. We would like to keep the interviews as unstructured and as open-ended as possible, while still covering every important area. This is a dilemma which you will have to cope with as the situation demands. You should try to get the interviewee to volunteer information, if you can, so that we can have some assurance that his responses are valid indicators of his personal situation and his personal feelings. The conversation should flow naturally, with each of your probings having some relevance to what has been previously said. The opening questions (under The Program, I. General Considerations) may not elicit much in the way of a specific response; you are more likely to get some sort of generalized, hazy answer. But the questions can give you a means to open the conversation and a chance to begin to develop some rapport. If you can get the subject to begin talking about the program at the start, then you will be able to gently guide his responses toward the relevant areas.

The specific questions which follow each subtopic may be used as guides, so that you know just what we are trying to get at in each case. When the conversation lags, you may want to turn to these in order to get things moving again. The only caution which we have for you concerns the last questions on page 3 of the interview form, those having to do with race relations among the students. Our pretesting has demonstrated that if this is brought up early in the interview, it may cause the interviewee to interpret many questions under subtopics II, III, and IV in this light. Therefore, it would be best to avoid touching on this question until these other topics have been thoroughly explored.

After the topics of Program, Family, and Friends have been well covered, it might be best to follow the suggested question format more closely. This is especially true for the topics of Values, Goals, and Self-Concept. As you no doubt realize, these are rather hazy areas to explore, and we would prefer to have some standardized basis of comparison. In addition, these questions have been designed to supplement the scales of the personality tests which have been taken by most of these students. We are hopeful that this last part of the interview form will provide us with some insights into the validity of their test responses.

Most of the interviews will probably take place in the respondents' homes. However, we would like to keep the atmosphere as confidential as possible. If there are too many distracting

influences--children playing, TV set turned on--or other family members are present, you might suggest to the respondent that you carry on your conversation on the porch; or you could go for a walk around the block or find a nearby bench, stoop, etc. The major consideration will be to find a spot where background noise will not blot out the tape and where the subject will feel free to talk openly.

THE PROGRAM

I. General Considerations

Were there any things, in particular, that you liked about the Penn State program?
Can you tell me about one particular thing that you especially liked?
Others?
Were there any things that you particularly disliked about it?
Can you tell me about one certain thing that you especially disliked?
Others?
Was the program too hard for you, was it too easy, or was it just about right?
Can you give me some examples of this?
How do you think that the things you learned in the program will help you in the next few years?

SKILL TRAINING STUDENTS ONLY:

Was the work at the school interesting to you?
In what ways?
Do you think that this could be improved? How?
How much of what you learned do you think you could apply on the job?
Could you be taught more you could apply?

ACADEMIC STUDENTS ONLY:

Were the courses that you took interesting to you?
In what ways? OR Why not?
Were you able to see how these things could be used outside of the school, in real life?
For instance...
Do you think that these things can be improved?
In what ways?

What did you think about starting to study again?
Do you think that there was too much homework?
Was the reading too hard?

II. Teachers and Counselors

In general, did you like the teachers?
How about the counselors?
Did you feel that they cared about you as a person?
Did you feel that if you had a personal problem, you could go to them for advice or help?
After you were out of the program (OR: now that you are out of the program), would you still go to one of these people with a personal problem?
Who would you rather go to with a problem--a teacher, a counselor, or the supervisor?
Were there any teachers or counselors that you didn't like?
Don't mention any names, but try to tell me what it was about him (her) that you disliked.
Were there any that you especially liked?
Why did you like him (her)?
Do you think that the teachers were fair to everyone, or did they tend to play favorites? (IF they played favorites) In what ways?

III. Supervision and Discipline

Who is the supervisor of the program?
How well did you get along with him?
What kinds of contact did you have with him? (ASK respondent to specify particular pleasant or unpleasant incidents)
How do you feel about the rules you had to follow in the program? Did you feel they were too strict?
How much did the <u>teachers</u> enforce these rules?
How much did the <u>supervisor</u> enforce these rules?

IV. Student Relations

Did you make any friendships with the other students in the program?
Did you ever see any of the other students outside of the school?
Were there some students who you spent most of your time with at school; for instance, working together in class, or talking during breaks? Could you give me their names?

Did you know these people before you started the program?

SKILL TRAINING STUDENTS ONLY:

Did you very often see any students from the other classes?
Where did you see them?
How much contact did you have with them?
How did you feel about them? (Like or dislike?)

(When you were in the program) did you ever feel sort of "left out of things" at the school?
Do you think that the other students were pretty friendly with everyone, or did they stick together within their own little groups?
Did you feel that the Negro and white students got along well together, or were there bad feelings between them?
What do you think could be done about this?

V. Building and Grounds

How did you feel about the school building itself?
(PROBE): location, physical condition, etc.
How did you generally feel about going to the school every evening?
Glad? Was it just a "chore"?
(PROBE FOR MOOD)
How did you usually feel at school?
Cheerful? Lonely? Among friends?
What did you think about where the school was located?
Did the school ever have any assemblies or meetings where all of the students got together?
How did you feel about them?

VI. Economic Considerations

Is anyone besides yourself financially dependent upon you?
Did you have a regular job while you were in the program?
Did the program interfere with your ability to earn money?
Did you have enough money to dress as well as the other students? (IF NO) How did this make you feel?

PROGRAM DROPOUTS ONLY:

Do you think that you would have stayed with the program if you could have afforded it, or wouldn't it <u>honestly</u> have made any difference?

VII. Time and Distance Factors

Did you think that you had to spend too much time every day in the program, or were the time demands fair enough? (DIG FOR SPECIFICS)
How about the time of day?
Would you rather have had day classes?
Did you think that the program was lasting for too many months?
If so, how long do you think that a program like this should last?
Did you have to travel too far to get to class every evening?
How far was this?
How did you make the trip? (Car? Bus?)
How long did it take you?

FAMILY

I. General Situation

Are both of your parents living?
Are they divorced or separated?
Either or both remarried?
Which do (did) you live with?
Number of brothers?
Number of sisters?
Who provides the major source of financial support for your family?
Does your mother have a job outside of your home? Doing what?

II. Family Educational Pattern

How far did your father go in school?
How far did your mother go in school?
How far did each of your brothers and sisters go in school?
Did any of your family ever try any non-school types of education, such as correspondence courses, trade school, apprentice training, business school, army schools, etc.
Were they able to finish the courses which they started?

III. Interaction and Belongingness

How well do you think that your whole family understands and accepts each other?

How well do you think that the members of your family understand and accept you?
How well do you feel you understand and accept the other members of your family?
Which family members do you feel closest to?
Which do you feel farthest from?

IV. School Orientation

When you were in regular high school and grade school, did your parents try to get you to go to school and to study, or did they think that school and studying were a waste of time, or didn't they seem to care one way or another?
When you first started to think about leaving school for good, what did your parents say and do about this?
What did they do when you found out about the Penn State program and signed up for it?
Did they try to help you stay in the program, or did they think that you should be spending your time in other ways?

V. Spouses (married interviewees only)

What did your wife (husband) think of your decision to sign up for the Penn State program?
Did she (he) try to encourage you and help you, or was it the other way around?
Has your association with the program created any problems in your home?
Not enough time to spend with wife (husband).
Not enough time to spend with children.

FRIENDS

I. Size and Solidarity of Peer Group

About how many pretty steady friends do you have?
Friends you see about every day?
How long have you known these friends?
Has your group of best friends stayed pretty steady since grade school, or have they begun to drift apart?
How well do (did) your buddies stick together whenever there was trouble from grown-ups or from other groups?

II. Parent-Peer Cross-Pressures

Did you ever think you were going against your family in who your friends were at any time, or don't you think that they cared who your friends were?

If your parents oppose your choice of some friend, what usually happens?

If your parents want you to do one thing and your best friends want you to do another, what usually happens?

III. Peer Orientations Toward School

How far did most of your close friends go in school?

Did your friends generally like school, or did they dislike it? Name some incidents?

Of your group of closest friends, were you one of the first to leave school for good, about the middle, or one of the last?

Did those who already left school make fun of those who stayed in school longer? (In what ways? What did they do?)

Were most of your friends able to get steady jobs after they left school, or did they just "hang around" most of the time?

IV. Reactions to Program

What did most of your close friends say when they heard that you were signing up for the Penn State program? Did they make fun of you or "ride" you?
In what ways?

Did any of them sign up with you? Are they still in the program? How long did they stay?

Did any of your close friends ever try anything like trade school, apprenticeship, business school, correspondence courses, or army technical courses?

Were they able to finish the courses, or did they have to stop part way through?

While you were in the program, did you feel that you were losing contact with your old friends?

Did you make new friends who were in the program with you?

How did these new friends compare with your old friends?
Did you like them as much?

OTHER INFLUENTIALS

When you really need some good advice about making a big decision in your life, is there anyone you go to for this advice? (If not a parent or sibling) Tell me something about this person.
Who has been the single most important person in your life?
Who is second in importance?
Who has influenced you the most in your decisions about how much schooling you should have?
Who has influenced you the most in your decisions about what sort of jobs you would like to have?

CRITICAL INCIDENTS

Can you name one or two specific things which happened that led you to leave school, originally?
What were you doing when you heard about the program last summer?
Did any specific things make you decide to sign up for the program?

DROPOUTS: What made you decide to quit?

STAY-INS: Why do you think you stuck it out?
Did you have any long periods of absences?
Why did you come back?

PATTERN OF DROPPING OUT

Have you ever tried any other training programs or courses? Were you able to finish them.
Do you think that you would sign up for another program if you had the chance?
If you should happen to join another program or take a course of some kind, do you really think that you would finish it?

VALUES

How much education do you think is necessary for a person to get along in the world?
Do you think that it's possible for everyone to get this much schooling?
How good a job should a person try to get?
(Higher than father's, same as father's, lower than father's?)
What do you think are the most important things in a person's life?
Do you think that hard work and planning really pays off in the end?

GOALS

What do you want to get out of life?
What sort of person would you really like to be?
What neighborhood would you like to live in?
What clubs would you like to belong to, if you could?
When you first signed up for the Penn State program, what did you expect to get out of it?
If things went pretty well for you, what kind of job would you really like to get?
What kind do you actually think you will get?
How much money do you think you would need to earn to barely get along?
How much would you need to be really well off?
How much money do you really expect to earn?

} GET ALL ANSWERS IN WEEKLY RATES

SELF-CONCEPT

What is your favorite free-time activity?
(What do you like to do when you don't have anything you especially have to do?)
If somebody gave you $500 tomorrow, what do you think you would do with it?
How much control do you think you have over your future?
How much do you think a person should plan ahead for the future?
Did you ever think that you were getting a pretty dirty deal from life?

How do you feel about the kids (in regular school) who s[illegible]a to "have it made"?
(Have their own cars, are in all the activities, are planning to go to college, etc.)
What kind of person do you like to spend your free time with?
What do you think a really successful person is like?
What does he (she) like to do?
What does he (she) have?
Who is the most successful person that you know personally?
Tell me something about him.
Picture a man who is an accountant at the U.S. Steel tube works.
In what ways are you like him?
In what ways are you different from him?

APPENDIX C

AREAS SUGGESTED FOR DISCUSSION WITH TEACHERS

1. Administration

   Teacher-supervisor relationship. Support of teacher in teacher-pupil relations. Teacher perceptions of supervisor's attitudes towards tardiness, absenteeism, discipline, etc. Material support of teacher, facilities, equipment, books.

2. Relationships with Students

   How do they see students? What do they see as the student's reasons for being in program? What were the characteristics of those to whom they were attracted or those they felt in conflict with?

3. Students' Ability and Interest

   Were they really teaching? Was it a school of baby-sitting operation? What topics had the greatest interest; which bored the students? Did teaching methods have to be changed? What was acceptable performance from students?

4. Discipline Problems

   Did these students present more or less problems than those in regular school? Were special techniques needed for controlling the class? Were they ever afraid of students? Frustrations and problems.

5. Racial Problems

   Did these appear in the classroom? Teachers' perceptions of interracial attitudes and behavior.

6. Physical Conditions of School

   Condition of building and rooms. Location, grounds.

7. Teachers' Ideas about the Learning Process

   What were they trying to accomplish in the classroom? What are his personal values and goals in teaching?

8. Was the Program Any Influence on Other Areas of Professional Life?

   Change in perception of proper teaching. How does this perception compare with regular teaching--if different, how do you justify?

9. General Attitude Towards Problem of Dropouts.

   Is it seen as a problem? Own conception of what causes dropping out? Have their ideas about dropouts changed?

10. How and why did you get involved in this program? Expectations of program.

11. Critical incidents, both good and bad, to point out times when teaching was successful or not.

EVALUATION OF TEACHER INTERVIEWS

EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES AND BASIS FOR RATING

All ratings except for general rank were based on a three point scale with '1' as the most positive and desirable value for all categories and '3' as the least desirable; '2' was the average or typical rating. General rank was based on a five point scale with '1' as most desirable and '5' as least desirable; '3' was the average, catch-all category. If there was insufficient evidence for a decision about a particular category it was not rated.

There are six critical areas in which the teachers were rated on the basis of the taped interviews.

A. General rank and effectiveness.

1. General rank (five point scale) includes an evaluation of the respondent (R) as a teacher and as a person. It includes the summation of all the following ratings, plus the subjective evaluation and impression of the interview.

2. General effectiveness - R's effectiveness as a teacher and as a person as judged by his ability to get the material across and to make it interesting, to enthuse the students, to reach them, and to gain their respect, affection, and trust. This measure considers the R in his role as teacher, guidance counselor, and friend. This measure differs from the measure "general rank" in that it is a less subjective evaluation based on actual accounts of classroom activity and interaction with individual students.

B. Insight and effectiveness in relating to the students.

1. Insight - R's general insight into the problems, motivation, and attitudes of the students.

2. Relate to students - R's closeness to the students. This measure includes R's willingness and desire as well as his success in communicating with the students as a group and as individuals. It concern; R's ability to "reach" the students as a teacher and as a fellow human being.

3. Guidance orientation - R's tendency to take a counselor role with the students in an effort to help them with their academic and personal problems.

4. Psychological orientation - R's familiarity with psychological jargon and general principles of psychology. This scale is intended to be a built-in check for R's whose facility with more sophisticated terminology might seem to indicate more insight and guidance orientation than is actually present.

C. Involvement in Program

1. Involvement in program - This measures the R's degree of emotional attachment to the program and the student, the degree to which R has become "wrapped up" in the program psychologically.

2. Attitude - general - R's general attitude toward the program, the students, and his role as teacher. This is a very subjective evaluation which includes a total impression of all the categories under "C" and denotes a general positive attitude and approach to the program and the students.

3. Change in Attitude - Positive '1' or negative '3' change in attitude toward the students and the program since the beginning of the school year.

4. Enthusiasm - Enthusiasm about the program, students, and R's teaching position.

5. Effort - R's personal effort above and beyond the minimal necessary to make the classroom interesting and stimulating or to approach and aid the students. This includes making a special effort to obtain supplies and equipment or to arrange extra field trips or activities; spending extra time preparing for classes; and devoting time and energy to helping students with personal or academic problems.

6. Do it again? - R's interest in participating in a similar program in the future.

7. Personal gains - Perceived personal gains from working with the program as indicated by comments such as "I'm a better person for it"; "I understand people better", "I have gained a lot of insight into myself".

8. Carry-over into regular teaching - Positive effect which this experience has had on R in his regular job - teaching or other. This includes more awareness of the slow students, more concern with and sensitivity to the problems of students and new techniques and approaches to teaching subject matter.

D. Personal characteristics of the teacher.

1. Creativity - R's wealth of creative ideas which contribute to teaching and "reaching" the students.

2. Flexibility - Ability and willingness to alter approach to students both in teaching and in personal communication. Willingness and facility in discarding usual patterns of approach and replacing them with techniques more suited to the needs of the students.

3. Dynamism - Evaluation of the personal dynamism, enthusiasm, activity and personal impact of R as it comes across on the tapes.

4. Self-criticism - Willingness to admit mistakes and shortcomings in teaching and in relating to the students.

E. Attitude toward students.

1. Condescension absent - Absence of condescending attitude toward the students and/or the program itself.

2. Prejudice absent - Absence of class or color prejudice.

3. Stereotypes absent - Absence of use of stereotyped phrases and statements about the students, education, philosophy, etc.

4. "Good group" vs. "dregs of society" - Positive attitude toward students and dropouts as a group as evidenced by comments such as "These kids are mature adults", "These kids work hard", "These kids have a lot of potential" in contrast to "These kids are really slow", "These kids are the lowest group in society", "These kids are immature and delinquent".

F. Approach to interview.

1. Honest - R's honesty, fairness, and openmindedness.

2. B.S. Absent - Absence of attempt to feed interviewer a line, or to B.S..

3. Egocentrism absent - This basically measures whether the taped interview is drop-out centered or R centered, whether it is couched in terms of "they" or in terms of "I". It also attempts to determine whether R is giving himself undeserved praise or credit.

("F" is probably the most shakey of all the categories rated. Its value on the whole is questionable because only very extreme obvious cases could really be detected.)

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON HUMAN RESOURCES
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Publications:

Research, Development, and Demonstration in Adult Training and Retraining, The Pennsylvania State University, September 1966. by Jacob J. Kaufman, Grant N. Farr, and John C. Shearer.

The Role of the Secondary School in the Preparation of Youth for Employment, The Pennsylvania State University, February 1967. by Jacob J. Kaufman, Carl J. Schaefer, Morgan V. Lewis, David W. Stevens, and Elaine W. House.

A Community Organizes for Action: A Case Study of the Mon-Yough Region in Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University, July 1967. by Robert W. Avery and Herbert A. Chesler.

The Development and Utilization of Human Resources: A Guide for Research, The Pennsylvania State University, July 1967. by Jacob J. Kaufman, Grant N. Farr, and John C. Shearer.

A Developmental Program for an Economic Evaluation of Vocational Education in Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University, June 1966. by Ernst W. Stromsdorfer.

The Issues, Evaluation, and Potential of Vocational Education in Pennsylvania, The Pennsylvania State University, October 1967. by Jacob J. Kaufman and Morgan V. Lewis.

An Analysis of the Comparative Costs and Benefits of Vocational Versus Academic Education in Secondary Schools, The Pennsylvania State University, October 1967. by Jacob J. Kaufman, Ernst W. Stromsdorfer, Teh-wei Hu, and Maw Lin Lee.

The School Environment and Its Influence on Educational Programs for High School Dropouts, The Pennsylvania State University, January 1968. by Jacob J. Kaufman and Morgan V. Lewis, assisted by David Gumpper.