DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 157	CG 019 925

AUTHOR	Gaston, Suzan N.
TITLE	LSYOU: The Effects of an Alternative Organizational Framework on Students at Risk for Dropping Out.
PUB DATE	Apr 87
NOTE	25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (71st, Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Affective Objectives; Coping; *Dropout Programs; High Risk Students; *High Schools; Humanistic Education; *Nontraditional Education; *Organizational Change; *Participative Decision Making; *Potential Dropouts; Student School Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited

ABSTRACT

        Many potential dropouts have problems coping with the formal and impersonal structure of most high schools. In response to this, an effort was made to create an alternative, more supportive, organizational structure featuring participative management in the Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited (LSYOU) program. Program teachers, tutors, and counselors underwent inservicing in a counseling curriculum (Quest Skills for Living). All class sizes were limited to 13 with a tutor and teacher in each class, students and staff were involved in nonacademic activities, and student input and autonomy were maximized in the program. The program was designed to facilitate the acquiring of coping skills. The Profile of Schools (POS) survey and local questionnaires were administered to test whether students perceived the program as exhibiting an alternative organizational structure. Students identified as potential dropouts were assigned to treatment and control groups and administered the POS as a pretest and posttest. Results showed that the LSYOU program was perceived as having organizational characteristics of the participative management style and that the program significantly positively impacted certain academic and affective skills. It is hypothesized that this increase in skills will reduce alienation among this at-risk group, thus reducing their chances of dropping out of school. (ABL)

LSYOU: The Effects of an Alternative

Organizational Framework on Students at Risk for Dropping Out

Suzan N. Gaston

Louisiana State University

April, 1987

Abstract:

This paper describes the major hypothesis underlying the LSYOU program structure. It has been asserted in the literature that many potential dropouts have problems coping with the formal and impersonal structure of most high schools. In response to this, an effort was made to create an alternative, more supportive, organizational structure in this program. This was attempted by having program teachers, tutors, and counselors undergo inservicing in a counseling curriculum (Quest Skills for Living); by limiting all class sizes to 13 with a tutor and teacher in each class; by involving students and staff in nonacademic activities; and by attempting to maximize student input and autonomy in the program. In order to test whether students perceived the program as exhibiting an alternative organizational structure, the Profile of Schools (POS) survey was administered as well as several locally constructed questionnaires. The major research focus is the student POS. Prior to the onset of the program, the applicant pool was administered the POS at a testing session and were told to respond in terms of their present school. Students were then randomly assigned to the treatment and control conditions. At the end of the program, the control group students were administered a posttest and asked to respond in terms of the school they had attended in the spring. The treatment group students were asked to respond in terms of the LSYOU program. The control group responses will be used to test the consistency of student attitudes over the course of the summer and the treatment group responses will serve to indicate the perception of organizational differences between the regular school and the program organizational structure.

3

Section I : Background and Rationale of the LSYOU Program

In a recent report to the Pittsburg Foundation, Bickel, Bond, and LeMahieu (1986), on the basis of a literature review, divided the research on school dropouts into the following four broad categories:

1. Factors and attributes within the students themselves (the student centered model);

2. Factors and attributes of the students' family background (the family centered model);

3. Characteristics and practices within particular schools (the school centered model); and finally,

4. Systematic factors in the society at large (the societal model).

This paper focuses on the LSYOU program which investigated the interaction of two of the above approaches, namely how the characteristics and practices of an alternative summer school could impact attributes within the student themselves. An additional hypothesis which remains to be investigated is that students with these newly acquired skills, will be able to return to regular school environments and demonstrate reduced alienation and more school success.

Cusick (1973), articulated the characteristics of schools that contribute to the intended effects of the school as an organization, i.e. passing along a specific body of knowledge in the form of curriculum to students. These characteristics include the following: "1. subject matter specialization, 2. vertical organization, 3. doctrine of adolescent inferiority, 4. downward communication flow, 5. bath processing of students, 6. routinization of activity, 7. dependence on rules and regulations, 8. future-reward orientation, and 9. physical arrangements that are conducive to passing on information from teacher to student."

A number of unintended effects of this organizational structure include little teacher-student interaction, little student involvement in formal activities,

1

4

fragmentation of educational experience, minimal compliance on the part of students, and student concern for the maintenance of their own subsystem. (Cusick, 1973)

Wehlage (1984) elaborates on the concept of unintended organizational characteristics of the school. He states that the impersonal bureaucratic structure of large high schools has created a "sense of alienation among students who feel that the adults do not care for them and that they are likely to be treated in an unfair or arbitrary manner. The comprehensive high school of today may create adult/student relationships that result in skepticism and cynicism in both parties."

Bidwell (1965), Cusick (1973), and Wehlage (1984), appear to agree that the bureaucratic structure of the traditional high school has implications on the degree of involvement felt by all high school students. Cusick (1973) notes that the school emulates the society for which it prepares its students. Those students who have the academic and social skills to cope with the bureaucratic structure of the school usually remain in school.

Wehlage (1983) believes that a significant factor in the cause of a student dropping out of school is his/her lack of academic and social coping skills. Wehlage (1982) defines social coping skills as self-management; control of aggression; ability to reconcile conflicting demands; and adaptation to authority. He defines cognitive coping skills as abstract thinking, problem solving, and frame of reference flexibility. A student's lack of coping skills causes him/her to have difficulty in becoming socialized to the traditional institutions of society, including schools. Wehlage (1984) believes that the role of the school for the potential dropout should be one which assists the student to develop the social and academic skills necessary to foster the "commitments, attachments, beliefs and involvements with societal norms, roles and expectations."

Wehlage's point of view is not contradictory to Cusick (1973), Waller (1932), and Coleman (1961) who emphasize the strength of a student's ties to his/her subculture as a possible determinant of his/her alienation and subsequent dropping out of school.

2

5

Rather, Wehlage's (1982) observation is that a lack of coping skills on the part of the student is possibly a contributing factor to that student not developing strong enough ties to the student subculture. On the rather hand, Pressholdt (1984), in his study of why students drop out of high school, did not find that the influence of peers was a significant factor in a student's decision to drop out of school. His findings conclude that when a student intends to drop out of school, his/her belief system regarding the consequences of dropping out of school is in conflict with societal norms and expectations of that behavior.

While Pressholdt's (1984) findings are somewhat in conflict with the studies that support the importance of ties to the student subculture, it seems to support Wehlage's (1982) notion that one's inability to bond to societal norms, roles and expectations is determinant of the student's decision to drop out of school. Wehlage (1982) attributes this inability to bond to a lack of academic and social skills as previously defined.

The traditional school, as described by Cusick (1973), Bidwell (1965), Waller (1932), and Coleman (1961) does not seem to possess the organizational characteristics that would foster the social interactions that Wehlage believes is necessary to assist the potential dropout. Based on this assumption, it would seem reasonable to believe that students who have been identified as potential dropouts would benefit from an intervention that provides an organizational structure that fosters the type of social interactions that Wehlage believes is essential to the socialization of this type of student.

Mann (1984) asserts that this structure must include a low pupil teacher ratio in a smaller than average school. He also agrees with Wehlage (1983) that the structure of a school most suitable to retaining potential dropouts is one that show a great deal of care and concern for the student. In addition, this structure must include a high level of personal contact; instructional methods that vary and are suitable to the student's learning style; student tasks that are challenging and feasible; and opportunities for the student to demonstrate initiative and responsibility. This

3

6

property of care and concern is what the "futures literature describes as a high touch school." (Mann, 1986).

The type of school structure characterized by Mann (1984) that would foster the retention of potential dropouts by assisting him/her to acquire the academic and social skills, defined by Wehlage (1983), is similar to the characteristics of the participative managerial system as described by Likert (1961). In his book, New Patterns of Management and the Human Organization, Likert described along a continuum, the characteristics of organizations relative to the superior - subordinate relationship.

The continuum consists of the following four organizational types:

1. The exploitive-authoritative system is one in which applied sanctions are the motivating force that drives organizational members. Communication has a downward flow. Decision making is concentrated at the top. Interaction among members is limited, particularly between hierarchical levels. There is little supportive behavior by the leaders of the organization. In addition, there is little mutual trust and confidence between leaders and subordinates.

2. The benevolent-authoritative system is similar to the exploitive-authoritative system but not to such an extreme.

3. The consultative system is more similar to the participative system but to a lesser degree.

4. The participative management system is characterized by supportive leadership in all situations; cooperative and substantial team work; and shared decision making in setting and attaining goals. There is also a high level of trust and confidence between leaders and subordinates. Communication is characterized by little blockage; flows both vertically and horizontally; and is frequent between groups and individuals. In addition there are high goals and a concern for control of performance at all hierarchical levels in the organization.

Likert (1962) developed an instrument to measure the characteristics of an organization along the organizational continuum described above. This instrument was later adapted to be utilized in schools, and is entitled the Profile of a School (Likert, 1972).

In summary, Bidwell (1965) and Cusick (1973) offer a great deal of insight into the characteristics of the traditional high school. In addition, Wehlage (1983) describes the academic and social coping skills necessary for a student, who has been identified as a potential dropout, to acquire so that he/she may complete high school. Mann (1986) identifies the social structure of a school that is necessary for a student to acquire these coping skills. This structure appears to be different from the traditional school structure described by Bidwell (1965), Cusick (1973), Waller (1932), and Coleman (1961).

The social structure described by Mann (1984) that he believes fosters the coping skills necessary for a potential dropout to remain in school is similar to the participative managerial organizational type depicted by Likert (1962). The participative managerial organizational type is one of four types that Likert (1961) uses to describe superior-subordinate interactions in organizations.

Section II : Description of the Treatment in the LSYOU Program

The LSYOU treatment was based on the participative management style described by Likert (1961). Following is a discussion of the organizational characteristics of the LSYOU program which were designed to reflect a participative management style.

1) Selection of Staff

The LSYOU staff consisted of 1 headmaster, 9 teachers, 8 tutors, 2 counselors, 16 peer counselors, and 1 recreation director. All staff members were selected on the basis of their ability to display characteristics of the partici- pative management style. A review of the applicant's background and the job interview were designed to ascertain the applicants supportive behavior, ability to work as part of a team, concern for excellence of performance, communication style, and decision making style. Only applicants who rated high in the above described areas were selected for employment in the LSYOU project.

2) Inservice Training

In the previous section. it was described that at-risk students generally lacked identifiable academic and social coping skills, which in turn causes him/her to become alienated from the regular school environment. Since all of the students selected to participate in the LSYOU project were identified as at-risk for dropping out of school, it was assumed that most of them experienced a degree of alienation.

The Quest National Center, which was formed approximately ten years ago, has developed a program for adolescents entitled <u>Skills for Living</u> that is designed to reduce alienation among young people. It attempts to do this through addressing the development and reinforcement of affective and social skills (Crisci, 1986). These skills include the improving of self concept, dealing constructively with feelings; developing a positive attitude; building constructive relationships; appreciating and strengthening family bonds; establishing trust, loyalty, and commitment; learning the elements of effective parenting; understanding the principles of financial management; developing goal setting and life planning skills; and discovering meaning in ones' life and personal views (Crisci, 1986).

In addition to utilizing the Quest curriculum in the LSYOU project, all staff members (not just those teachers implementing the curriculum) were required to participate in a three day workshop conducted by the Quest National Center. This workshop is designed to enhance the motivation, communication style, decision making style and goal setting behavior of participants. Since all staff members were familiar with the components and goals of the Quest curriculum, they were able to reinforce those goals outside of the regular teaching environment.

3) Class Organization

To facilitate the perception of students that the LSYOU program had a participative management style, students were placed in classes where the ratio of teacher to student was 1:13. In addition, each class had a tutor or teacher aide. This ratio was designed to provide as much individualized instruction as possible. Also, in that type of environment, group participation, shared decision making, cooperative team work, supportive leadership, motivation, and goal setting can flourish.

4) Curriculum

Students were able to earn ½ credit in pre-algebra and ½ credit in reading for participation in 180 hours of instruction. The pre-algebra course was designed to help students acquire abstract concepts through the use of concrete methods such as manipulatives. The reading course centered around the Quest curriculum and included reading, speaking, and writing assignments. As previously mentioned, the content of the Quest curriculum is such that it both necessitates and enhances the components of the participative management style. Activities utilized to deliver the units in Quest centered around group participation, shared decision making, and cooperative team work. Supportive leadership was displayed by formal and informal leaders. Communication was frequent within the group and between individuals. Goal setting, motivation, and high standards of achievement were also emphasized.

While the counseling and computer curriculum did not teach Quest units, they did utilize the Quest method of delivering their activities.

5) Work Component

All students in the LSYOU project spent ½ day working with a professional on the LSU campus. Just as the staff was selected based on their ability to display characteristics of the participative management style, worksite supervisors were also selected on this basis. This was noticed by student participants and reflected in comments about their bosses such as, "He was like a father to me", and "She helped me recapture the dreams I had lost" (Shapiro, Gaston, Hebert, and Guillot, 1986).

In addition, students could select their worksite, of those available, prior to entering the program which demonstrated the use of the shared decision making.

6) Team Meetings

In order to practice group participation, shared decision making, cooperative team work, and frequent communication, team meetings on individual students were held daily. Each student had a team consisting of an administrator, counselor, two teachers, and a tutor who assessed the student's progress and made specific recommendations for improvement that was shared with other appropriate staff members.

7) Elective and Extra Curricula Activities

Each student belonged to a group in the dormitory that consisted of thirteen students. Each group elected a representative to the LSYOU student council. Through their group meetings, students selected their extra curricula activities, including the cost of the activity to a student, which he/she could pay for through the earnings from their employment. This of course demonstrated shared decision making, communication, cooperative team work, and group participation in setting goals.

Outstanding students were awarded weekly recognition. This culminated in an awards ceremony during the closing exercises. Students were awarded recognition for progress and enthusiasm in academic, elective and social areas. This demonstrated a concern for performance at all levels, as well as the establishment of high goals for participants.

Students were able to select their electives, which ranged from chorus and newspaper to tennis and karate, prior to entering the LSYOU program. In addition, new electives such as wrestling and track were added through student requests. This of course reflected shared decision making, supportive leadership, and group participation in setting and attaining goals.

Section III : Validating the Treatment

Background:

In order to be able to report with confidence that the organizational characteristics of the LSYOU program actually reflected the participative management style, and to be able to report that this theory based treatment effectuated the results reported by Dr. Shapiro (1987), validation of the treatment was necessary. This was implemented through a qualitative and quantitive approach.

This paper will report the results of the quantitative approach. However, the qualitative data, which reflects such statements as "LSYOU is like my family," is contained in the LSYOU Project Evaluation (Shapiro, Gaston, Hebert, and Guillot, 1986).

The LSYOU project was based on the following theoretical proposition: A dropout prevention program, operating as a summer school, that has an organizational structure based on the participative management style, as defined by Likert (1961), will facilitate the acquiring of coping skills, as defined by Wehlage (1982), by students who have been identified as potential dropouts.

The independent variable of this study is defined as the organizational characteristics of a dropout prevention program based on the participative management style. The organizational characteristics of participative management style may be defined in the following manner:

1. Supportive leadership is displayed in all situations;

2. Group participation is seen in setting and attaining goals;

3. Communication is frequent and with groups and individuals;

4. Cooperative teamwork is substantial;

5. Decision-making is shared regarding the establishment and attainment of goals;

6. Concern for control of performance exists at all hierarchical levels in the organization; and

7. Extremely high goals are set for the organization to achieve and the level of committment to goal achievement is high.

8. Motivation is based on a reward system developed through group participation.

The dependent variable of this study is defined as the coping skills acquired by students who have been identified as potential dropouts. For the purposes of this study, coping skills will be defined in three ways: 1) the student's gain in achievement scores in math; 2) the student's gain in achievement scores in reading; and 3) the student's reduction in attitudes toward dropping out of school.

The first dependent variable is the student's post test scores on the math section of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). The second dependent variable is the student's post test scores on the reading section of the CTBS. The third dependent variable is the student's post test scores on the Student Opinion Questionaire (SOQ).

The focus of this paper, however, is to validate the existence of the independent variable.

Operational Definition:

The independent variable in this study is the student's scores on the Profile of a School instrument which was developed by Likert (1961). This instrument was designed to meas re the perception of a school's organizational characteristics by either staff or students.

The questions are designed to measure eight subscales across the four organizational types: exploitive-authoritative; benevolent-authoritative; consultative; and participative. The eight subscales include the following: 1) character of leadership, from non-suportive to supportive; 2) character of motivational forces, from low to high; 3) character of communication, from weak and distorted to strong and accurate; 4) character of interaction, from cold and distant to warm and close; 5) character of decision-making, from unilateral to shared; 6) character of goal setting, from unilateral to shared; 7) character of climate, from high goal committment and team cooperation to low committment and cooperation; 8) character of end result of feelings about one's school from extremely high to extremely low.

The student version of this instrument will be utilized in this study. This version has sixty-two questions that may be answered on a scale of one to eight, with responses one and two indicating an exploitive-authoritative organizational type; responses five and six indicating a consultative organizatinal type; and responses seven and eight indicating a participative organizational type (Likert, 1972). A sample quesion of the POS follows:

	Not Free	Somewhat Free	Quite Free	Very Free
How free do you feel to talk to your teachers about non-academic matters?	1 2	3 4	5 6	7 8

Scores in each of the combined response categories (one and two, three and four, etc.) are totaled providing a summary score and mean for each of the subscales.

Methodology:

Students, who were identified as potential dropouts by their school counselor, were selected for participation in this study. Two hundred students were randomly assigned into two groups. One group of one hundred students entered the dropout prevention program that was designed to facilitate the acquiring of coping skills. The other group of one hundred students participated in a summer JTPA work program.

In order to test whether students perceived the program as exhibiing an alternative organizational structure, the Profile of Schools (POS) survey was administered. Prior to the onset of the program, the applicant pool was administered the POS and were told to respond in terms of their present school. Students were then randomly assigned to the treatment and control conditions. At the end of the program, both groups of students were administered a posttest. The control group was asked to respond in terms of the school they had attended in the spring. The treatment group students were asked to respond in terms of the LSYOU non-residential components of the program.

The control group responses were used to test the consistency of students' attitudes over the course of the summer regarding their regular school. The treatment group responses served to indicate whether the students perceived the LSYOU program as having participative management organizational characteristics. In addition, the treatment group served to indicate whether there were perceived organizational differences between the LSYOU program and the students' regular schools.

Section IV : Results

Table I describes the organizational variables in the participative management system that were measured by the POS. Table II compares the pretest means and posttest means of the control group responses on these variables. As can be noted, means varied very little between pre and posttest for this group. In fact, no significant difference was found between pretest and posttest on any variable in the control group. This indicates that students who did not participate in the LSYOU program had consistent views of their regular school at the end of school in May of 1986 and prior to the opening of school in August of 1986.

Table III compares the pre and posttest means of the treatment (LSYOU) group on the organizational variables of the participative management system. These scores indicate a significant difference in all variables between the perception of the treatment group's regular school which was measured on the pretest and the perception of the LSYOU alternative school, as measured on the posttest.

It is interesting to note the similarity of the pretest scores of the control group (Table II) and the treatment group (Table III). This similarity indicates that the two groups had the same perceptions of their school prior to the treatment group attending the LSYOU program. In this instance, it also supports the success of the random assignment of students to groups.

Table IV depicts a regression analysis of all posttest variables on group, controlling for all pretest variables. When the posttest leadership variable is regressed on the group variable, adjusting for the leadership pretest, it is found that there is a significant difference between groups. This indicates that a systematic relationship does exist between assignment to the LSYOU treatment and leadership posttest scores, when pretest leadership scores are adjusted.

This pattern is the same for all regressions with the exception of the regression of the end results posttest on group, controlling for the end results pretest. Here, no significant difference was found between groups, indicating that no relationship

13

exists between assignment to the LSYOU treatment and posttest end results scores, when pretest end results scores are adjusted. All other factors on the test consisted of multiquestions.

Section V : Discussion

The focus of this paper was tc validate that the treatment condition or the LSYOU program consisted of alternative organizational characteristics than regular schools. In addition, the intention of this paper was also to validate that the LSYOU program exhibited the organizational characteristics of the participative management style as defined by Likert (1961). It accomplished this through the analysis of the POS pretest and posttest scores of students in the treatment (LSYOU) and control groups. These scores reflected the perceptions of the students on eight organizational characteristics of schools.

Shapiro (1987) describes the impact on students who participated in the LSYOU project through a comparison of their posttest scores in reading; math computations; math applications; career maturity; and intentions to dropout of school, adjusting for their pretests, with the posttest scores of the control group. These results indicate a significant difference between these groups on these variables.

The practical significance of this paper must be examined in light of the results presented in Dr. Shapiro's paper (1987). Clearly, the LSYOU program, validated as being comprised of the organizational characteristics of the participative management style of Likert (1961), significantly impacts certain academic and affective skills of students who attended the program. It is hypothesized that this increase in skills will reduce alienation among this at-risk group, thus reducing their chances of dropping out of school.

Appendix

TABLE I

<u>POS Organizational Variable Definitions for the Participative Management System</u>

Organizational Variable	Definition
Leadership	Indicates the extent to which supportive behavior is displayed fully and in all situation.
Motivation	Indicates the extent to which a reward system, developed through group participation, is utilized in setting and progressing toward goals.
Communication	Indicates the extent to which communication, aimed at achieving goals, flows both horizontally and vertically in the school.
Interaction	Indicates the extent to which cooperative team work is present.
Decision Making	Indicates the extent to which decision making is widely done, although well integrated, through out the school.
Goal Setting	Indicates the extent to which goals are established through group participation.
Climate	Indicates the level of goal committment and team cooperation that is present in the school.
End Result	Indicates the response to a one item question, "How do you feel about your school?"

Adapted from Rensis Likert, <u>The Human Organization: Its Management and Values</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) and Rensis Likert, <u>Norm Comparisons of POS</u>, (1984).

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF PRE AND POST TEST MEANS OF THE CONTROL GROUP ON THE POS

Variable	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Significance of Difference
Leadership	4.613	4.936	.117
Communication	4.648	4.990	.075
Goal Setting	5.556	5.662	.262
Interaction	4.813	5.162	.396
Motivation	5.562	5.772	.292
Decision Making	5.258	5.711	.321
Climate	5.194	5.384	.238
End Result	4.569	5.474	.097

****

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF PRE AND POST TEST MEANS OF THE TREATMENT (LSYOU) GROUP ON THE POS

Variable	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Significance of Difference
Leadership	4.642	5.937	.000
Communication	4.622	5.932	.000
Goal Setting	5.312	6.548	.000
Interaction	4.850	6.513	.000
Motivation	5.330	6.317	.000
Decision Making	5.702	6.720	.000
Climate	4.934	6.378	.000
End Result	4.556	6.041	.000

TABLE IV

STUDENT POS POSTTEST SCORES BY GROUP ADJUSTING FOR POS PRETEST DIFFERENCES

Dependent Variable : Leadership Posttest N=137

Multiple R : .522   Squared Multiple R : .272 Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .261

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Std. Coefficient	T	Signigicance Level
Constant	2.812	0.438	0.000	6.420	0.000
Leadership Pretest	0.454	0.085	0.393	5.337	0.000
Group	1.019	0.215	0.349	4.738	0.000

*******************************~***

Dependent Variable : Communication Posttest N=137

Multiple R : .492 Squared Multiple R : .243 Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .231

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	Std. Coefficient	T	Significance Level
Constant	3.011	0.439	0.000	6.859	0.000
Communication Pretest	0.422	0.085	0.376	4.993	0.000
Group	0.969	0.222	0.328	4.357	0.000

Dependent Variable : Goal Setting Posttest N=137

Multiple R : .490 Squared Multiple R : .240 Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .229

Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coefficient	T	Significance Level
Constant	3.800	0.413	0.000	9.208	0.000
Goal Setting Pretest	0.340	0.068	0.380	5.035	0.000
Group	0.943	0.216	0.330	4.372	0.000

****

Dependent Variable : Interaction Posttest   N=137

Multiple R : .583 Squared Multiple R : .340 Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .331

Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coefficient	T	Significance Level
Constant	3.574	0.355	0.000	10.065	0.000
Interaction Pretest	0.318	0.062	0.361	5.146	0.000
Group	1.397	0.207	0.474	6.749	0.000

Dependent Variable : Motivation Posttest   N=137

Multiple R : .456   Squared Multiple R : .208   Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .196

Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coefficient	T	Significance Level
Constant	3.506	0.460	0.000	7.618	0.000
Motivation Pretest	0.405	0.076	0.413	5.347	0.000
Group	0.649	0.212	0.236	3.058	0.000

****

Dependent Variable : Decision Making Posttest   N=137

Multiple R : .392   Squared Multiple R : .154   Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .141

Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coefficient	T	Significance Level
Constant	4.696	0.414	0.000	11.345	0.000
Decision-Making Pretest	0.189	0.066	0.228	2.863	0.005
Group	0.949	0.252	0.300	3.763	0.000

Dependent Variable : Climate Posttest   N=137

Multiple R : .444   Squared Multiple R : .197   Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .185

Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coefficient	T	Significance Level
Constant	4.144	0.391	0.000	10.601	0.000
Climate Pretest	0.241	0.066	0.282	3.632	0.000
Group	1.044	0.225	0.360	4.646	0.000

****

Dependent Variable : End Results Posttest   N=137

Multiple R : .207   Squared Multiple R : .043   Adjusted Squared Multiple R : .028

Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coefficient	T	Significance Level
Constant	4.774	0.484	0.000	9.870	0.000
End Result Pretest	0.148	0.077	0.163	1.922	0.057
Group	0.594	0.375	0.134	1.584	0.115

References

Bickel, W. E., Bond, L., LeMahieu, P. "Students at Risk of Not Completing High School."
A Background Report to the Pittsburg Foundation. (August, 1986), 12-18.

Bidwell, Charles, W. "The School as a Formal Organization," in James G. March (ed.),
Handbook of Organization, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965, pp 972-1022.

Blau, Peter, and Scott, Richard. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach,
San Francisco: Chandler, 1962, 2-8.

Coleman, J. S. The Adolescent Society, New York: Free Press, 1961.

Crisci, Pat. "The Quest National Center: A Focus on Prevention of Alienation."
Phi Delta Kappa, (February, 1986), 440-441.

Cusick, Phillip. Inside High Schools, New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1973.

Hoy, Wayne, and Miskel, Cecil. Educational Administration:Theory Research and Practice,
New York: Random House, 1982, 53-54.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, Rensis and Liker, Jane. Profile of a School, Ann Arbor, Michigan:
Rensis Likert and Associates, 1972.

Mann, Dale. "Can We Help Dropouts: Thinking About the Undoable." Teachers College
Record, Vol. 87, No. 3 (Spring, 1984), 307-323.

Pressholdt, Perry; Fisher, Jack; Brenn, Briand; and Clemons, Tanya. "Understanding
Students Intention to Drop Out of High School." The Southern Psychologist, Vol. 2,
No. 1 (1984), 48-52.

Shapiro, Jonathan; Gaston, Suzan; Hebert, Janet; Guillot, Dewey. LSYOU Project
Evaluation: Report to the Louisiana Department of Labor, Louisiana State
University: 1986.

Shapiro, Jonathan. A Quantitative Analysis of LSYOU. A paper presented to AERA,
April, 1987.

Waller, W. The Sociology of Teaching, New York: Wiley, 1932.

Wehlage, Gary, et al. "Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student."
(Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundational, 1983).

Wehlage, Gary, and Rutten, Robert. "Dropping Out: How Much Do School Contribute to the
Problems?" Teachers College Record, Vol. 87, No. 3 (Spring 1984), 374-392.