DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 568 RC 018 406

AUTHOR Takei, Yoshimitsu; Ryan, Patricia C.
TITLE Enhancing the Quality of Life at Bureau of Indian Affairs Off-Reservation Boarding Schools. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. American Indian Education Policy Center.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Human Development Services (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 30 Sep 84
CONTRACT 90-PD-86507
NOTE 270p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Education; *Boarding Schools; Bureaucracy; Educational Attitudes; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Private Schools; *Quality of Life; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools

ABSTRACT

This report examines aspects of life at Bureau of Indian Affairs off-reservation boarding schools (BIA ORBS) that might negatively influence the physical and psychological development of students. The project consisted of several phases: (1) telephone interviews with 40 former ORBS students; (2) intensive visits by research teams to three ORBS and five comparison private schools; (3) administration of quality of life questionnaires to teachers and students at the above schools; and (4) development of an intervention strategy. Contrary to the inhumane conditions of the past, there was no evidence of blatant or systematic abuse of students at BIA schools. Although survey results indicated that students were fairly satisfied with their schools, attrition rates of 40-50% suggested otherwise. Other major findings were that ORBS had problems with student drinking and fighting, and that students wanted a more rigorously academic education. Many difficulties appeared to result from excessive bureaucratization at BIA schools. Staff had no sense of collective responsibility for their school, there were few warm and trusting relationships between students and staff, and students became highly dependent on each other for comfort and support. A comparison was made between BIA schools and non-BIA boarding schools. Recommendations include structural changes in the BIA-ORBS relationship, school size, and staff work assignments; procedural changes related to basic philosophy and mission, problem-solving methodology, parent-school interaction, and school climate; and changes in school leadership and professional nature of staff. Survey and interview instruments are included. (SV)

AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION POLICY CENTER
THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

FINAL REPORT

ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF LIFE AT BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS OFF-RESERVATION BOARDING SCHOOLS

By
Yoshimitsu Takei
Patricia C. Ryan

Project Director
Grayson Noley

Prepared for
Office of Human Development Services
Department of Health & Human Services
under
Grant No. 90-PD-86507

September 30, 1984

ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF LIFE AT

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OFF-RESERVATION BOARDING SCHOOLS

A research project of the
American Indian Education Policy Center
320 Rackley Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

By
Yoshimitsu Takei
Patricia C. Ryan

Project Director
Grayson Noley

Prepared for
Office of Human Development Services
Department of Health & Human Services
under
Grant No. 90-PD-86507

The research reported in this document was performed with the support of a grant from the Office of Human Development Services, Washington, D.C. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and no official endorsement of the Office of Human Development Services or any of its agencies is implied.

September 30, 1984

Additional copies may be ordered by sending a $12 check or money order payable to The Pennsylvania State University at the American Indian Education Policy Center, 320 Rackley Building, University Park, PA 16802.

ABSTRACT

American Indian off-reservation boarding schools (ORBS) have the potential to provide positive and worthwhile experiences for American Indian students. Historically, however, this has not been the case. Many programs have done little to enhance the personal and occupational development of their clients and offered dull, warehouse-like experiences for students and staff alike.

The purpose of this project was to examine these institutions firsthand. They were then compared with their counterparts in the "private sector." From this review, we hoped to develop an intervention strategy which would lead to the improvement of current practice. In order to accomplish this goal, a five-phase study was undertaken. The first phase consisted of a survey of former (mid-70's) Bureau of Indian Affairs Off-Reservation Boarding School students. This was followed by school visitations to three of these BIA schools. Phase three involved the study of five non-BIA private boarding schools. In phase four attitudinal data collected from students and staff at the sample of schools in this study as well as at other schools were analyzed. Finally, an intervention strategy, based on the information gathered in previous phases, was developed. This report presents the results from the five phases of the study and outlines basic changes which we feel would improve the educational programs and quality of life at BIA ORBS. Changes are recommended in three areas: structure, procedure, and leadership. Recommendations concerning structural change include the relationship between ORBS and the BIA, school size, and staff work assignments. Procedural changes which appear to be necessary are in the areas of basic philosophy and mission, problem solving methodology, parent-school interaction, and school climate. Changes are also suggested in terms of school leadership and the professional nature of the staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

* * *

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared for the Office of Human Resources, Children's Bureau, Washington, D.C. The overall research effort was directed by Dr. Yoshimitsu Takei with various phases under the direction of Patricia Ryan, and administered by Dr. Grayson Noley.

The authors wish to express their gratitude to the BIA officials who assisted us in conducting this study. Several colleagues whose contributions to the study should also be noted. Dr. Francis M. Sim prepared the analysis of former BIA ORBS student telephone interviews and provided guidance with the statistical analysis methodology, and Dr. Patrick D. Lynch provided valuable suggestions.

Graduate Assistants contributing to the study include Jonathan Smith, Louis Spaventa and Charles Lone Wolf. Mr. Smith assisted with one of the non-BIA school visitations and contributed to the statistical analysis and technical writing. Mr. Spaventa participated in one BIA ORBS school visitation, the development of the telephone questionnaire, and telephone interviews of former BIA students. Mr. Lone Wolf prepared the review of the literature, assisted with telephone interviews of former students, and participated in one BIA school visitation.

Others contributing to the research effort were Dr. Margot LeBrasseur who assisted with the drafting of the initial proposal, development of the telephone questionnaire and telephone interviews; Marilyn Watt who participated in all three BIA school visitations and manuscript editing; Paige Baker who participated in one BIA school visitation; Margaret Smith who assisted with three private non-BIA school visitations; Paula Takei who participated in one non-BIA school visitation; Elliott Asp who assisted with manuscript editing; and Bill Kleemeier who assisted with proofreading. We also wish to acknowledge the contribution made by

The Pennsylvania State University graduate students in the American Indian Leadership Program who assisted with telephone interviews of former BIA students. The effort and hard work of all contributors are greatly appreciated.

We also wish to thank Dr. Charles Cordova, Mr. Delton Cox, Dr. Dennis Fox, and Mr. Jay Bruce Hoover who served as members of an advisory board and who gave us valuable criticism and advice concerning the project.

The authors also wish to extend their gratitude to Mrs. Claire Markham, Mrs. Carla Evans, Miss Ellen Fink, and Mrs. Judy Leonard for their assistance in the typing and preparation of this manuscript and Mrs. Marian Dressler for her support and assistance in the expediting of administrative details and proofreading.

The Project Officer for this project was Mr. Jake Terpstra of the Children's Bureau. We express our gratitude to him for his assistance and guidance throughout this project.

We wish to dedicate this report to the administrators, teachers and students at the schools we visited, who generously gave us their cooperation by consenting to be interviewed and filling out the questionnaires used in the study. Without their help and the help of those former students at BIA schools who consented to be interviewed, this project could not have been completed.

Yosimitsu Takei
Patricia C. Ryan
Grayson Noley

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this study was two-fold. The original intention was to determine the etiology, degree, and characteristics of physical and psychological abuse of students attending Bureau of Indian Affairs Off-Reservation Boarding Schools (BIA ORBS). The second objective was to develop a remediation or intervention strategy which, it was hoped, would reduce the occurrence of these incidents.

However, a preliminary investigation revealed that while physical and psychological abuse did occasionally occur at ORBS, it was not systemic in nature and did not constitute as much of a threat to students as it was originally hypothesized. But, a more overarching problem did become apparent during this initial phase of the project. That is, the overall quality of life at BIA ORBS appeared to pose several problems for the students in those schools. Therefore, the purpose of the study was expanded. The original focus on abuse was subsumed under a larger topic, quality of life. Thus, the aim of the study became that of examining those aspects of BIA ORBS which might negatively influence the physical and psychological development of students attending those schools. The scope of the intervention strategy was expanded to include all aspects of the ORBS experience.

Objectives

To accomplish the study's purpose, several goals were adopted when the project was initiated. The first three and the last objectives listed below were the

original goals to which were added other objectives. The final list of goals for the project is as follows:

(1) To review the available literature on the study's theme of BIA boarding schools with particular emphasis on student problems and means of school improvement.

(2) To ascertain how the students were treated at these schools by means of in-depth telephone interviews with former students.

(3) To evaluate the current conditions at BIA ORBS by means of visitations to selected schools.

(4) To study a sample of non-BIA boarding schools to assess their educational philosophies and school operation. To ascertain, by means of interviews with staff and students, the similarities and differences between these private boarding schools and BIA ORBS.

(5) To analyze BIA and non-BIA student and teacher attitudes.

(6) To develop a practical and useful intervention strategy for enhancing the quality of life at BIA ORBS and for providing quality educational service to American Indian youth enrolled in these schools.

Background of the Problem

The Bureau of Indian Affairs began operating boarding schools in the late 1800's. The most well known of those are the Chemawa School in Oregon, the facility Chilocco in Oklahoma, and the Haskell School in Kansas. Although the development of boarding schools provided educational opportunities many Indian children otherwise would not have had, a series of systematic abuses also occurred. In retrospect, the most fundamental of these abuses were those related to forced acculturation such as the practice of punishing children for speaking their own

language. Other forms of abuse were the lack of a nutritional diet, the denial of the practice of cultural activities, and the forced separation of children from their families for years at a time. Also, strict discipline at the hands of untrained supervisors resulted, at times, in physical beatings and emotional impairment.

Furthermore, children left unsupervised in BIA ORBS reportedly have been sexually abused, beaten by other students, or forced to exist in psychological environments so frightening that they would risk their lives to get away. Others have reportedly died at the hands of other students while their supervisors ignored their earlier pleas for help. Still, other reports tell tales of children who were handcuffed to their beds for infractions of rules.

While such problems were documented in the study known popularly as the "Meriam Report" which appeared in 1928, and despite the fact that many people, both Indian and non-Indian, suspected that enrolling Indian children in BIA boarding schools placed them at risk, a recent assessment of the lives of students at those schools had not been conducted. What was needed was research to ascertain the nature and extent of the problem and the development of procedures which could improve the living conditions and educational programs for those youngsters who attend these institutions. That was the purpose of this project.

Overview of the Study

Phase One

This study consisted of five phases. The first phase had, as its primary purpose, the determination of the nature of abuse found in BIA ORBS approximately ten years ago. This information was gathered through in-depth telephone interviews with former BIA ORBS students who attended an ORBS during the school year 1974 to 1975. Samples were obtained from six of these schools.

Each school sample was analyzed and a composite analysis was developed for the six schools.

Phase Two

The purpose of phase two was to obtain a deeper understanding of the ways in which BIA ORBS functioned and the effect this had on the lives of the students. In order to accomplish this goal, it was necessary to gather information firsthand by personal visitations to selected BIA ORBS. Three schools were selected for visitations by research teams. During these visitations, intensive interviews were conducted with staff and students alike by research team members. School-by-school summaries of the findings as well as a composite report of the three visits are provided.

Phase Three

Phase three resembled the second one. Here, however, the schools visited were not BIA schools, but rather, five prominent and well-known private schools.

Phase Four

Phase four of this study was conducted simultaneously with phases two and three. In addition to the personal interviews with staff and students, survey questionnaires were distributed during the visitations at the BIA and non-BIA boarding schools. These questionnaires were administered anonymously and with the purpose of tapping teacher and student attitudes regarding the quality of life in their schools. Findings for BIA and non-BIA samples are compared. The attitudes of teachers and students in the study schools were also contrasted with those of public school teachers in Pennsylvania and American Indian and Alaskan day school students.

Phase Five

In phase five an intervention strategy was developed. The intervention strategy has multiple, dependent components and is an outgrowth of the team's research and a review of the effective schools' literature.

Organization of the Report

This report contains seven chapters. Chapter II contains the review of the literature. Methods and Procedures are outlined in Chapter III. Phase 1, the Survey of former BIA ORBS students is covered in Chapter IV. Chapter V continues with Phase 2, the school visitations to BIA ORBS. Phase 3, Chapter VI, details the school visitations to selected non-BIA private boarding schools. Chapter VII, Phase 4, presents student and teacher survey analyses. Lastly, Chapter VIII, Phase 5, presents the intervention strategy.

CHAPTER II

A SELECT REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS OFF-RESERVATION BOARDING SCHOOLS

Introduction

A review of the literature on off-reservation boarding schools is essential to developing an understanding of both the structure and functioning of ORBS that any type of intervention strategy applied to an ORBS setting would have to address. This literature review examines several types of documents and published material relevent to ORBS. These include: government documents; academic studies; contracted research or evaluation studies; journal articles; and published material concerned with Indian education in general.

There are seven major divisions in this review. Following the introduction, a section on BIA ORBS history is provided which is followed by the third section on government documents. Included here are congressional documents and publications, Bureau of Indian Affairs Documents and Publications and miscellaneous government documents and publications. The fourth section concerns the school environment and includes materials on administration, academic instruction (teachers, curriculum, achievement and bi-cultural nature of ORBS), home living area, and, counseling and guidance. Information on the student (affective factors and adjustment, and, the effects of ORBS on post-graduate life) comprises the fifth segment. A summary is presented in the sixth section followed by a bibliography.

History of ORBS

In the literature on Indian education, Carlisle Indian School, established in 1879 in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, is frequently cited as the first established off-reservation boarding school for American Indians. However, the program at Carlisle (and other subsequent ORBS) was neither new nor unique for American Indians. More than fifty years previously, the famous Choctaw Academy was set up to educate American Indians with essentially the same goals as Carlisle and the other ORBS which followed.

The educational program at Carlisle and other ORBS involved (by definition) the removal of students from their homes, as well as strict discipline, work and study segments, an "outing system," and emphasis on the learning of industrial arts skills (Birchard 1970; Brunhouse 1935; Fine 1980; Fitz 1935; Long 1938; and Meyer 1954). The Choctaw Academy espoused almost an identical philosophy 50 years earlier (Noley 1979). The history of this is important in that it shows that there was little change in the philosophy of Indian education for well over one hundred years. Equally significant is the fact that the criticisms of the Choctaw Academy are similar to those leveled at the off-reservation boarding schools which were subsequently established by the federal government, i.e., almost total control of the student by the schools, the lack of any parental input into the curriculum, the low expectations and inadequacies of teachers, and the inadequacies of the curriculum itself. In fact, the descriptions of problems of the Choctaw Academy (and American public education in the early 1830's) by various historical researchers, (e.g., Foreman 1928-31, Fox 1943, Layman 1942, and Noley 1979), are remarkably similar to the problems of government boarding schools as outlined in the Meriam Report which was published in 1928, more than a hundred years later. Apparently the methodolgy and philosophy of Indian boarding school education, in general, did not change for over 100 years.

After the founding of Carlisle, other government boarding schools were established. In some cases, missionary schools were taken over and expanded, while in other cases, government facilities were utilized. Many of these schools practiced assimilative education and sought to achieve it by emphasizing White values and cultural norms while de-emphasizing Indian ones. Fine (1980) details the manner in which Carlisle broke down Indian values and customs by changing the name, appearance, language, clothes, and manners of every student through a three phase process comprised of work programs, European classroom instruction and shop skills, and a live-in program with White American families.

In 1928, Lewis Meriam documented the many shortcomings of Indian education at that time in a document known as the "Meriam Report". This was a devastating criticism of the many federally operated boarding schools that touched upon both the living conditions at the schools, as well as the inadequacies of the teachers and the curriculum. According to Meriam (1928, p. 359), the government was "attempting to do a highly technical job with untrained and, to a certain extent, even uneducated people."

Berry (1969) reviewed the ea ., and subsequent literature on American Indian education and concluded that criticisms such as those contained in the Meriam Report about teachers are rare in more recent literature and "that many of the observations made in the Meriam Report no longer apply." Birchard (1970) also reviewed literature and data on Indian boarding schools, but was much less optimistic in his appraisal of these schools.

A number of "histories" of BIA ORBS have been written; for example, Epperson's (1952) history of federal boarding schools up to 1933. Wild's work (1941) provides a history of education in the southern plains (Southwestern Oklahoma) which reviews early history and school policies of Concho, Fort Sill, Riverside, Chilocco, and other boarding schools. Mishou (1942) researched the development of

federal schools for Alaska Natives from 1885 until 1941, including the early history of Mt. Edgecumbe boarding school and the Wrangell Institute, and the use of ORBS in the "lower 48" states to educate Alaska Native students.

There are also a number of specific histories of individual boarding schools. A history of Chemawa was written by Lemmon (1941). Another history of Chemawa Indian School written by McKeehan (1981) details the background of the school as well as its relationship to various government policies for Indians and Indian education. McKeehan also documents a shift in the school's philosophy from totally assimilative in nature to a more pluralistic bent involving the reinforcement and preservation of Indian culture.

Other historical works include Albuquerque Indian School by McKinney (1934), Flandreau Indian School by Kizer (1940), Riverside Indian School by Hangar (1971) and Shannon (1971), Fort Sill Indian School by Doty (1971), and St. Paul's Indian School by Suttmiller (1963). Also, historical summaries of these schools and others are found in numerous studies and evaluations done on ORBS as well as various tribal educational histories. A recent study by McBeth (1983) documents many of the experiences, attitudes and perspectives of former boarding school students in West-Central Oklahoma, and, like McKeehan (1981), shows how the philosophies of ORBS have evolved over time to such concerns as the provision of remedial programs and curriculum dealing with Indian culture and history, and the social needs of Indian students.

Government Documents

Numerous documents relevant to off-reservation boarding schools have come from a number of different governments. Congressional hearings, evaluations, research, and general information have contributed to knowledge of ORBS' operation and their overall effects on students. Also the government has hired

academic institutions and private sector firms to study ORBS. This review of federal documents is divided into three parts: Congressional documents; Bureau of Indian Affairs documents and publications; and miscellaneous government documents and publications. It is not exhaustive and basically covers only those documents and publications in general circulation.

Congressional Documents and Publications

Congress has been the forum for many criticisms of the BIA in general and Indian boarding schools in particular. It has also focused in-depth attention on the processes by which these schools operate and how they affect the Indian students attending them. Testimony regarding federal Indian boarding schools has been given before a number of Congressional committees and sub-committees. The defense and justification for ORBS have also taken place within this special forum.

Hearings before the Special Sub-Committee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, at the March 30, 1968 meeting at Flagstaff, Arizona[1], focused attention on the education of Indian children. Correspondence from BIA boarding school employees brought out the frustration experienced by school employees who felt hampered by the BIA organizational infrastructure. A paper by Dr. Robert L. Bergman (1973) was also a part of the testimony considered at the March 30 hearing. Bergman's position was critical of the manner in which the boarding schools operated, as well as the prevalence of certain detrimental conditions in the homeliving environment. In his paper, Bergman stated:

> The most basic need, I think, is to recognize that the life of the boarding school student outside the classroom is more important than his formal education, and that if the children are to grow up successfully, away from their parents, some substitute must be provided. Programs stemming from this recognition will be costly and will require educating those concerned to a new approach because with present attitudes, increased

1 Hearings were held between 1967 through 1969 at other locations.

> money will be spent for teaching equipment rather than on people. Dormitory personnel must be increased by a factor of about four, which would provide one attendant on duty for 15 to 20 children. The dormitory attendant's importance must be recognized so that their morale, their freedom of action, and their status in the eyes of the children will be improved. It would be best if the dormitory personnel knew the children, were familiar with the ways of their families, and spoke their native language. There is no supply of such people with any particular training for the task, and such a supply must be created by hiring Indian people and training them. This could be accomplished by also hiring experienced child care workers as dormitory supervisors and in-service educators. For example, people with experience in residential treatment centers might serve in such supervisory and training capacities. They would be particularly qualified for the work because if they came from good institutions they would have learned what is most important for anyone working in a boarding school to learn, namely, to examine his own attitudes and behavior in order to understand and reach children.

Bergman goes on to stress that the problem with children in schools coming into constant opposition is not necessarily restricted to Indian schools, but in most cases affects Indian children in ORBS much more seriously than White children attending public schools. Further, this will continue unless adequate dormitory care is given to Indian children.

In 1969 the Sub-Committee on Indian Education (as part of the Kennedy Report) published a Compendium of Evaluations Done on Federal Boarding Schools by private individuals and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (U.S. Congress, Senate Sub-Committee on Indian Education, November 1969). This report contains evaluations of 13 off-reservation boarding schools which served over 90% of the Indian boarding school population at that time. Much of the Sub-Committee's concern was directed at the psychological ramifications stemming from Indian children's attendance at ORBS. It proceeded to conduct evaluative studies of each school through the assistance of mental health and education specialists. The schools which were evaluated included Albuquerque Indian School, Busby Boarding School, Chilocco Indian School, Flandreau and Pierre Indian Schools, Haskell Institute, Intermountain Indian School, Magdalena Dormitory, Mt. Edgecumbe Boarding School, Oglala Community School, Phoenix Boarding School, Seneca Boarding

School and Jones Academy, Sherman Institute, and Stewart Indian School. These evaluations documented the problems at ORBS in administration, curriculum, personnel, and the effect of the schools on students' mental health.

A study by ABT Associates of Cambridge, Massachusetts, under the auspices of the Sub-Committee on Indian Education, reported dissatisfaction with the personnel situation in the boarding schools. Their report indicated:

> In the dormitories the inadequacy of student guidance is heightened by the many other demands on the counselor's time. Since the majority of the dormitory personnel are responsible for building maintenance and for punishment, as well as for guidance, it is hardly surprising that students rarely confide in them. They must see that floors are mopped, rooms neat, and misbehavior punished. At the same time, each one is expected to be like a father or a mother to one hundred or more boys or girls, and to provide them with the love and attention they would receive at home. This task, impossible even for the best trained counselor, is usually assigned to untrained persons. Some have personal problems of their own which manifest themselves in the disregard or mistreatment of students.

The general overview provided in the Compendium of the Evaluations states that the following situation at Stewart School is typical of all the schools. The following summary was provided for Stewart Indian School in its evaluation:

> Stated succinctly, we feel Stewart is a tragedy. Historically an isolated school for problem children, it is now the school to which Indian children from the Southwest are sent as the only alternative to dropping out of education entirely. At Stewart these children are passed from one vocational department to another, never receiving sufficient training to prepare them for jobs, and never receiving the remedial programs necessary to cope with their deficiencies in reading and writing English. They graduate from the school with a high school diploma and a ninth grade education. The teachers at Stewart know their task is hopeless. They accept the 'low potential' of their students, and expect to prepare them for the lowest of occupations. They are indifferent, uncreative, and defeated. The guidance staff attempts to ameliorate the school's archaic social rules, but must fight dormitory aides who were educated at Stewart and who believe in an enforced strict discipline and puritanism. The principal believes in trying new approaches and remedial programs, but must work with teachers whom he has not chosen, and a completely inadequate budget. The schools must obey rigid social rules characteristic of reform schools, while living under the lie that they are actually receiving a high school education. They have almost no contact with the world outside the barbed wire boundaries of the campus, and cannot even return to their homes for Christmas. That they remain vibrantly alive human beings at Stewart is neither an excuse for the school's existence nor a negation of the tragedy. They remain children confused and threatened by

White America, deprived of an adequate education and subject to inhumane rules restricting every aspect of their lives.

The hearings and testimony before the Sub-Committee on Indian Education in 1968 and 1969, as well as the various evaluations which were conducted on federal Indian boarding schools, resulted in the Kennedy Report of 1969. This report titled "Indian Education: A National Tragedy, A National Challenge," called for a review of the principles and procedures by which many of the off-reservation boarding schools operated. The Kennedy Report found that little had changed since the 1928 Meriam Report and recommended reform within the Bureau of Indian Affairs (largely through reorganization of the BIA), and through increased participation of tribes and Indian parents in the education of Indian children. As a result, the early 1970's saw many changes in off-reservation boarding schools. For instance, curriculum in Indian culture, history and social studies, as well as an emphasis on student rights and the involvement of Indian school boards helped to affirm the bi-cultural nature of these schools.

In February of 1977, hearings were held by the Sub-Committee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives concerning oversight hearings on Indian education. Prior to the hearings, the Sub-Committee staff spent 73 man days in the field and visited a total of 51 BIA schools including seven off-reservation boarding schools. A report by the Sub-Committee staff contained the following observations:

(1) A major problem of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is lack of leadership. The positions of Commissioner and Director of Education Programs have been subject to frequent change and the resulting instability has created an untenable situation. This pattern within the Central Office is often repeated in the field, creating an ever-widening leadership vacuum. The various area offices have been allowed to go their own way, without direction, or, in many cases, accountability. This has led to great variations in program performance, an overall lack of policy formation, and frustration on the part of tribes and local BIA officials,

who see inquiries and suggestions effectively ignored. Because of this leadership problem, the Bureau lacks a sense of mission . . . .

(2) The BIA suffers from a lack of information gathering and program monitoring capabilities. Information systems are directed towards aggregating dollar amounts to submit to Congress and the justification of these amounts. Information which would be useful in formulation of policy (i.e., administrative versus program costs, accurate student information, community makeups, staff abilities and performance) is either non-existent or not available to those in policy making positions. This situation is further complicated by the varying levels of cooperation within the divisions of the Central Office and between the Central Office and field. This failure to communicate has made it extremely difficult for the Sub-Committee staff to obtain needed information and may explain why some BIA decisions from the Central Office, Area or Agency level, are difficult to effectuate in the schools and are sometimes ignored.

(3) The BIA has a plethora of problems (i.e., facilities maintenance and construction, personnel, budget control, etc.), which are administrative in nature. Along with these go various policy questions (i.e., boarding schools, Indian self-determination, and community control). Coherent policies and specific operations procedures must be formulated to deal with all of these problems and the formulation of these solutions must begin now . . . . The staff stresses that any policy formulations should occur through the system, with BIA constituent tribal input, and should not be formulated outside the system and subsequently imposed. Such impositions led to resistance on the part of both field personnel and local tribes and will contribute to the problem, not its solution.

(4) In the past, too much Bureau time has been spent in justification and excuse-making in anticipation of, or in response to, criticism. Not enough effort has gone into a true commitment to solve problems.

In addition to the Report of the Sub-Committee Staff, supporting testimony was given by a number of BIA education specialists and administrators. For example, Dr. Noah Allen, Superintendent of the Phoenix Indian Boarding School, indicated that school boards for Indian boarding schools lack any authority or power and that they are strictly advisory in nature. Allen also contended that the education components in Area Offices do little to merit their existence and that the technical and logistical help and support that is received from them at the boarding school level does not merit the great outlay in personnel and money to provide this level of infrastructure. Allen further stated that the school board, superintendent, and the school should, in fact, be regulated by the state and the

accrediting organizations throughout the country, meaning specifically that he sees no need for Bureau schools to be regulated in any fashion different from the public schools.

During hearings before the Select Committe on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, on Oversight of Indian Education on July 24, 1980, testimony was offered regarding the closure of Fort Sill Indian School and Stewart Indian School. This testimony completely contradicted statements from evaluations done in previous years. James Pierce, President of the National Federation of Federal Employees, stated that the only ORBS in Nevada has a fine curriculum including programs not available at other schools. Pierce stated:

> The school offers a human relations course, experienced career education, athletic programs, and instrumental music programs (not available at the Sherman and Intermountain Schools). Stewart is unique among the Indian schools for owning and operating a 27 hundred acre ranch. The large ranch affords Stewart the opportunity to offer ranch management, heavy equipment operations, and a forestry management program. In addition, in cooperation with the County Sheriff's Office and the Carson City Police Department, the school offers a Police Cadet Program.

Other testimony by Pierce, Richard Martin from the Stewart Indian School, and Dr. Ted Beavers from the Fort Sill Indian School concerning the practice of furloughing BIA teachers and staff during the summer and its effects on both staff and student morale affirmed earlier discussions of staff problems. In his testimony, Beavers stated that there was so much anxiety among students, dormitory aides, academic staff, and plant management staff, that proper work could not even be accomplished at Fort Sill Indian School. Regarding the furloughing of BIA teachers, Pierce stated:

> While it is true that most public school teachers do not work during the summer vacations, it is also true, particularly where their salaries are set through collective bargaining, that they receive 12 months' salary for the 10 months of the school term. In fact, many school systems spread these salary checks over the full calendar year. BIA educators receive no salary at all when they are furloughed. Other options available to many public school teachers, such as teaching summer school, are also not open to BIA personnel. The budget constraints now preclude active summer school programs. The

> cruelest blow is the fact that these workers cannot even receive unemployment compensation during the period of layoff. Sections 3304(a)(6) of Title 26 U.S.C. denies compensation to employees of education institutions for time between school years or terms if they have a reasonable expectation that they will be hired back the next year or term. BIA educators in furlough positions, like construction workers, face periods of time without work, hence, without pay. However, unlike construction workers, the benefits society provides to seasonal employees are denied them.

Testimony at the July 24, 1980 hearing by Pierce, Beavers, Martin, and others provided at least some rational explanation of the high turnover and low morale among BIA teachers and other education positions cited in other early literature sources. Overall, the July 24 Indian Education Oversight Hearing focused on four issues: the proposed closing of Fort Sill and Stewart Indian Boarding Schools; the furloughing of Bureau of Indian Affairs teachers; contract schools' problems with indirect costs and operations and maintenance funding; and, a study of Johnson O'Malley's support for basic school operation. Citing possible reductions in educational opportunities and increased crowding in other schools, representatives of the Apache, Kiowa, and Commanche Tribes of Oklahoma, the Phoenix Area Inter-Tribal School Board, the Reno-Sparks Tribal Council, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, the National Congress of American Indians, the National Federation of Federal Employees, and the Fort Sill and Stewart Indian Schools opposed the school closings and BIA restrictions on student transportation. The National Council of BIA Educators and the National Federation of Federal Employees opposed teacher furloughs. Representatives of the Coalition of Indian Controlled School Boards, the Navajo Nation, and the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon expressed concern about Public Law 95-561. The National Congress of American Indians called for further research on Indian response to the Johnson-O-Malley Study. Earl Barlow, Director of the Office of Indian Education, justified the school closings and responded to funding questions.

On February 24, 1982, additional hearings were held concerning the closing of three more off-reservation boarding schools before the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs. The hearing before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, U.S. Senate, 97th Congress, Second Session, concerned the Bureau of Indian Affairs proposal to close three off-reservation boarding schools. Schools scheduled for closure were: Wahpeton Indian School, Wahpeton, North Dakota; Concho Indian School, Concho, Oklahoma; and the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute, Albuquerque, New Mexico. Bureau of Indian Affairs witnesses' testimony was built around the theme that boarding schools had outlived their intended purposes, that they were expensive, and that Indian children would be better off in other settings. Witnesses for the states of Oklahoma, North Dakota, and Utah all felt that the BIA had not supported their reasons for change, and that the Indian students would be better off in the present boarding home situation.

During another Indian Education Oversight Hearing before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, U.S. Senate, on May 18 and 19, 1982, in Washington, D.C., testimony by Joseph Abeyta, Superintendent, Santa Fe Indian School, provided additional information on the operation and effects of ORBS. According to Abeyta, students at the Santa Fe School are achieving at grade level or above. The previous year 43 out of 82 graduating seniors went on to higher education. Out of that 43, at least five received academic scholarships to the University of New Mexico and another received a University of New Mexico Presidental Scholarship. Perhaps more significant, however, were Abeyta's comments on how the government has handicapped the operation of ORBS through inadequate funding and widely fluctuating program policies that have resulted in confusion, frustration, and uncertainty. Examples cited include federal resources and programs for Indian education that have been reduced, transferred, or eliminated; the lack of financial support from the BIA for basic program needs; and, the fact that BIA operations

result in waste and inefficiency. Abeyta goes on to cite examples of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' inefficient organization and over-bureaucratization. Other testimony at the May 18 and 19 hearing included statements by Charles Geboe, Superintendent of Intermountain Indian School, Brigham City, Utah, who expressed concern about the closing of Intermountain Indian School and its effect on unique programs currently located there. Geboe specifically cited the single parent program which involved 33 unwed mothers and their children. The May 18 and 19 hearing focused on two principal topics; federal responsibility for the education of Indians, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs' education services which include the BIA elementary and secondary schools and contract schools. A common thread which ran throughout the testimony of all the tribal witnesses, and witnesses representing Indian organizations, centered around the lack of budget for effective Indian education programs.

Bureau of Indian Affairs Documents and Publications

The BIA has printed numerous materials concerning ORBS. This includes: statistics on Indian education (McLemore 1981, Leading Fighter 1981, and Paquin 1981); annual reports for each separate school; publications for the in-house training of staff; research on special problem areas; and evaluations of programs in schools.

Statistics concerning Indian education contain tabular statistical data on Bureau of Indian Affairs operated schools for various fiscal years. The data include: (1) the number of BIA boarding and day schools by area office; (2) the number of tribally operated boarding and day schools by area office; (3) BIA boarding school enrollment and average daily membership; (4) boarding school enrollment by grade; (5) day school enrollment and average daily membership; (6) day school enrollment by grade; (7) total boarding and day school enrollment by grade; (8) total boarding and day school enrollment and average daily membership;

(9) dormitory enrollment and average daily membership; (10) dormitory enrollment by grade; (11) tribally operated contract school enrollment and average daily membership; (12) contract school enrollment by grade; enrollment by degree of American Indian blood; (13) fiscal school year enrollment and school summary; (14) enrollment by tribe; (15) completions and graduations by area office; (16) Johnson-O'Malley enrollments by area office; (17) school construction summary; (18) participation in elementary and secondary education programs; (19) higher education program enrollment by area office; and (20) adult education program enrollment by area office. Also included are: a list of federally recognized tribes and bands; children's drawings; and a fact sheet indicating the number of Indian children enrolled by fiscal year and the average daily membership. Annual reports for each school are available through the Office of Indian Education Programs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, in Washington, D.C.

Publications for the in-house training staff fall largely in three areas. These include the instructional area, the home living area, and the guidance counseling area. Publications in the area of academic instruction include bi-lingual education for American Indians; curriculum needs of Navajo pupils; helpful hints for new BIA teachers; social studies in BIA schools; special education guidelines; and environmental awareness for Indian education. Publications on the home living environment include "Dormitory Life, Is It Living?" (1959) and a series on the preparation of BIA teachers and dormitory aides. The BIA has published a series on the preparation of BIA teachers and dormitory aides and another on guidance and counseling titled, It is a Time of Visions (1978). This series includes titles such as "Counseling Education Program, A New Approach," and "Reaching Out," a peer counselor program. A publication on American Indian high school guidance has also been published by BIA.

The BIA's Indian Education Resources Center located in Albuquerque has published a series on research and evaluation reports. Of the more than sixty reports which have been published in this series, a number are significant to this particular literature review. The first report in this series concerns a survey of the Chilocco Indian School in 1972-73 (U.S. Department of the Interior, BIA, Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 01, 1972). To obtain information, a goals development survey was mailed out to 1,600 parents, students, and alumni; one-third responded. On the average, respondants felt there was a need to: (1) keep Chilocco open and operating with existing staff; (2) develop ways to improve communication skills of students; and, (3) improve communication between school and home. According to the National Indian Education Association the study showed a number of weaknesses. The report was criticized by the NIEA as containing an assortment of confusing, disorganized details; failing to recognize the need for constructive reform in an institution where 300 students found their educational experiences irrelevant and meaningless; using mail-out questionnaires; and, lastly, being poorly conceived and lacking empirical verification (The National Indian Education Association 1976, p. 213).

Another study was conducted by Rosenbluth (1973) to provide an understanding of the educational environment at the Fort Sill Indian School and to exert positive influence for change. The Bureau of Indian Affairs schools' philosophy, goals, administrative management, and staffing were explained in the study. Various aspects of the school program were examined and recommendations made for the following areas: curriculum, mathematics and science, language arts, social sciences, industrial arts and home economics, dormitory living, out-of-class activities, cultural arts, athletic program and physical education, food services, enrollment accounting, and facilities. Program alternatives, including contracting,

were described and recommendations were made. Overall, the major goal of the evaluation was to review and develop the long-range goals of the institutions. A number of instruments were used to obtain different types of information from a variety of sources. To assess educational preference, a 33 item, forced choice, instrument was sent out to five hundred students, staff members, parents, tribal representatives, and others. The response was less than desirable but the researcher felt that ". . . consistent answers and ranking by persons . . . lend validity to the survey." (Rosenbluth 1973, p. 59, and The National Indian Education Association 1976, p. 213). According to a review of this study by the National Indian Education Association (1976), the educational goals were generalized from the material gathered in the survey and were briefly discussed. The report listed some twenty educational needs, ranging from improving the school's telephone system to refurbishing classrooms.

An evaluation of Riverside Indian High School at Anadarko had results that were generally positive (U.S. Department of the Interior, BIA, Research and Evaluation Report Series, No. 19.01, 1976). The evaluators, however, did find some deficiencies. Their recommendations, based on an analysis of their findings, were to explore and improve alternative methods of secondary education; to develop ways to improve staff and student relationships; to improve the physical facilities; and to decrease the drop-out rate.

Another report in the series (U.S. Department of the Interior, BIA, Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 11, 1972) describes pilot projects which were designed to experiment with methods of achieving the objectives of the off-reservation boarding school project and were conducted at Sherman Indian High School, Riverside, California, and at Chilocco Indian High School, Chilocco, Oklahoma. The general objectives for the ORBS project at each school were to review long-range goals, to identify and describe the existing program, to review

the existing program in terms of long-range goals, and to provide recommendations for meeting the long-range goals and objectives. The ORBS program covered the areas of goals and philosophy, school plant, curriculum, out-of-class activities, administration, evaluation, admissions practices, plant management, public and human relations, and health services. The project was devised as a vehicle for supplying the answers for the following questions concerning Indian education: Can ORBS continue to serve the needs of Indian youth? If so, what kinds of schools should and can they be? Should some of them have special purposes? What types of students should be enrolled? And most importantly, what place do ORBS play in a policy of self-determination? The report extensively describes the internal system by which ORBS operate and the conditions which are conducive for student achievement in an ORBS environment.

In August of 1973, the Bureau of Indian Affairs announced its decision to close the Intermountain Indian Boarding School, located in Brigham City, Utah, since its enrollment had declined from 2,150 to 800 students. Another Series Report (U.S. Department of the Interior, BIA, Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 24.02, 1975) states that this decision was based on two previous reports which gave the following reasons: the existence of adequate facilities schools on or near the Navajo Reservation to meet the students' needs; the Navajo Nation policy that Navajo students be educated on the reservation; and the high cost for operating the school. Tribal councils, Indian leaders, and Indian organizations all opposed the BIA's decision. In January of 1973, an All-Indian Study Commission had been formed to determine whether there were sufficient numbers of non-Navajo students to permit maintaining the Intermountain School at the eight hundred student level for the 1974-75 school year. This report presented the All-Indian Study Commission's report, the BIA's response, and the Navajo Area School Board Association's resolution. The report also contained information on

Intermountain School's monthly enrollment and attendance, off-reservation boarding school enrollment for school years '72, '73, and '74, off-reservation boarding school admission policies, information regarding program planning and development, and attendance boundaries and student eligibility. The Intermountain Evaluation Task Force was organized following the decision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Navajo Area Office to phase out the Intermountain Boarding School which provides high school education for Navajo youth. The policies of self-determination and a preference for schooling Navajo youngsters as close to home as possible brought about the phase-out decision. This, in turn, questioned the need for the continuance of the Intermountain School. The findings indicated that: (1) a secondary school serving various tribal groups does not seem desirable; (2) post-secondary education can be more easily obtained elsewhere; and, (3) the possibilities for utilizing the facilities for other non-BIA purposes were purely conjectural at the present time.

In 1973, the Project ANNA Report was released (U.S. Department of the Interior, BIA, Research and Evaluation Report Series, No. 18, 1973) which provided an assessment of Alaska Native needs in education. This research effort involved Bureau of Indian Affairs educational personnel; researchers from institutions of higher education lacking experience in Indian and Alaska Native education; and representatives from the Alaska Native community. The study attempted to identify educational preferences of Alaska Natives; develop a benchmark of educational information which reflected the current status of BIA programs; develop alternatives and make recommendations about the future role of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in education in Alaska; and develop alternatives and make recommendations concerning the future of the two BIA boarding schools in Alaska. The study involved the use of survey instruments to determine the attitudes of students and school board members, and the educational needs of resident boarding

schools. The results revealed that students want to retain boarding and village schools as options; generally want to go beyond secondary school for more education; and prefer a two-world goal, that is, to be educated in such a manner that they can live and be successful in or out of the home village. A complex survey instrument was used for the boarding school segment of the study. A review by the National Indian Education Association (1976) stated that the results focused on the extent to which needs are being met rather than an assessment of existing needs. The review found the Project ANNA survey instruments to be minimally adequate and the accuracy of its data was questionable.

A survey of the characteristics of students attending Fort Sill and Chilocco Indian Schools (U.S. Department of the Interior, BIA, Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 55, 1976) was conducted by the Albuquerque Indian Education Resources Center. Student records from Fort Sill and Chilocco Indian Schools were examined for purposes of determining needed educational programs. Data were obtained for: all students who had completed the '75-'76 school year and were expected to return; all '75-'76 seniors who had graduated; and, all other students for whom pre- and post-test data were available. In all, 172 records were reviewed for Fort Sill and 206 records for Chilocco. The characteristics examined were sex distribution, state of residence, family structure, type of school previously attended, and age. Fort Sill results indicated that 54.7% of the students were over grade level, 82.6% had problems while in attendance at other schools, primarily non-BIA schools, 53.5% came from broken homes, and 29.7% came from tribes located outside the state of Oklahoma. Chilocco results indicated a normal sex distribution for all but the 12th grade where only 39.7% were female, only 52.4% came from tribes in Oklahoma, 46.6% lived with both parents, 43.2% lived with a single parent, 10.2% lived with other than parents, 85.9% came from other than BIA schools, and 62.6% were over-age grade level. It was concluded that

attitudinal, emotional, academic, familial, cultural, and environmental characteristics of the students should be further analyzed in depth so that a total educational program could be developed to address the problems of these Indian students, and, that funding and facilities should be provided to help the boarding school alter the total behavior of the student.

A report by Underwood (1976) surveyed 18 Bureau of Indian Affairs operated ORBS and developed a profile of students attending them. Investigating these schools, a survey team of researchers in law, accounting, education, and psychology gathered data from the 18 ORBS, three elementary, 12 secondary, and three post-secondary schools. The following aspects of the schools were examined: student characteristics; teacher-pupil ratios; operating costs from 1972-1975; per pupil costs for each school (1975); operating costs for elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools (1975); dorm facilities; distribution of 1975 boarding school expenditures; annual operating costs versus consumer price index; major costs (total, education, facilities, and title programs); and, construction costs. The major conclusions were: per pupil costs were not inordinate; post-secondary admissions policies were based on local rather than formal BIA policies; personnel costs were substantially fixed via Civil Services salaries; attempts to evaluate educational programs appeared minimal; uniformity of fiscal categories and program definition categories were minimal; the development of long-range career plans was not often accomplished; there was little cooperation between local colleges and Indian boarding schools; teaching personnel were not always qualified; there was no systematic method of allocating funds; and, most significant, major recommendations from the 1969 Kennedy Report had yet to be implemented.

The hearings held by the Special Sub-Committee on Indian Education from 1967 through 1969 at various locations across the United States were extremely damaging to BIA's efforts to continue the operation of ORBS as "business as

usual." Beginning in the early seventies, the BIA began to conduct its own program aimed at justifying the existence and continued operation of ORBS. An evaluation report on the Pierre Indian School (U.S. Department of the Interior, BIA, Aberdeen Area Office, 1973) provides an assessment of the special education needs of Indian children in the Aberdeen area and six possible courses of action for Pierre Indian School. The first section reported in detail the findings of the needs assessment, which was conducted with a survey questionnaire and was completed by 137 individuals concerned with Indian education. The conclusions drawn from the data were that a need existed for an off-reservation boarding school program for students with unusual social-emotional learning handicaps and that the program should provide a quality family/home living component. The second section proposed and evaluated the following alternatives: (1) continue Pierre Indian School's 1972-1973 program and upgrade it with appropriate staff and renovation of the fiscal plant; (2) close the school, reassign the students, and design programs in each of the area boarding schools in the Aberdeen area which were already serving Indian children with learning handicaps; (3) provide a qualified specialist to help schools meet special needs; (4) establish group homes on reservations to serve students with special needs; (5) obtain special education services on a contract basis; and, (6) proceed with the present program at Pierre Indian School and make systematic improvements in spite of staffing and budget constraints.

In 1978, an advisory committee, composed of BIA education program administrators, was formed to assess off-reservation residential schools operated by the BIA. A report prepared by the Committee on Off-Reservation Residential Schools (Sahmaunt 1978) attempted to provide an Indian viewpoint as well as a justification of the BIA's continued operation of these schools. The Committee's report attempted to show that the schools were still needed and necessary to educate Indian children. Interestingly, the Committee did not argue that ORBS

were better suited than public schools to educate Indian children but, rather, argued that ORBS were necessary to fulfill diverse social needs of Indian children which public schools could not fulfill.

A summation of research literature and other documents, published or sponsored by the BIA, is difficult to make regarding ORBS. Several common themes do emerge, however: most of the literature dates from the early to mid 1970s; the method of evaluation, survey, or research, varies widely and has often been subject to critical review; and in almost all cases where recommendations were made, they failed to be implemented.

Miscellaneous Government Documents and Publications

Although Congressional Committees and Sub-Committees and the Bureau of Indian Affairs provide the major portion of the literature concerned with ORBS, other federal agencies contribute to the evaluation of the management and operation of ORBS. Much of this work has been critical of the BIA. In a report to Congress in October of 1978, the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the management weaknesses in the BIA which had been identified in numerous studies, including a GAO Report in 1975 on the funding of Indian education programs (U.S. GAO, 1975, 1978). The report concluded that legislation was necessary because the BIA has failed to correct the weaknesses despite numerous reports, recommendations, and hearings.

Another report (U.S. Comptroller General, 1972) addressed opportunities to improve Indian education in schools operated by the BIA. The staff of the Comptroller General's Office reviewed testimony given before the Sub-Committee on Indian Education, various evaluation reports and other research, as well as recommendations made in the Kennedy Report and by the National Advisory Council on Indian education. The staff concluded that there was a need to revise

the operation, management, and administration of BIA schools. The 1972 report was addressed specifically to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but by 1978 it was evident that few, if any, of the recommendations had been implemented.

A report (U.S. Comptroller General, 1978) also completed in 1978 stated that the Bureau of Indian Affairs was not operating their boarding schools efficiently. This report argued that the BIA could save several million dollars and improve the operating efficiency by consolidating schools to make greater use of space and equipment, establishing policies for controlling expenditures, and having adequate staff and funds to maintain them properly.

According to this report, the BIA operated 15 off-reservation and 57 on-reservation boarding schools for 18,562 students in 1977. An investigation into the operation of these schools had found buildings and dormitories vacant, classrooms half empty, expensive equipment unused, and funds mismanaged. Some schools were poorly maintained with some conditions presenting safety hazards. Boarding schools, both on and off the reservation, were, for the most part, ignoring BIA eligibility criteria and admitting students whose eligibility had not been verified. Six off-reservation schools, designed for 6,320 students, had a combined enrollment of only 2,654. The BIA was aware of under-utilization of its off-reservation boarding schools but had been unable, or unwilling, to consolidate them because of Congressional and/or tribal actions. The information contained in this report was obtained through examination of reports and documents, visits to five BIA headquarters and area offices, interviews with BIA officials, school administrators, and tribal officials, and inspections of six off-reservation and four on-reservation boarding schools.

The reports by the GAO and the Comptroller General show that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, despite adverse testimony, evaluation reports, and specific

recommendations over a ten-year period, was either unable or unwilling to change their administrative and budgetary procedures in schools operated by the Bureau. Public Law 95-561, enacted in November 1978, mandated certain structural changes in the BIA to overcome management deficiencies and to reaffirm the policy of Indian control over education of Indian children. The Act provided for direct funding to the school based on an equitable formula, local control of personnel staffing, direct line authority from the Office of Indian Education programs to the schools, development of uniform procedures and practices, and an overall policy of Indian control of education. However, the act did allow the central BIA administration to maintain overall control of the operation of ORBS.

The School Environment

This section examines the ORBS literature which deals with school environment. Specifically, we are concerned with four aspects: administration, academic instruction, home living or dormitory life, and guidance and counseling.

Administration

The previous section highlighted many of the BIA management and administrative deficiencies. The primary emphasis here is on the administration and budgetary process in off-reservation boarding school organizations.

Paxton (1971) looked at perceptions of power in a federal boarding school. He investigated congruence among the views of students, staff, and Indian parents in order to examine perceptions of the relative power of various factions in affecting the allocation of system resources and the implementation of programs. The data indicated: (1) that there was a lack of congruence among respondents regarding the relative power of various groups in affecting both resource

allocations and program implementation; (2) students, staff, and parents viewed various actors and groups in the larger society as being the most influential in the decision-making process and viewed themselves as being the least influential; (3) students and parents viewed the advisory school board as being the most influential of the groups; and (4) school staff viewed the advisory school board as having very little influence.

Hammerschlag (1973) examined the problems of American Indian boarding schools from a systems perspective. He concluded that the schools have failed to define primary tasks, that is, to educate Indian children versus handling Indian children's behavioral problems. He states

> "In accepting the role of agent of social controls, the school overreaches its resources, leaving precious little time for scholarly endeavors. Since they are unable to deal with students who act out and drop out, the staff members begin to wonder what they are doing here; they eventually withdraw and simply survive from day to day."

He also states that in systems terms, the school fails to define its primary task.

> "The sub systems operate as if they exist only to serve their individual ends; and that their inability to articulate, to make their boundaries more permeable, and together to more clearly define the primary task, is expressed in frustration, powerlessness, and a feeling of weariness and dissatisfaction."

Dlugokinski (1974) suggests that boarding school experiences accentuate rather than resolve problems for Indian children and that at least part of the problem seems to stem from uncertainty as to the school system's continued existence. He states that

> "In one secondary school in Oklahoma where we provided consultation, the staff was uncertain whether they or their school would continue from one year to the next. Everyone seemed to be involved in a kind of holding action; the implicit guideline was to make no noise and cause no notice. It was as if the staff, perhaps adaptively, hoped that it could creep quietly into another year of existence. In order for a person to effectively examine himself and his behavior a basic sense of security must be present. In many Indian schools, this type of examination has not taken place, primarily because there is no such security at the institution's base."

Colfer (1975) examined the administrative structure and process at Chemawa Indian High School in Salem, Oregon. He describes the many administrative problems that arise from lack of communication and coordination among various staff sub-groups at the institution, the power struggles and political maneuverings of the overall staff at Chemawa, and the competition among staff groups for limited budgetary resources. Colfer sees the entire Chemawa staff as being divided into two areas, guidance versus academic. She states,

> "Within the school, academic and guidance must always be at war with one another because each year a new budget is produced and, upon that budget hinges the fate, in terms of resource allocation, of the segment. In 1971, for instance, guidance lost a round when the superintendent, in an effort to save money for the school at large, removed a large percentage of the dormitory permanent positions, replacing them with temporary positions so that Chemawa would not have to pay summer salaries to as many guidance personnel."

Colfer views the administrative and budgetary process at Chemawa as a vicious circle in which (1) Chemawa has a power structure which is segmentary in nature; (2) inflation, increased expectations of the people, and a shortage of money combine with the segmentary structure to make the strategy of predatory expansion adaptive; and (3) the stated goals of the school's segments are set aside because of the necessity to ward off invading segments.

A study by Charleston (1980) investigated the relationship between educational administrators' positions and their support for local Indian control of Indian education in the BIA. As Public Law 95-561 mandated, organizational changes in the Bureau of Indian Affairs suggested the need to determine whether educational administrators supported the policy of Indian control of Indian education versus the historical practice of administration by the BIA in Indian education. As his data base, Charleston used a national survey of all BIA educational administrators and tribal administrators, obtaining a 64% response rate. Charleston's findings indicated that

> "The local school supervisors and local Indian school boards were contenders against the agency superintendents for education for control over the managerial functions. The area level administrators and tribal employees tended to support the school level administrators and local control in opposition to the agency level administrators and the BIA employees who supported agency control to a greater extent than the local control. It was predicted that the BIA will tend to support the agency level administrators over the local school level administrators. Based on the responses of the educational administrators, it was predicted that the BIA will fail to fully implement policy of Indian control of Indian education."

The studies by Paxton (1971) and Charleston (1980) are indicative of general administrative problems within the hierarchical structure of the BIA, which relates not only to ORBS but to other subdivisions of the BIA organizational structure as well. The study by Colfer (1975) illustrates the problems which can beset individual ORBS, but over which they have little control, since the difficulties arise from the organizational hierarchy of the BIA. There are few studies on specific ORBS such as the one done by Colfer (1975) and, thus, it is difficult to determine whether the problems of conflict and competition among various staff sub-groups at Chemawa Indian High School are found in other ORBS as well. However, a study by ABT Associates (1969) found that one of the principal obstacles to the achievement of the educational goals in BIA schools was the twofold problem of school management and administration. It was concluded that the BIA and the Department of the Interior should take steps to reform the confused administrative chain of command of BIA schools.

The study by ABT Associates (1969, p. 40) also suggested that the relative inefficiency of the administrative system of the BIA is due, in part, to unclear allocations of responsibility and ill-defined hierarchies of authority. The study also noted that although parts of the BIA administrative system are inefficient and slow to respond to the needs of the Indian population, transfer of the BIA to another department of the federal government would be a less efficient means of improving its operations than internal reorganization. The ABT Associates' recommended

form of internal reorganization would have given the assistant commissioner for education direct line authority over area, agency, reservation, and school superintendents. This authority would be shared at each level by Indian school, reservation, agency, area, and national board. Thus, the interests of both the local Indian communities and of national policy would be represented in control of Indian schools.

It was also noted in the ABT report that the civil service status of BIA teachers and staff members has deleterious effects on the instruction offered by BIA schools. Administrators are constrained by regulations from offering outstanding teachers salaries commensurate with their abilities, and from discharging incompetent employees, except with great difficulty. Recruitment of promising applicants is also hampered. It was also reported that the turnover rate among BIA teachers is much higher than most schools in the United States. Often, the most ambitious and promising teachers are those who leave the system first.

As stated previously, it appears that BIA schools have failed to define their primary task as being whether to educate or handle children with behavior problems. In addition, no clear policy exists as to whether schools should provide vocational training, academic instruction, or a combination of both. As a result, decisions are made without the benefit of local studies or needs' assessments, or nationwide research and analysis. As a result, programs may not always conform to the stated goals of the overall BIA educational system, or be in line with objectives set by the local school board. The ABT report suggested that a more clearly defined hierarchy of authority and responsibility would make local administrators more responsive both to local needs and to directives from higher authorities.

A final note regarding administration: The study by ABT Associates (1969) and the Kennedy Report (1969) both indicated that BIA schools were insufficiently funded to overcome the students' difficulties resulting from poverty and cultural barriers. Later studies and evaluations also indicated that BIA schools, particularly ORBS, were insufficiently funded.

Academic Instruction

This review of academic instruction as it relates to ORBS will look at four specific areas: teachers, curriculum, achievement, and bicultural education.

The ABT study (1969) stated that the principal reason for the deficiency of education in BIA schools was the inadequacy of instruction offered. They observed that

> "Programs should be begun immediately for the improved recruitment, selection, training, and supervision of teachers, counselors, and teaching aides. Continuous curriculum development efforts, such as the BIA's Project Necessities, are also necessary if curricula are to be made more appropriate to the needs of Indian students; new curricula in the area of language arts are most urgently required."

The investigators found that BIA teachers and administrators sometimes appeared to expect their students to do poorly in school. This could result in a self-fulfilling prophecy. The author also pointed out that teachers and administrators did not always show sufficient initiative or imagination in overcoming resource constraints in order to provide effective instruction. However, the evaluation of the Albuquerque Indian School (U.S. Congress, Senate Sub-Committee on Indian Education, 1969) indicated that the teachers and administrators at the school were stiffled in their efforts toward creativity and imagination. Both students and faculty at Albuquerque were concerned about the number of restrictions that were placed upon them by BIA regulations. It is important to point out that the nature of academic instruction at ORBS historically has alienated Indian students.

It has only been within the last 15 years that these schools have become oriented to the bicultural needs of the Indian students attending them. Due to the fact that many BIA employees have been working for the Bureau since the days when it was Bureau policy to promote cultural assimilation, it is understandable that the desirability of bicultural education will be much easier stated than accomplished.

Teachers

Since the establishment of the first off-reservation boarding school for Indian students, questions have been raised about the qualifications of individuals teaching at these schools (Foreman 1928-31, Fox 1943, Lehman 1942, and Meriam 1928). However, a review of the literature by Berry (1969) found little difference in the qualifications of BIA teachers and those employed in public schools. The government evaluations done on 13 BIA boarding schools in 1969 (U.S. Congress, Senate Sub-Committee on Indian Education, 1969), in examining Albuquerque Indian School, found that at least half of the members of the fifty person faculty had master's degrees, the superintendent possessed a doctoral degree, and a number of other faculty members were in the process of earning doctorates. They also found the turnover rate relatively low, with the majority of teachers at Albuquerque employed for 14 years or more. In addition, the salaries paid to BIA teachers were considerably higher than those paid to public school teachers in Albuquerque.

One part of the national study of American Indian education stated that BIA teachers are older, more experienced, less dissatisfied with their general situation, and less susceptible to teacher turnover than urban teachers of Indian children (Havighurst 1970). Few inferior teachers were found in any of the Indian schools studied. Perhaps the most serious cause for concern regarding teachers in ORBS is poor morale due to uncertainties involving teacher separation and retention. Letchworth (1972) found a separation rate of 36% for BIA teachers; higher

employment termination rates among those teachers with high incongruity in their work environment; and a relationship between termination and dominant career patterns.

Although the Havighurst (1970) study found the attitudes of BIA teachers favorable, the ABT Associates (1969) study recommended that a continuing program for teachers and administrators regarding the educational capabilities of Indian students was essential and that this training could help to overcome the problem of self-fulfilling prophecies.

A study by Garrison (1971) examined factors related to teacher turnover in BIA schools. Although not specifically targeted at ORBS, Garrison examined the relationship of teacher turnover to selected personal factors and teachers' perceptions of employment conditions. He found that age was a significant factor in turnover, with those under thirty terminating at a higher rate than those over thirty. Female teachers terminated at a higher rate than did male teachers, and in terms of Civil Service grade, the highest termination rate was for G.S.-7, the next highest for G.S.-9, and the lowest for G.S.-11. In addition, teachers with negative perceptions of the school environment terminated at a higher rate than did those with positive perceptions. There was no significant difference between those who terminated and those who remained with respect to the following factors: marital status, ethnic origin, number of school-age children, years of teaching experience, assignment in major field, size of home community, regional origin, method of referral, size of school to which they were assigned, remoteness of the school's location, employment of the spouse, working conditions, supervision, school assignment, and living conditions.

Other literature has focused on those teacher characteristics which are associated with effective teaching of Indian children. Kleinfeld (1975) identified a number of desirable personality and behavioral traits for teachers of Indian and Eskimo students. Various non-verbal modes of effective communication are cited

by Kleinfeld which include smiling, close body distance, and touch. Kleinfeld further states that after personal rapport has been established teachers should demand a high level of academic work. Kleinfeld states,

> The characteristic of active demandingness may have special importance in effective teaching cross-culturally for several reasons. As previously discussed, teachers in a cross-cultural context tend to be more uncertain of the relevance and legitimacy of their requirements and, hence, more hesitant about making academic demands. Second, Indian and Eskimo students may play the role of shy Native. Many students have found over the years that White teachers expect Native students to stare mutely at the floor when confronted with an academic demand. Students then learn to use this behavior to avoid difficult tasks. Third, village Indian and Eskimo students tend to have low academic self-concepts. What this means in the classroom is that students underestimate what they actually can do. Thus, if students are to produce what they are capable of, the teacher must demand more than students think they are capable of.

Another study by Kleinfeld (1971) described instructional strategies for teachers of Indian and Eskimo students. Kleinfeld's recommendations were summarized by the National Indian Education Association (1976) Review of the Literature on Educational Needs and Problems of American Indians and Alaska Natives. Kleinfeld's instructional strategies include: (1) personalism--experimenting with ways to harmonize personal teaching style with students' learning styles; (2) competitiveness--devising teaching methods to cope with passive students; (3) joking--using the Native method of correction; (4) project, reward, and work rhythm--assigning concentrated work followed by material rewards and relaxation; (5) observational learning--using image based instructions; (6) community based anchoring ideas--relating instructional materials to students' community experiences; (7) parental involvement--informing parents about the why and hows of the methods and strategies used.

It must be noted that most studies and references cited in this particular section are applicable to Indian education in general, and that the specific application to ORBS is taken within that context. Hebdon (1965) examined the overall nature of instructional staffs at Intermountain Boarding School in Brigham

City, Utah, and Phoenix Indian High School in Phoenix, Arizona. Another study which deserves mention, although in a general context, is a study done by Tippeconnic (1975) which examined the relationship between teacher-pupil control ideology and student attitudes. The study examined Navajo boarding school students on the reservation and indicates that BIA boarding school students had more favorable attitudes towards school than public school students; females had more favorable attitudes toward schooling than males; and public school teachers were more custodial than BIA boarding school teachers.

Curriculum

This section examines the nature of curriculum offered in ORBS, the difficulties of teaching specific subject areas, and meeting special needs of Indian students. One of the early studies which assessed the nature of curriculum offered in ORBS examined secondary education offered at Chilocco Indian High School (Hathcoat, 1946). It was one of the first to make specific recommendations for changes in the nature of curriculum for ORBS. However, few studies have been done on the nature of curricula offered at ORBS. Much of the information regarding ORBS curriculum must be gleaned from federal evaluations and reports, as well as other government publications.

The Meriam Report (1928) describes the ORBS curriculum at that time as unrealistic and indicated that classroom instruction techniques were found ineffective. The report stressed the need for relevant instructional curriculum, adapted to the individual needs and background of the students, and noted the failure of the schools to take into consideration the nature of Indian languages. It was only under the leadership of BIA Commissioner John Collier during the 1930's that the BIA initiated efforts at bilingual education and relevant bicultural curriculum (Kennedy Report, 1969, p. 251).

It must be noted that the nature of curriculum at ORBS is often directly related to the educational criteria for admittance. The BIA admits students to ORBS for whom a public or federal day school is not available; for those who need special vocational or preparatory courses not available to them locally; and for those who are retarded scholastically or who have pronounced bilingual difficulties. Also, students are admitted under the BIA's social criteria (i.e., lack of or low school attendance) which may reflect former poor school attendance or difficulties with the former home environment. This may result in a condition similar to that found in Chilocco Indian High School, which characterized many of the ORBS in the early 1970s which were admitting students under the BIA's social criteria.

> "The few delinquents at Chilocco give the whole school a reform school atmosphere. A small number of the students are sent there because they can't get along anywhere else. These students force the administration to be very strict with rules and regulations. As a result, many teachers categorize all of the students as delinquent cases and treat them as such. It is no wonder that the students have little to say in class when they are thought of as poor, ignorant, Indian juvenile delinquents." (Kennedy Report, 1969, p. 169).

An evaluation report on Phoenix Indian High School revealed that more than 580 of the 1,000 enrolled students could be considered academically retarded. The nature of criteria used by the BIA for admission to ORBS makes it extremely unlikely that a school would be able to meet the needs of all the students. In response to this situation, by the early 1970s individual ORBS had begun to experiment with specialized programs in an attempt to meet needs characterized by the BIA's criteria for admissions. The 1969 evaluation of Stewart Indian High School (U.S. Congress, Senate Sub-Committee on Indian Education, 1969, p. 417) states that the basic problem regarding the curriculum for Indian students is that students come to Stewart with academic problems requiring intensive remedial work and, that instead of this, they receive a watered down, easy curriculum. The evaluation found that entering sixth graders at Stewart are academically retarded

by about one year and that upon graduation are retarded well over three years and thus, "the school has not achieved any remedial function and, in fact, seems to have exacerbated the difficulties the Indian children had before they arrived at Stewart." The instructional program at Stewart Indian High School in 1969 was very traditional. Only basic required subjects were offered. No elective classes, such as speech, drama, foreign language, biology, botany, or English literature were available to the students. The majority of students were required to take four years of home economics for girls and four years of practical art for boys. With this arrangement, the possibility of students having a choice to take an elective course they desired, or were interested in taking, was eliminated. The majority of students were scheduled into classes without any choice during their total high school career. The evaluation also found that the general instructional staff atmosphere at Stewart reflected a total lack of teacher involvement in planning and curriculum development.

The evaluation describes the nature of the vocational program offered at Stewart in the following manner:

> All vocational programs, except for house and sign painting, are 'non terminal.' Initially, students are rotated from one vocational specialty to another (drafting, carpentry, welding, sheet metal, and machine shop, electricity and electronics, painting and farm work for the boys) until the junior year, after which they spend one-half day of each school in one vocation--either wood shop, metal shop, painting, or farm work. The boys who do best are encouraged to take painting or carpentry, while the low achievers are placed in general farm work and heavy equipment operation. The girls may choose from only two fields--general and home service (domestic work) or hospital ward attendant training, which the girls considered a degrading farce--a euphemism (they say) for more domestic work."

However, one vocational program which evolved at Stewart showed generally positive results. This involved the 2,200 acre farm which was operated as a part of the school program. The farm was a cattle raising operation with about 140 cows and about 200 acres of hay land. The annual production of yearlings was

slaughtered and used for meat at the school. In 1969, three vocational areas were taught on the farm: beef production; heavy equipment operation; and mechanics. The evaluation on Stewart found that the three vocational areas were well integrated.

> The beef production requires farm machinery to harvest hay and maintain the irrigation system and earth moving machinery to build ponds, level and smooth land and build and maintain the irrigation water storage and distribution system. The mechanics classes maintain the machinery for both of the other classes. The heavy equipment operation classes utilize the earth moving machinery. This provides a realistic environment for a vocational training program because it is an actual operation which produces an identifiable result. The boys can then see the results of their activities.

The uniqueness of the Stewart farm program was cited at later hearings in the mid '70s when an effort was made to close Stewart High School. At the current time, no ORBS offers this type of vocational, agriculture program.

During the '60s and '70s, various studies investigated the difficulties associated with the teaching of specific subjects in BIA operated schools. Probably the most common problems are those associated with teaching English as a second language. A rare insight was offered by psychologist Robert L. Bergman (1968) who observed the following:

> I have been trying to learn Navajo, and find it a very difficult language. It seems reasonable to assume that for a Navajo-speaking child, English is equally difficult, yet these children are expected to come to a large, strange, crowded institution and manage in an almost totally English speaking environment. Their position is more or less the same as ours would be if we were to be suddenly enrolled in Moscow University and expected to learn astronomy in classes taught in Russian. Elsewhere, when children are expected to learn a second language, reading, writing, and arithmetic are taught in their native language and concurrently they are instructed in the other language. It would seem logical to do this with Indian children, and to start teaching in English only when the children have a reasonable mastery of their language. Submerging the students in English from the first is now so long established a custom, however, that it is rarely even questioned.

Dr. Bergman's observation is reflected in curriculum research which often concentrates on the problems and difficulties associated with teaching English as a

second language to Indian and Eskimo students. Unfortunately, most of this research examines the issue from the perspective of the teacher, almost totally ignoring the problems of the student. For instance, Zintz (1971) examined some of the problems associated with teaching English. Zintz discussed the implications of bilingual education for improving students' multicultural sensitivity and stressed the need for continuous alertness on the part of teachers to differences in language, values, and customs. He emphasized the importance of understanding the student as a real person. Some educational researchers such as Harrison and Wilkinson (1973) have taken a minority viewpoint and have indicated that some programs teaching English prove to be unsatisfactory due to a lack of caring teachers and a tendency to thrust too much on the child too fast. Unfortunately, few teachers or educational researchers have attempted to implement alternative strategies.

A study by Galkowski (1971) looked at the influences affecting artistic expression of Indian children at Pierre Indian Boarding School. Galkowski found that purposeful or meaningful use of time at the school was directed to an expression of handiwork, often artistic. Leisure time activities all affected the students' artistic ability. It was also found that the more artistic group scored consistently higher in artistic expression and that Indian children usually expressed themselves manually, often artistically, rather than verbally. Recommendations suggested that classroom projects could be done through the art media and that math could be taught through beading and woodworking.

The National Study of American Indian Education (Havighurst 1970) found that there was a wide-spread desire for the inclusion of Indian history and culture in schools attended by American Indians. Both students and parents widely believed that the schools generally ignored Indian heritage and wished schools would teach something about tribal history or culture. As a direct result of the

Kennedy Report (1969) and the National Study of American Indian Education (Havighurst 1970), most BIA schools began developing units on Indian History and Culture by the early 1970s. Studies by McKeehan (1981) and McBeth (1983) both indicate that by the mid-'70s the philosophy of most ORBS had changed to include the teaching of Indian Art, Indian Culture, and Indian History within the basic skills component of ORBS curriculum.

Achievement

Probably no area of Indian education has been more thoroughly researched than the achievement of American Indian students. A study by Havighurst (1970), as a part of the Final Report of the National Study of American Indian Education, pointed out that there is no reason to suppose that Indian children differ from other children in intelligence. It was suggested that the low achievement of Indian children at certain grade levels is related to the child's limited experiences and is compounded by the family's poor socio-economic circumstances. The study pointed out that most studies place Indian children just below the national norms during the first few grades. The study concludes that the pattern of low achievement of Indian children is similar to that of other low income, non-English speaking children.

As early as the 1930s, Rainey (1932) conducted a study of Salem Indian High School comparing the cultural background, the intelligence scores, and the percent of White blood to classroom grades. Penoi (1956) looked at various factors affecting the academic achievement of Indian students attending various off-reservation boarding schools in Oklahoma. A similar study was also done by Tompkins (1961). Perhaps one of the most famous studies regarding the educational achievement of Indian children was the one conducted by Anderson (1953) entitled, "The Educational Achievement of Indian Children. A Re-examination of the Question: How Well are Indian Children Educated?" The study

examined the progress and achievement made by American Indian students in various educational settings and the factors thought to affect their educational development. Tests were administered to all students in grades 8 and 12, enrolled in day, mission, public, non-reservation boarding, and reservation boarding schools located in a number of areas. Data were obtained on the students' degree of Indian blood, language spoken at home, home stability, place of residence, kinds of friends, late entrance to school, size of school attended, regularity of school attendance, and academic ambition. It was found that as the cultural and educational backgrounds of Indian children became more like those of White children in the public schools, the educational achievement of Indian children more closely matched those of White children.

Bass (1971) conducted a longitudinal study designed to determine whether there were significant differences in academic achievement among senior year American Indian students in federal on-reservation, federal off-reservation, public on-reservation, and public off-reservation schools. The goal of the study was to gather a variety of data on psychological and social variables and to investigate the relationship of those variables to achievement. A sample of students drawn from 21 high schools in seven states was stratified on the basis of sex, grade, and geographic area, with approximately equal sex ratios. Tests were administered at various times over a four-year period from 1966 through 1970. A number of tests were administered including the California Achievement Test, the California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity, the Mooney Problem Checklist, and a number of other questionnaires and data forms. The study found no reliable differences in terms of achievement among four types of schools. The study also found that for the 45 categories for which significant achievement differences were registered, rankings were so variable that no hierarchical pattern or evidence of particular superiority or inferiority emerged.

Almost all regional and national studies of American Indian achievement during the early and mid-'70s found that Indian students were almost consistently achieving below national norms. And, ORBS students were graduating at least three years behind comparable public school institutions. In general, various studies have attempted to discover a relationship between achievement test scores and other factors, in an attempt to ascertain the causes of below norm achievement of Indian students. Various studies have correlated achievement test scores with grade level, type of school, socio-economic status, parental background, and other personal factors.

Most researchers concluded that regarding achievement tests and grade point averages, Indian students are below national norms. However, several authors have pointed to the inadequacies of achievement tests as measures of knowledge due to their cultural biases; non-comparability of existing data; and unreliability of teachers' evaluations. According to the National Indian Education Association (1976):

> The correlation between student achievement and segregation/integration of schools has not been definitely established: Some researchers say that there is no difference; some say that BIA boarding school students do worse; and some say that these students do better. Most researchers agree that socio-economic level may affect performance more than race; they also generally agree that parents' educational level has a significant effect on student achievement. Several personal factors have also been identified as being relevant to achievement.

Bicultural Nature of ORBS

The ABT report (1969) stated that many BIA administrators and teachers, and many Indians as well, believe that Indians can choose only between total Indianness and complete assimilation in the broader American culture. The report recommended that schools should stress the alternative of biculturalism, which offers Indians the best possibility of combining a firm cultural identity with occupational success. The investigators found that the general thrust of BIA

education in 1969 directed students toward eventual departure from the reservation and migration to a city. The schools did not, however, prepare students academically, socially, psychologically, or vocationally for urban life. As a result, many return to the reservations, disillusioned, to spend the rest of their lives in "economic and intellectual stagnation." The report recommended that the schools acquaint students with the three basic alternative identities from which they may choose: complete Indianness; biculturalism; and total assimilation into the mainstream culture. As mentioned previously, by the mid 1970s, most BIA schools, including ORBS, had begun to develop bicultural curriculum units.

The advent of bicultural curriculum and teaching methodologies in ORBS was long in coming and even longer in implementation. Early studies by Ulibarri (1959), Jackson (1965), and Itzkoff (1966) addressed issues involving cultural pluralism for American Indian education. Perhaps the leading researcher in this field has been Judith Kleinfeld who has identified unique cultural and personality characteristics of Indian and Eskimo students, researched the effective teaching of Indian and Eskimo students, and provided a case study on effective bicultural education regarding Alaska Native students attending St. Mary's High School, a Catholic boarding school (Kleinfeld 1972; 1973; 1975; and 1979).

Previous research in Indian education has continually cited and made reference of the unique characteristics of American Indian and Alaska Native students. Unfortunately, few of these studies have analyzed the nature of these characteristics and, particularly, few have attempted to isolate and examine these characteristics in terms of strengths and weaknesses in relationship to education. Kleinfeld (1973) did examine characteristics of Alaskan Native students in terms of strengths related to learning. She found that these youngsters had specifically cognitive strengths in the area of memory, and visual and spacial abilities. In regard to social strengths, the author found Native students to be strong in

integrative social skills but weak in egocentric personality characteristics. Kleinfeld believes that the educational problems of Indian and Eskimo students stem primarily from the area of identity formation. In school, identity problems are often misconstrued as a lack of motivation. Kleinfeld's reference to identity formation "refers to the development of a unified set of values and directions that organize a life and give it meaning." In reference to Alaska natives, Kleinfeld believes that most school programs which try to help students solve identity problems are ineffective. That is, most students are simply told to choose the best of both cultures. This, in itself, is ineffective since many values that children must choose from are often incompatible and contradictory. Compounding this is the lack of a provided framework which students may use to organize their various values and beliefs. Kleinfeld succinctly summarizes this by stating: "To tell children to form an identity by choosing the best of both cultures makes about as much sense psychologically as telling children to communicate by choosing the best of two languages."

Kleinfeld's case study of St. Mary's High School is an analysis of effective bicultural education. Kleinfeld's examination of the bicultural educational principles employed at St. Mary's provides a unique insight into an educational program which can promote effective academic achievement with Alaska Native or American Indian students. Her study of St. Mary's concluded that the school is highly effective in cross-cultural education and produces graduates with skills and the communication style needed for access to the opportunities of the majority culture. The study found that St. Mary's graduates succeed in college much more frequently than Eskimo students graduating from public schools or other boarding schools. However, skills which enabled them to function well in the majority culture did not cut them off from the culture of their home villages. An important aspect of education, which takes place at St. Mary's, is the informal education

which occurs through personal teacher-student contacts. That is, teachers live in the dormitories with students, organize extra-curricular activities, and are with students continually on evenings and on weekends. Kleinfeld believes that this type of contact and interaction serves to strengthen Native student identity and personality and provides necessary illustrations of effective resolution of personal crises and conflicts. It appears from a review of the literature that this aspect is lacking at most ORBS where on evenings and weekends students are left in a vacuum, not only in terms of activities, but also in terms of value structure and reinforcement.

Home Living Area

The home living area and dormitories in ORBS are a critical aspect of the student social environment. The fact that many students are admitted to ORBS under the BIA's social criteria for admission further emphasizes the importance of having an adequate and meaningful social environment. Unfortunately, studies of the social environment are not numerous. However, there are references throughout the literature on ORBS and Indian education suggesting that the dormitory life of these schools is detrimental to the healthy development of the Indian child.

Early work on the social environment at ORBS, such as the Meriam Report (1928), criticized conditions found at the schools and cited deplorable health conditions, old buildings, bad fire risks, crowded dormitories, and sanitation below accepted standards. Literature on Indian education, in general, indicated that by the early 1940's significant improvements had been made in these schools, resulting in adequate and modern physical facilities. A review of the literature by Berry (1969) gave an impression of physical facilities at ORBS on a par with those found in public schools, including adequate conditions in dormitories.

Yet, the importance of dormitory life at ORBS stems not from the physical facilities of the dormitories, but from the ability of the home living environment to meet the emotional and social needs of the Indian students who are housed in them. In terms of research, most studies have concentrated on academic concerns and, in many cases, have neglected the importance of the role that the home living environment plays, not only in academic performance and social adjustment while at ORBS, but also in future adjustment. Early studies such as Mann (1937) researched Indian housing conditions at Wrangle Institute in an effort to determine the most effective type of home management in housing Indian students. In another early study, Queton (1955) observed the behavioral changes which occurred in children living in cooperative dormitories at Fort Sill Indian School. For the most part, early studies of the home living environment at Indian boarding schools are scarce. But even the current assessment of the home and living environments at ORBS and dormitory programs operated by the BIA provides reasonable cause for concern. A central problem is that children are living without their parents and are essentially not provided a substitute. In almost all federal Indian boarding schools, the staff of the dormitories is so small that there is little or no opportunity for children to form meaningful relationships with adults. Research and studies conducted during the early 1970s continually pointed to the adverse effects that the home living environment at ORBS was having on the students' mental health (Bergman 1969; Bergman and Goldstein 1973; Goldstein 1974; and Blanchard 1975).

Generally, the staff and faculty at ORBS consider the home living environment to be a considerable improvement over the home situations from which many Indian students come. Many BIA staff continually refer to dormitory living as the "good life" and fail to see any fundamental shortcomings which may be associated with the structure and organization of dormitory life at ORBS.

Historically the dormitory aide has been the one role assigned almost exclusively to Indians, and it has generally been agreed that dormitory staff occupy almost the lowest level of the BIA's hierarchical organizational structure. Blanchard and Warren (1975) found that both the dorm aides and students were suffering from a predominance of irrational and destructive transactions in the dormitory environment. Their study of role stress affecting dormitory aides at ORBS found that the training of dorm aides has been largely ineffective because there has been no concerted attempt to rearrange the contingencies in the environment within which the aides must work. They also found that task overload often occurs and appears to be a function of the interaction of many variables. One aspect which compounds the problem is that many dorm aides are products of the boarding schools and have internalized a boarding school model of child rearing which is not only archaic but possibly more punitive than current practices of the educational system. And, thus, according to Blanchard and Warren, "They expect the student to behave as they were forced to behave, and consider methods of social control practiced on them appropriate to the present situation which they are in." The study found that role stress in dormitory aides is derivable from conflicts which occur:

(1) between powerless position and irrational system expectations;

(2) among Indianness, loyalties, and tribal prejudices in aide-student interactions;

(3) between need to feel worthy and the destructive position of being in a job closed to advancement and generally devoid of opportunities for building self-esteem;

(4) between Indian culture and forced acculturation in their own lives;

(5) between institutional colonization and tribal culture values;

(6) between administrative promises and actual yield;

(7) between prejudices they experience as Indians and requirements that they transmit norms and values through which these prejudices are manifest;

(8) between the felt need to manage and control student behavior and their demonstrated powerlessness to exercise such control; and,

(9) between their desire to help students and their inability to function in a helping way.

A review of a BIA publication, The Preparation of BIA Teacher and Dormitory Aides (AVCO Economic Systems Corporation, 1968), provides an illustration of the ineffectiveness of BIA dormitory aide preparation. The publication is approximately 150 pages in length, consists almost entirely of selected supplemental readings which bear little relevance to the conditions and situations which characterize most ORBS, and provides little direction or orientation for the job requirements faced by most BIA dormitory aides. In addition, there is no cultural orientation in the publication.

Davis (1979) examined the perception of Indian students regarding actual and ideal dormitory aide behavior regarding the control of students and the students' attitudes regarding their aides. Two hundred and eleven Indian students attending an ORBS in a predominantly non-Indian community in the Midwest were surveyed to examine the effects of the congruence between students' perception of, and preferences for, dormitory aide control of students' behavior and students' attitudes towards dormitory aides, dormitory life, and classroom life. Students indicated they preferred aide behavior which was more humanistic than what was perceived by students as actual dormitory aide pupil control behavior. Students tended to possess positive attitudes toward their aides when student preference for ideal aide behavior was consistent with students' perceptions of actual aide behavior. As the data indicated, students generally had positive attitudes toward the aides. Contributing considerably to this was the fact that girls in grades six through eight possessed very positive attitudes toward their dormitory housemothers. The more custodial the aide's behavior appeared to the student, the less positive the student's attitude toward the dormitory aide.

Kleinfeld (1977) found that Eskimo students at boarding schools evidenced a high degree of psychological disturbance and that the psychological disturbance appeared to be school related. Her studies suggested that boarding schools contribute to a high incidence of social and emotional disturbance among Eskimo adolescents and that changes in the school environment can have substantial effects. She found that the level of problems in different years varied markedly with such factors as the personality and policy of the dormitory director, the number of dormitory attendants, and the amount of recreational activities available.

Counseling and Guidance

Counseling and guidance is an integral part of the school environment and, yet, is inextricably linked to both the home living area, as well as the instructional area. Because of the conflict which often occurs among staff sub-groups at ORBS, counselors and guidance staff often find themselves at odds (Colfer 1975). Guidance staff in the home living area often identify with many of the perceptions (and stress) which characterize the attitudes of other dormitory staff. Counselors or guidance personnel outside the home living environment often reflect attitudes and perceptions characteristic of academic and administrative staff. Perhaps the earliest research on guidance and counseling programs at ORBS was conducted by Oliver (1947), who found few standards for guidance and counseling programs at BIA and reservation high schools. Oliver found little continuity in the procedures and techniques employed by the various schools.

Merrill (1971) described the mental health program at Sherman Indian High School in Riverside, California. Merrill's study details Sherman's clinical services which included their in-service training program for dormitory personnel, teachers, school counselors, and public health service personnel, as well as the overall

integration of these sub-groups. The in-service training for staff members was described as involving mental hygiene techniques that emphasized inter-personal relationships and was humanistic in nature. Overall, the Sherman program was described as operating between January and May of 1971 and serving 107 of the approximately 700 students enrolled.

Dlugokinski (1974) examined the frustration and dilemmas present in BIA-operated schools and found that the diversity of approaches in these schools, problems of acculturation, and history of poor individual academic and emotional adjustment of the students of these schools suggested that a reformulation of tasks and priorities was needed. He felt that this reformulation of tasks should emphasize creative solutions to special needs. He recommended that counseling services should be more peer oriented, and that schools should have multifaceted supportive services.

A paper by Klinekole (1979) examined the problems that Indian students face in boarding schools. Klinekole reasoned that Indian students who have withdrawn from public schools for various reasons may receive alternative education at ORBS but that they also have various academic, environmental, and personal problems which must be considered. Although this paper addresses many of the problems that confront students at ORBS, the orientation of the paper is primarily in recommending peer counseling programs which can help alleviate many of the problems inherent in boarding school life by encouraging open communications among close friends at school.

A more general study by Hull (1982) recommends that social workers who provide child welfare services to American Indians be aware of current and past efforts to help tribes, the cultural factors unique to them, and successful but selective intervention strategies. Hull also notes that though the government has destroyed much cultural and familial tradition by forceably separating and sending

many American Indian children to boarding schools, these schools also have provided no appropriate parenting models for children raised there. Hull attributes the increased incidence of child abuse among Indians, in part, to the early experience of their parents who grew up at these institutions. Hull feels that some Indian characteristics such as a lack of concern for time, the desire not to be intrusive, and other cultural characteristics may give many social workers cause for undue concern. Hull stresses that counselors working with Indians must be non-directive and have an increased awareness of cultural dynamics affecting Indian children.

In general, little research has been directed at the counseling experience of ORBS students. Most research in this area has examined affective factors of adjustment, personality disorders, and the later effects of boarding on students' lives and adjustment. These factors shall be examined in the next section. It must be noted, however, that research and evaluations on ORBS conducted during the late 1960s and early 1970s continually cited the lack of effective counseling and guidance at ORBS. In many cases, counselors were used as disciplinarians at ORBS; consequently, students were reluctant to discuss problems with the same counselors who were responsible for making decisions regarding punishment and disciplinary action. This role has been common at many ORBS and, as a result, students often rely upon other staff, such as dormitory personnel, in handling personal and emotional problems. In the evaluation of Chilocco Indian High School (U.S. Congress, Senate Sub-Committee on Indian Education, 1969), the recommendations regarding the counseling and guidance staff at the school included the following:

(1) The primary function of the counseling personnel should be to discuss academic problems as well as personal problems;

(2) Counselors must not be a part of any disciplinary measures;

(3) To accomplish effective counseling, the counselor's background and training should include courses in behavioral sciences specifically related to the area of minority groups and, preferably, an internship program in counseling.

In general, the situation at Chilocco was characteristic of most high schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The significance of guidance and counseling at ORBS takes on special meaning when one considers that over 80% of Indian students are admitted to ORBS under the BIA's social criteria. The following statement adequately summarizes the guidance and counseling situation at most ORBS:

> In the area of guidance, the administration relies on counselors in the dormitories to act as guidance counselors. They are also called upon to supervise from 80 to 120 students and are responsible for discipline as well as guidance. It is obvious that anyone who is in charge of discipline is not a likely candidate for a student to confide in and discuss personal problems. At best, most dormitory counselors are little more than watchdogs who patrol the area to be certain that each student is in the building. (U.S. Congress, Senate Sub-Committee on Indian Education, 1969)

The study by ABT Associates (1969) also found problems with guidance and counseling in BIA schools. In many cases, counselors were regarded as custodians and disciplinarians. Untrained dormitory aides were responsible for being a surrogate father or mother to one hundred or more boys or girls and expected to counsel them on certain personal problems which, in many cases, would be impossible even for the best trained counselor.

Some of the above generalizations concerning counseling must be viewed with caution, however. To assume that counselors cannot establish rapport with students if the counselors also are responsible for discipline ignores the fact that parents simultaneously advise and discipline their children. Furthermore, the dorm aides whom these students often seek out for advice are also responsible for maintaining discipline in the dorms and hand out punishment when students break the rules.

The Student

Affective Factors and Adjustment

This section reviews the literature regarding psychological characteristics and factors related to the behavioral and emotional needs of ORBS students. Studies on ORBS students have looked at ethnic identity, attitudes, self-confidence, intelligence, self-concept, leadership, and other aspects of student personalities. Studies during the 1920s and 1930s made numerous comparisons between Indians and Whites, full-bloods and mixed-bloods, boys and girls, tribe with tribe, and one type of school with another. Most early efforts were primarily concerned with achievement and intelligence, and with Indians consistently scoring below that of Whites. Anderson (1953) concluded that as the cultural and educational background of Indian children became more like those of White children in the public schools, the more closely the educational achievement of Indian children matched that of the White children.

During the early 1960s, educational researchers and psychologists began to focus attention on Indian boarding schools in terms of their negative effects on the mental health of Indian students (Cobb 1960; Hoyt 1962; Greene 1964; Krush and Bjork 1965 and 1966; Bergman 1967; Leon 1969; and Beiser 1974). In 1960 the BIA and the Department of Health, Education & Welfare hosted a workshop which reviewed the emotional problems of Indian students in boarding schools and related public schools (Cobb 1960). During the next decade, an overwhelming amount of research, data and information was compiled by various educational researchers and psychologists which seemed to point to the conclusion that in general, boarding schools had a negative effect on Indian students' mental health. It was pointedly shown that ORBS tended to have a disastrous effect on the self-concept and psycho-social adjustment of Indian students. This often culminated in personality disorders.

Studies by Krush and Bjork (1965 and 1966) examined mental health factors in Indian boarding schools and their relationship to the personality disorders among the Indian students at those schools. Early on, Krush and Bjork found ORBS were often used as a means of removing a student from a socially undesirable environment to a setting where attention must be given not only to traditional educational programming but, also, to every phase of social development. Krush and Bjork found that, administratively, the school population at Flandreau Indian School revealed seven distinct categories of students:

(1) Individuals of average intelligence having relatively stable home backgrounds and capable of doing academic high school work;

(2) Individuals of average intelligence having relatively stable backgrounds and seeking vocational training to enable them to become skilled artisans;

(3) Individuals of average intelligence having relatively unstable backgrounds causing them to be socially dependent and/or neglected;

(4) Individuals having physical handicaps which interfere with learning;

(5) Individuals who are mentally retarded and incapable of actively participating with members of the preceding four groups;

(6) Individuals who are socially maladjusted and pose special problems in their repetitive conflicts with authority; and

(7) Individuals having severe emotional conflict, who develop psychoneurotic, psychosomatic, or psychotic reactions.

It was readily apparent to the researchers that each of the above categories required a special program to solve the problems unique to that particular group; yet, the resources available at Flandreau were totally incapable of providing such a diversified program. Other factors identified as affecting the mental health of ORBS students included the relatively high percentage of public school drop-outs; the geographic location of the school with respect to the natural home of the individual students; the instability of student enrollment; and the lack of association of Indian students with other non-Indian students in nearby

communities. Krush and Bjork's initial efforts in interviewing students at Flandreau exposed an interesting paradox. That is, most students gave reasons for attending Flandreau which were at variance with their case histories.

In looking at the nature of personality disorder of ORBS students at Flandreau, Wahpeton, and Pierre Indian Schools, Krush and Bjork (1966) contended that the frequency of movement and the necessity to conform to changing standards could only lead to confusion and disorganization in the student's personality. Also, the frequency of movement further interferes with and discourages the development of lasting relations in which love and concern may permit the development of maturity. Krush and Bjork stated that the dilemma in dealing with individuals who have disordered homes and disordered behavior is how to teach them to deal with the dependency that schools create in these youngsters while trying to help them.

Leon (1969) also looked at the mental health considerations in Indian boarding schools and offered testimony before the special Sub-Committee on Indian Education which culminated in the Kennedy Report of 1969. Leon indicated that boarding schools primarily acted as custodial institutions and that their failure to educate or to meet the psychological and social needs of the Indian students was bad enough; yet Leon suggested a strong case could be made that the boarding schools even contributed to the students' mental health problems. In testimony before the Sub-Committee, he stated:

> Some of the effects of Indian boarding schools are demonstrated by the very people who are now working in the boarding schools. Many Indian employees, most of whom are guidance personnel, are themselves a product of the Indian boarding school. I have found that some of these people have great difficulty in discussing their own experience as Indian students. Many of them show, what I would call, a blunting of their emotional responses. This I would attribute to the separation from their parents and the oppressive atmosphere of these boarding schools.

Leon contended that boarding schools were inadequate to treat the emotional problems of the students attending them and that the overall boarding school experience does more harm than good; he further stated "they do not educate, they alienate." In his testimony Leon recommended that the schools be converted into residential treatment centers for emotionally disturbed Indian students and be administered by mental health personnel. He strongly emphasized that all educational and dormitory personnel should have training in the care and treatment of emotionally disturbed and socially deprived children.

A study by Minock (1970) examined factors associated with deviant behavior of students attending Intermountain Indian School. Minock examined the types and frequency of deviance, and the relationship between deviance and factors in the pre-Intermountain, Intermountain, and post-Intermountain experiences. The study group consisted of the 1964 graduating class at Intermountain School, Brigham City, Utah. Among the important findings it was noted that:

(1) Of 233 total deviant acts, 84 were time schedule violations and 66 were for drinking and drinking related violations;

(2) The quantitative pattern of deviance was about the same during grades 10 and 11 and then decreased during grade 12;

(3) There was an inverse relationship between family size and deviance;

(4) The lowest average deviance rate occurred among those students whose parents were living together;

(5) The students who started school at ages six to seven had the lowest average deviance rate;

(6) There was a negative correlation between grade point average and degree of deviance;

(7) Deviants had higher average scores than non-deviants on ten of twenty characteristics evaluated by counselors and teachers; and,

(8) The former Intermountain students with the highest post-high school productive activity scores also had the highest high school average rate of deviance.

Research conducted by Roulston (1971) surveyed the attitudes and perceptions of Alaska BIA boarding school students. In order to determine the preferences and perceptions of Native students attending BIA boarding schools, a survey instrument was devised to measure the BIA student's background, future plans, and his projected feelings relative to school facilities, personnel, curricula, and inter-personal relationships. The respondents totaled 558 students and represented Anchorage, Fairbanks, Southeast Alaska, Bethel, and Nome, and ranged in age from ten to 21 years. It was also noted that most came from large families. The survey results indicated:

(1) School facilities, teachers, and courses were generally satisfactory;

(2) There was a preference for attending school in Alaska (40% attended school outside Alaska);

(3) There was some evidence of teacher discrimination (55% of the sample wanted more Native teachers, 36% did not care, and 8% responded negatively);

(4) 91% of the sample wanted more Native culture and history in the curriculum;

(5) There was evidence of inter-group conflict among American Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos (85% felt such conflict caused problems);

(6) Language arts, social studies, and work experience courses were the most important subject areas; and

(7) Future plans included finishing high school (3.2% did not intend to finish, 28% planned to go to college, 12% planned to attend a vocational school, 20% planned to get a job after high school, and 30% had no definite plans at all.

Another major research effort which dealt with the attitudes of Alaska Native students was the Project ANNA Student Survey coordinated by Boyd (1973). In the review of the Alaska Native Needs Assessment (Project ANNA), it was determined that one of the most important educational decision-makers was the Native student himself. In Alaska Native communities, students and their desires are an important factor in deciding which option (boarding school, boarding home

program, or state dormitory) to select for high school. The survey methodology consisted of questionnaires mailed to each school for school officials to distribute to students, and the completed questionnaires were sent to the Indian Education Resource Center at Albuquerque, New Mexico. In the final report, the responses were primarily presented in graphic form. It was found that the Alaska Native students would like to keep the boarding schools, the boarding home program, and village schools all as viable options. Many wanted to attend college or pursue some form of training beyond high school. They expressed a preference for the two-world goal, that is, to be prepared to live in or out of the village. The most important finding of the survey was the "mobility factor," referring to the movement from one high school program to another. It was discovered that over 42% of the high school students surveyed had changed high school at one time or another. Overall, there was a strong student preference for vocational and career training after high school; however, few high school students indicated that they wanted vocational training as part of their high school program.

Further studies of Alaska Native BIA boarding school students examined the characteristics of persistors and drop-outs. Research by Atchison (1972) made a comparison of the characteristics of 93 persistors who attended BIA schools in the 1970-71 school year and drop-outs from the 1969-70 school year. Peal (1973) looked at the attitude of Native students regarding school and found a correlation between acculturation and separation of Indian students in boarding school settings. Oviatt, Griffiths, and Farley (1973) developed a composite description of the Alaska Native school dropout. Their report summarized seven research projects, identified the findings, and presented recommendations. The seven studies were presented via consideration of:

(1) The characteristics of the student who has dropped out of school;

(2) The characteristics of the student who has remained in school;

(3) The differences between the students who have and those who have not dropped out of school;

(4) The reasons certain drop-outs have returned to school; and

(5) The attitudes of students toward the BIA boarding schools.

In view of the studies under consideration, this report examined the limited future orientation of the drop-out, the negative self-concept of the drop-out, the effects of school community planning and coordination, and the relationship between parents and the educational system. Among the major recommendations presented were the re-examination of school curricula and counseling services; the development of village procedures to prepare prospective boarding school students for boarding school life; the development of a school oriented identification system which would report drop-outs to the appropriate agencies; the development of a school oriented post-drop-out plan; and, the development of a planning and coordinating system within the BIA educational structure.

A study by Kleinfeld and Bloom (1977) investigated the effects of four different types of boarding schools on the mental health of Eskimo adolescents. The study concluded that boarding schools do contribute to a high incidence of social and emotional disturbance among Eskimo adolescents attending them. It was noted that these disturbances are not due just to initial adjustment difficulties that later subside, but are ongoing. The study suggests that changes in boarding school environment can have substantial effects and has a direct correlation with factors in the home living environment. It was noted that the kinds of changes needed in boarding schools appear to be considerably more complicated than the more commonly suggested remedies such as increased staff, increased recreational activities, and additional Native cultural content. It was suggested that although such changes may have immediate effects, even apparently well functioning boarding schools with low rates of obvious disturbance may, nonetheless, have

subtle adverse effects on long-term development. Follow-up studies of graduates who had attended the public boarding school during its smoothly functioning period, revealed high levels of passive, dependent styles of adult behavior, and an unusually high rate of college failure.

The Effects of ORBS on Post-Graduates

A review of the literature on Indian education by Berry (1969) points out that achievement tests are usually the most common means of assessing the effectiveness of a school's academic program, but that other possible criteria may also be used. In many cases, schools point to the success of their graduates as evidence of the quality of education that the school has provided. In the case of ORBS, however, little success can be cited. A number of follow-up studies on ORBS graduates have been conducted over the years. These include studies such as that conducted by Lawson (1940) which looked at the occupation of Indian girls after graduation at Sequoyah Orphan Training School in Tahlequah, Oklahoma; a study by Cowan (1956) which looked at the graduates of the special education program for Navajo Indians at Stewart Indian School; a study by Jewell (1959) which looked at graduates from the special program at Albuquerque Indian School; and, a study by Baker (1959) which examined the problems of Navajo male graduates of Intermountain School during their first year of employment.

Smith (1962) investigated the social adjustment of Latter Day Saint graduates from Intermountain Indian School. Questionnaires were mailed to the Mormon graduates of Intermountain Indian School, focusing on those who had graduated between 1957 and 1961. The study found that approximately 50% of the respondents had returned to their reservations, 21% had received further schooling, there was no employment among those who had settled off-reservation, a 24.66% rate of unemployment existed for those males who had returned, and marital status of the graduates was far from exemplary.

A study by Metcalf (1972) looked at the effects of boarding school on Navajo maternal attitudes and behavior. His investigation of long-term effects of boarding school education was conducted among Navajo women who had attended boarding school on the reservation during the 1950s. The subjects were 23 Navajo mothers and their pre-school children who lived in the San Francisco Bay Area. A series of open-ended interviews was used to obtain information on each mother's life history, school background, and child rearing practices. An in-home testing session included a variety of self-image and attitude measures for the mothers and systematic observations of mother-child interactions during structured and unstructured activity. Women who had spent at least one full year of middle childhood, ages 7 to 14, at home without school experience (i.e., neither boarding school nor day school) scored significantly higher than their boarding school counterparts on self-image instruments and on a maternal competence scale independent of the mother's age, the age of her first child, or her feelings toward her parental home. The observations of the mother-child interactions showed no difference in the overt child care behaviors of the mothers; however, the dimension of self satisfaction displayed in children's behavior was significantly associated with the mother's background. Mothers with at least one year at home during middle childhood had children who appeared more contented. Obvious limitations of Metcalf's study include the relatively small sample size. Other deleterious effects of boarding schools on Indian women have also been noted by Attneave and Dill (1980).

Conclusion

The bulk of literature on ORBS is primarily descriptive in nature with very little empirical work. The few empirical studies done may not be applicable

outside of the specific situations or schools in which they were conducted. For example, conflicts which Colfer (1975) cites as applying to Chemawa Indian High School may not necessarily apply to other ORBS.

The most significant aspect of the review is that the majority of references contain some type of criticism of the nature, structure, or operation of ORBS. References continually cite problem areas such as inadequate budgets, lack of manpower, poor job skills, poor organizational structures, inadequate and irrelevent curriculum, lack of counseling and effective mental health programs, inter-staff conflicts, low morale of both students and staff, failure to define the primary task of the schools, and the lack of specialized programs at the schools to meet the students' social and academic needs.

Throughout this review of the literature, various government entities have pointed out major shortcomings of ORBS and have made specific recommendations to improve the situations, yet, little change has occurred. The fact that ORBS are at the bottom of the BIA hierarchy has contributed to their inability to make recommended changes and to respond to the social and academic needs of their students.

Concluding Note

A human systems analysis of Indian boarding schools by Hammerschlag, Alderfer, and Berg (1973) shows, in systems terms, that most ORBS fail to define their primary task, and that the sub-systems operate in the school as if they exist only to serve their individual ends. Their study emphasized that the system has forced and encouraged dependency for a century and, therefore, any self-directing behavior has become difficult to achieve. They go on to say,

> But the more the school permits itself to be used as an institution for control, the more it re-emphasizes and tacitly encourages the tribes not to deal with it. The giving of education, like the giving of health and welfare,

> destroys people by robbing them of their own sense of powerfulness and worth. It re-emphasizes the institution's ability to give and the peoples' need to receive; it thus recreates a master-slave syndrome.

The authors conclude that boarding schools are ineffective educationally and do not promote the development of self control. Furthermore, they perpetuate, by virtue of their existence, the belief that they can educate and control better than the children's parents and communities. Also by being available, they remove the necessity for those issues to be dealt with directly by the tribes themselves.

REFERENCES

Abt Associates, Inc. (1969). Systems analysis of Indian education in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Anderson, K. E. (1953). The educational achievement of Indian children. A re-examination of the question: How well are Indian children educated? Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Antes, J. M. (1972). A supportive learning environment. Journal of American Indian Education, 11 (2), 5-12.

Atchison, S. R. (1972). Alaskan native Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school students: A comparison of the characteristics of 93 persistors, 1970-1971, and dropouts, 1969-1970. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Utah.

Attneave, C. L. & Dill, A. (1980). Indian boarding schools and Indian women: Blessing or curse. In Conference on the Educational and Occupational Needs of American Indian Women. Held at Albuquerque, NM. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

AVCO Economic Systems Corporation. (1968). The preparation of Bureau of Indian Affairs teacher and dormitory aides, Vol. 1. Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 031 320)

Baker, J. E. (1959). Problems of Navajo male graduates of Intermountain School during their first year of employment. Unpublished master's thesis, Utah State University.

Bass, W. (1971). An analysis of academic achievement of Indian high school students in federal and public schools. Albuquerque, NM: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory.

Bass W. P. (1971). An evaluation of the Bordertown Dormitory Program. Albuquerque, NM: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory.

Beatty, W. W. (1944). Why the boarding schools failed. In W. W. Beatty (Ed.), Education for action: Selected articles from Indian education 1936-43. Chilocco, OK: Chilocco Agricultural School Printing Department.

Begay, J. Y. (1980). English reading competence of Navajo students in public and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Beiser, M. (1974). A hazard to mental health: Indian boarding schools. American Journal of Psychiatry, 131, 305-306.

Benham, W. J., Jr. (1977). Education in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 52). Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Center. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 147 088)

Benjamin, E. (1973). An investigation of the self-concept of Alaskan Eskimo adolescents in four different secondary school environments. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University.

Bergman, R. L. (1967). Boarding schools and psychological problems of Indian children. (Paper) American academy of pediatrics committed to Indian health.

Bergman, R. L. & Goldstein, G. S. (1973). The model dorm: Changing Indian boarding schools. Paper presented at the 126th annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Honolulu, HI.

Berry, B. (1969). The education of American Indians, a survey of the literature (Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 35). Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Indian Education Resources Center.

Birchard, B. A. (1970). Education of American Indians: Boarding schools for American Indian youth. National study of American Indian education (Series IV No. 2 Final Report). Washington, D.C.: Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research; and Chicago University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 031 330)

Blanchard, J., & Reedy, R. (1970). The relationship of a test of English as a second language to measures of achievement and self-concept in a sample of American Indian students (Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Report No. 58). Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Blanchard, J. D., & Warren, R. L. (1975). Role stress of dormitory aides at an off-reservation boarding school. Human Organization, 34, 41-49.

Boyd, M. (1973). Project ANNA student survey. Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Center.

Brown, Reynolds, & Rich. (1968). History of Intermountain School. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Utah.

Brunhouse, R. L. (1935). History of the Carlisle Indian School: A phase of government Indian policy, 1879-1917. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Bryde, J. (1971). Modern Indian psychology. Vermillion, SD: Institute of Indian Studies.

Charleston, G. M. (1980). The relationship between educational administrators' positions and support of decentralization of authority in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Cobb, J. C. (Ed.). (1980). Emotional problems of Indian students in boarding schools and related public schools. In Workshop proceedings at the Albuquerque Indian School, April 11-13, 1960. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs and Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Cohen, J. A. (1982 February). Stress and the boarding school teacher. Independent School, 41 (3), 49-51.

Colfer, C. J. (1975). Bureaucrats, budgets, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs: Segmentary opposition in a residential school. Human Organization, 34, 149-156.

Cowan, L. D. (1956). A follow-up study of the graduates of the special education program for Navajo Indians at Stewart Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, Fisk University.

Davis, J. L. (1979). American Indian students' perceptions of actual and ideal dormitory aide pupil control behavior, and students' attitudes regarding their dormitory aides. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Dlugokinski, E., & Kramer, L. (1974). A system of neglect: Indian boarding schools. American Journal of Psychiatry, 131, 670-673.

Doty, A. (1971). Fort Sill Indian School Centennial. Lawton, Oklahoma: Fort Sill Indian School Printing Department.

Echohawk, M. (1977). Leadership vs. behavioral problems and belief in personal control among American Indian youth. Journal of Social Psychology, 102 (1), 47-54.

Epperson, F. H. (1952). History of Indian education in the U.S., with special reference to the development of the boarding school to 1933. Unpublished master's thesis, Eastern New Mexico University.

Fine, M. (1977 May). The institution of Carlisle School: A microcosm of 500 years of Indian policy. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 188 836)

Fitz, B. (1935). The history of Carlisle Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, University of New Mexico.

Foreman, C. T. (1928-1931). The Choctaw Academy. Chronicles of Oklahoma, 6, 453-480.

Foreman, C. T. (1928-1931). The Choctaw Academy. Chronicles of Oklahoma, 9, 382-411.

Foreman, C. T. (1928-1931). The Choctaw Academy. Chronicles of Oklahoma, 10, 77-144.

Fox, G. E. (1943). The Choctaw Academy: An experiment in Indian Education. Unpublished master's thesis, George Washington University.

Fraser, R. S. (1934). Studies of race intelligence of Indian pupils at Sherman Institute, Riverside, California. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Denver.

French, D. (1967). Indian residential schools. A research study of the child care programs of nine residential schools in Saskatchawan. Ottawa: Canadian Welfare Council.

Galkowski, L. J. (1971). Influences affecting artistic expression of Indian children at the Pierre boarding school. Unpublished master's thesis, Northern State College, Aberdeen, SD.

Garrison, I. R. (1971). Factors which relate to teacher turnover in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Goldstein, G. S. (1974). The model dormitory. Psychiatric Annals, 4, 85-92.

Greene, J. E. (1964). Psycho-social adjustment in an Indian boarding school September 1, 1963 - August 31, 1964 progress report. Las Vegas, NV: New Mexico Highlands University. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 027 985)

Hammerschlag, C. A. (1973). Indian education a human systems analysis. American Journal of Psychiatry, 130 (10), 1098-1102.

Hangar, T. Riverside Story. (1971). In 100th year of Riverside Indian School. Anadarko, OK: Riverside Indian School Printing Department.

Hathcoat, L. (1946). A pattern of high school education for the Chilocco Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Arkansas.

Havighurst, R. J. (1970). Mental development and school achievement of American Indian children and youth. The national study of American Indian education (Series IV No. 3 Final Report). Washington, D.C.: Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, and Chicago University.

Hebdon, T. R. (1965). A study of the high school instructional staffs in the Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools in Utah and Arizona. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University.

Hobart, C. W. (1968). Some consequences of residential schooling. Journal of American Indian Education, VII (2), 7-17.

Hoover, J. B. (1983). The development of interpersonal skills and student self-esteem as key elements in student success. Unpublished paper.

Hoyt, E. E. (1962). Young Indians: Some problems and issues of mental hygiene. Mental Hygiene, XLVI, 41-47.

Hull, G. H. (1982). Child Welfare Services to Native Americans. Social Casework, 63 (6), 340-347.

Itzkoff, S. W. (1966). Cultural pluralism in urban education. School and Society, XCIV, 383-386.

Jackson, C. E. (1965). Identification of unique features in education at American Indian schools, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.

Jewell, T. E. (1959). A study of the 1959 graduates from the special program at the Albuquerque Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, University of New Mexico.

King, A. R. (1964). A case study of an Indian residential school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Kizer, W. M. (1940). History of the Flandreau Indian School, Flandreau, SD. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Dakota.

Kleinfeld, J. S. (1973). Characteristics of Alaska native students. In Alaska native needs in education. Juneau, AK: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Kleinfeld, J. S. (1975). Effective teachers of Indian and Eskimo students. School Review, 83 301-344.

Kleinfeld, J. S. (1979). Eskimo school on the Andreafsky: A study of effective bicultural education. NY: Praeger Publishers.

Kleinfeld, J. S. (1974 May). Preparing teachers for the cross cultural classroom. Paper presented at the Northern cross cultural education symposium.

Kleinfeld, J. S., & Bloom, J. (1977). Boarding schools: Effects on the mental health of Eskimo adolescents. American Journal of Psychiatry, 134, 411-477.

Klinekole, R. V. (1979). Indian students' problems in boarding schools. Bureau of Indian Affairs Education Research Bulletin, 7 (2).

Klitza, F. (1972). Informal teaching techniques: Report from Fairbanks. Journal of American Indian Education, 12, (1), 12-15.

Krush, T. P., & Bjork, J. W. (1965). Mental health factors in an Indian boarding school. Mental Hygiene, 49, 94-103.

Krush, T., Bjork, J., Sindell, P., & Nelle, J. (1966). Some thoughts on personality disorder: Study of an Indian boarding school population. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, 868-975.

LaFromboise, T, Dauphinais, P., & Rowe, W. (1978 March). A survey of Indian students' perceptions of the counseling experience. Paper presented at The American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, Canada.

Lawson, M. E. (1940). Occupation of Indian girls after graduation at Sequoyah Orphan Training School, Tahlequah, Oklahoma. Unpublished master's thesis, Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Layman, M. E. (1942). A history of Indian education in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Leading Fighter, E. (1981). Statistics concerning Indian education, fiscal year 1979. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs Office of Educational Programs.

Lemmon, B. C. (1941). The historical development of the Chemawa Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, Oregon State University.

Leon, R. L. (1965). Maladaptive interaction between Bureau of Indian Affairs staff and Indian clients. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 35, 723-728.

Leon, R. L. (1969). Mental health considerations in the Indian boarding school program. As reported in special subcommittee on Indian education, Indian Education (Part 5), Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Letchworth, G. A. (1971 February). Morale and teacher separation and retention in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. Paper presented to American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 047 857)

Lewis, R. (1971). Procedural due process in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. American Indian Culture Center Journal, 2 (1), 11-13.

Lind, M. L. (1969). Relationships between work attitudes, perceived needs structures, and types of job settings for Bureau of Indian Affairs teachers in Alaska. Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, 419A-4192A.

Long, W. O. (1928). Indian education in Pennsylvania. Unpublished master thesis, The Pennsylvania State University.

Lynch, P. D. (1973). Professionals and clients: Goal dissonance in native American schools. In T. Arciniega (Ed.), Chicanos and Native Americans. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Mann, C. (1937). A study of Indian housing conditions of Wrangell Institute students to determine the type of home management house needed. Unpublished master's thesis, Oregon State University.

Martin, J. C. (1974). Self-confidence of selected Indian students. Journal of American Indian Education, 13 (3), 32-34.

Mason, C. P. (1955). Personality adjustment, mental maturity, and music aptitude of the three ethnic groups represented at Mt. Edgecumbe School, Mt. Edgecumbe, Alaska. Unpublished master's thesis, Central Washington College of Education, Ellenbury, Washington.

Mayfield, C. K. (1961). A test developed and administered to Navajo students at Intermountain Indian School to determine their readiness for reading from English pre-primer, primer and first year books. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.

McBeth, S. J. (1983). Ethnic identity and the boarding school experience of West-Central Oklahoma American Indians. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

McDermott, R. P. (1979 May). Social contexts for ethnic boarders and school failure. Paper presented at First International Conference on Non-Verbal Behavior, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada.

McKeehan, P. M. (1981). The History of Chemawa Indian School. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42 (01), Sec. A, P0113.

McKinney, L. G. (1934). History of the Albuquerque Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, University of New Mexico.

McLemore, B. (1981). Statistics concerning Indian education, fiscal year 1977. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior Office of Education Programs.

Meriam, L. (1928). Problem of Indian administration. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Merrill, O. W., Jr. (1971). A comprehensive mental health program at Sherman Indian High School. Washington, D.C.: Public Health Service Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Division of Indian Health.

Metcalf, A. R. (1972). Effects of boarding school on Navajo maternal attitudes and behavior. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Mental Health. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 188 834)

Meyer, J. H. (1954). Development of technical-vocational education at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida.

Milone, D., Tahmahkera, G., Tippeconnic, J., & Norris, C. (1982). Compilation of file comments about students at Phoenix Indian High School 1980-81. Arizona State University, Center for Indian Education.

Minock, S. N. (1970). Factors associated with deviant behavior at Intermountain School. Unpublished master's thesis, Utah State University, Logan, UT.

Mishou, F. H. (1942). The development of federal schools for natives in Alaska, 1885-1941. Unpublished master's thesis, George Washington University.

Noley, G. (1979). The history of education in the Choctaw Nation from precolonial times to 1830. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Norris, C. A. (1981). Project supplemental report, summary of pre-post test performance on the California achievement test in the Phoenix Indian School, 1980-1981. Phoenix Indian Center.

Odel, F. N. (1977). Reading and Language Achievement of Navajo Indian Pupils. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37 (9-A) 5589-5590.

Oetting, E. R., & Dinges, N. G. (1973). Evaluation summary model dormitory project: A report to Indian Health Service. (Contract No. HSM74-70-112). Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute, Inc.

Oestreicher, P. H. (1981). On the white man's road? Acculturation and the Fort Marion southern plains prisoners. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Oliver, E. S. (1947). An analysis of guidance programs of Indian high schools in the United States. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Washington.

Oviatt, B., Grittiths, K., & Farley, W. (1973). A perspective of the Alaska native school dropout. Salt Lake City, UT: Social Service Resource Center of Utah.

Paquin, B. (1981). Statistics concerning Indian education, FY 1978. Washington D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Office of Education Programs.

Paxton, S. G. (1976). Perceptions of power influentials in a Federal Indian school. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Peale. (1973). Attitudes re: Acculturation and separation of Indian students in boarding school settings. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Utah.

Penoi, C. R. (1956). Some factors of academic achievement in high school pupils attending selected Indian boarding schools in Oklahoma. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Pirie, Z. M. (1935). The introduction of the mental hygiene program at Sherman Institute through a child guidance clinic. Unpublished master's thesis, Claremont Colleges, Claremont, CA.

Pratt, R. H. (1964). Battlefield and classroom: Four decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Price, T. B., Baty, M. I., & Nutting, P. A. (1977). An intervention process designed to recognize and prevent school dropouts in an American Indian boarding school. Bureau of Indian Affairs Education Research Bulletin, 5 (3).

Provance, E. (1963). Problems of teaching senior English in an intercultural secondary boarding school for Eskimo and Indian students. Unpublished master's thesis, Fresno State College, Fresno, CA.

Queton, W. W. (1955). Observation of behavior changes of children living in cooperative dormitories at Fort Sill Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma A&M College.

Rainey, C. D. (1932). A study of the Salem Indian High School, comparing the cultural background, the intelligence scores, the percent of white blood, and the classroom grades. Unpublished master's thesis, Willamette University, Salem, OR.

Roessel, R. (1968). Dormitory living at Rough Rock. Journal of American Indian Education, 7 (3), 32-35.

Rosenbluth, H. (1973). Ft. Sill ORBS survey. Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs (Research and Evaluation Center).

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. F. (1968). Teacher expectations for the disadvantaged. Scientific American, CCXVIII (4), 19-23.

Roulston, S. (1971). Survey of attitudes and perceptions, Alaska Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school students. Juneau, AK.

Sahmaunt, D. (1978). Off-reservation residential schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. (Report Prepared by the Committee of Off-Reservation Residential Schools). Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Seymour, H. C. (1942). Indian youth attend boarding school. Harvard Educational Review XII, 405-415.

Shannon, R. (1971). A history of Riverside Indian School. Anadark , OK: Riverside Indian School Printing Department.

Smith, L. C. (1962). An investigation of the social adjustment of L.D.S. graduates from Intermountain Indian School. Unpublished master's thesis, Brigham Young University.

Suttmiller, F. (1963). A history of St. Paul's Indian School at Marty, South Dakota. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Dakota.

Svensson, F. E. (1973). What about the first Americans. Today's Education (January).

Tingey, J. W. (1978). Indians and blacks together: An experiment in biracial education at Hampton Institute (1878-1923). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Tippeconnic, J. W. (1975). The relationship between teacher pupil control ideology and elementary student attitudes in Navajo schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Tompkins, V. G. (1961). A survey of grading procedures in federal non-reservation boarding schools for American Indians. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Kansas.

Ulibarri, H. (1959). Teacher awareness of socio-cultural differences in multi-cultural classrooms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico.

Underwood, G. W. (1976). Off reservation boarding school survey, student profile, (Research and Evaluation Report Series, No. 56). Albuquerque, NM: Office of Indian Education Programs.

U.S. Comptroller General. (1972). Opportunity to improve Indian education in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 064 006)

U.S. Comptroller General. (1978). Bureau of Indian Affairs not operating boarding schools efficiently. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress Senate. (1969). Indian education: A national tragedy--A national challenge. Kennedy Report, 91st Congress, 1st Session. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs. (1980). Indian education oversight. (Hearing before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, Ninety-Sixth Congress, Second Session on oversight of Indian Education) Public Laws 95-561 & 95-608.

U.S. Congress Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs. (1982). Closing of Indian boarding schools. (Hearings before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, U.S. Senate, 97th Congress, Second Session, on the Bureau of Indian Affairs' proposal to close three Off-Reservation Boarding Schools).

U.S. Congress Senate, Subcommittee on Indian Education. (1969). A compendium of federal boarding school evaluations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1959). Dormitory life: Is it living? Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of Indian Affairs, Branch of Education.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1968). Social studies in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools: A position paper. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 047 837)

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1969). Helpful hints for new Bureau of Indian Affairs teachers. Window Rock, AZ: U.S. Government Printing Office. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 034 601)

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1970). Environmental awareness for Indian education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 046 615)

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1972). Off-reservation boarding school project. (Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 11). Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Center.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1973). High school guidance. Window Rock, AZ: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Area Office.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1973). An evaluation project: The Pierre Indian School, (Final Report). Aberdeen, SD: Bureau of Indian Affairs Aberdeen Area Office. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 184 763)

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1973). Intermountain evaluation task force, a report. Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Center.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Education Resources Center, Office of Indian Education Programs. (1974). Alaska native needs assessment in education. Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Office of Indian Education Program.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1975). Intermountain boarding school. (Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 24.02). Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Center.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1975). Evaluation of student rights and responsibilities programs. (Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 25). Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Center.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1976). Survey of student characteristics at Ft. Sill and Chilocco Indian Schools, 1976. (Research and Evaluation Report Series No. 55). Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs Research and Evaluation Center.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1978). Reaching out, peer counselor program. In It is a time of visions, Book 2. Counseling education program-A new approach. In It is a time of visions, Book 5, New directions-A focus. In It is a time of visions, Book 1.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1983). Results of the questionnaire on alcohol and drug abuse in schools funded under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs Office of Indian Education Programs, Division of Student Support Services.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1983). Minimum academic standards for the basic education of Indian children and national criteria for dormitory situations. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Helpful hints for new Bureau of Indian Affairs teachers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 040 959)

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. The preparation of Bureau of Indian Affairs teachers and dormitory aides, Vol. III: Contributions of Workshop Participants. Washington, D.C.: U.S.Government Printing Office. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 031 342)

U.S. Department of the Interior, Commissionor of Indian Affairs. (1965). The Navajo bordertown dormitory project: A report to the Senate Appropriations Committee by the Commissionor of Indian Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 024 490)

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Committee of Off-Reservation Residential Schools. (1978). Technical information for the committee. Anadarko, OK: Indian Education Programs.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Committee on Off-Reservation Residential Schools. (1978). Off-reservation residential schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Budget. (1980). A review of Bureau of Indian Affairs off-reservation boarding schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1978). Federal management weaknesses cry out for alternatives to deliver programs and services to Indians to improve their quality of life. (Report to the U.S. Congress by the Comptroller General of the U.S.). (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 171 484)

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1975). Information on federal programs which benefit American Indians. (Report of the Comptroller General of the U.S., B-114868).

Wax, M. L. (1970 March). Gophers or gadflies: Problems of Indian school boards. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Wesemann, R. E. (1970). Community background reports: Three boarding schools (Phoenix, Theodore Roosevelt, and Chemawa). National Study of American Indian Education, Series I, (No. 15 Final Report). Chicago, Ill.: Chicago University.

Wild, G. P. (1941). History of education of the Plains Indians of Southwestern Oklahoma since the Civil War. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

Wilson, J. (1969). Dormitory, teacher aides are big help in South Dakota. Journal of American Indian Education, 9 (2), 3-9.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The Methodology of the Study

The original goals of this project were to:

(1) Determine the extent and nature of student physical and psychological abuse within the schools.

(2) Determine the factors which influence and contribute to student abuse at these schools.

(3) Develop an intervention strategy intended to reduce student abuse at BIA ORBS and enhance the quality of education provided to the students.

The content of the intervention strategy was to be based on information gained from the data gathered during school visitations and survey questionnaire analyses. After interviewing former students at BIA ORBS, the above goals were modified as follows:

(1) To review the available literature on the study's theme of BIA boarding schools with particular emphasis on student problems and means of school improvement.

(2) To ascertain how the students were treated at these schools by means of in-depth telephone interviews with former students.

(3) To evaluate the current conditions at BIA ORBS by means of visitations to selected schools.

(4) To study a sample of non-BIA boarding schools to assess their educational philosophies and school operation. To ascertain, by means of interviews with staff and students, the similarities and differences between these private boarding schools and BIA ORBS.

(5) To analyze BIA and non-BIA student and teacher attitudes.

(6) To develop a practical and useful intervention strategy for enhancing the quality of life at BIA ORBS and for providing quality educational service to American Indian youth enrolled in these schools.

Both subjective and objective information was gathered from the staffs and students at the various BIA ORBS and non-BIA schools. The subjective information was gathered through school visitations conducted by members of the research staff. The objective data were obtained by means of questionnaires administered to current students and teachers as well as telephone interviews of former BIA students.

The Sample

In order to accomplish the research objectives specified above, BIA ORBS as well as non-BIA private boarding schools, were studied. The first step was to select the BIA sites within which the students and staffs would be sampled. Three sites were chosen on the basis of the administrators' willingness to cooperate with the research team. Nonetheless, the schools appeared to be representative of BIA ORBS.

The student and staff samples from each school were selected with the assistance of the school administration. Subjects were assured that all information was confidential and that their responses would remain anonymous.

Data from other samples were also used in the analysis. The results of the 1980 Educational Quality Assessment questionnaire distributed to Pennsylvania secondary teachers were employed in a comparative analysis with the BIA and non-BIA teacher data. Also, the survey data of American Indian and Alaska Native public school students tabulated for Development Associates, Inc., in 1981 and 1982

were compared with the responses of both the BIA and non-BIA students surveyed. The results obtained by Development Associates, Inc. formed part of a nationwide evaluation of Indian education and thereby presented a large sample with which comparisons could be made.

Data Collection Procedures

Both descriptive and attitudinal data were gathered through interviews and questionnaires. The descriptive interviews included student and teacher assessment of their satisfaction with school, problems at school, and suggestions and recommendations for changes at the school. The attitudinal data dealt more with students' personal feelings. For example, students were asked about the problems they were experiencing, their attitudes towards themselves, and so on.

In order to ensure confidentiality, the names of the individual schools and respondents were removed from their responses as soon as the interviews and surveys were completed. Individual names were associated with information only for the purposes of data collection, establishing sample composition, and authenticating data collection or obtaining missing information.

Instrumentation

To obtain representative data, a total of three interview tools were designed. The first interview format was developed for use in the telephone conversations with former BIA students. Also, separate interview formats were designed for students and staffs in assessing the current situation at both BIA boarding schools and non-BIA private boarding schools.

To complete Phase 1, the interviews with former BIA students, instrumentation development, training of interviewers, and interviewing convenience were

all considered. The questions were developed with the input of various Indian graduate students at The Pennsylvania State University and were designed to elicit candid, thorough, and complete descriptions of BIA boarding schools from students who attended these schools in 1974 and 1975. The graduate students conducting the interviews were carefully prepared through training sessions in interviewing technique. The interviews were completed at the convenience of the interviewee, necessitating such considerations as after-work hours and time zone changes.

Two survey questionnaires were also employed. The first survey questionnaire measured the attitudes of students in their respective schools. This instrument was an adaptation of the one used by Development Associates, Inc. from 1981 to 1982 in their assessment of American Indian and Alaska Native public school students. The modifications made by the research team were minor. The most significant changes were deletions of questions inappropriate in a boarding school environment. By doing this, the results of the administration of this questionnaire by Development Associates, Inc. could readily be compared to those obtained by the research team from BIA boarding school students and non-BIA private boarding school students. The second survey questionnaire was a slight modification of the 1980 questionnaire administered to Pennsylvania secondary education teachers in the state Education Quality Assessment. The most significant modifications were deletions of survey items inappropriate in a boarding school environment. In this way, the results of the Pennsylvania Education Quality Assessment Survey also could be compared with those tabulated by the research team from BIA boarding school teachers and non-BIA private boarding school teachers.

The intensive personal interviews of current students and staff at BIA and non-BIA boarding schools were conducted by members of the Penn State research

team during school visitations. Survey questionnaires were, in most cases, distributed by members of the research team during visitations to the schools.

Data Treatment

The objective data obtained from the survey questionnaires and certain short responses to interview questions were aggregated by school type and school. Subjective data which included the responses of participants' open-ended interviews are summarized throughout this report.

CHAPTER IV

PHASE 1

INTERVIEWS OF FORMER BIA ORBS STUDENTS

Introduction

A major portion of the work in the first year of the project was dedicated to obtaining information about the nature and scope of pupil abuse in BIA boarding schools. An "ex post facto" approach was employed so that data collection efforts would not pose a threat to the present staff at those schools. BIA officials supplied the team with names and home addresses of pupils enrolled in BIA schools during 1974-1975. Upon obtaining these lists, letters explaining the project and soliciting cooperation were mailed to a sample of 40 randomly drawn names. Telephone interviews were conducted with former pupils from six of the BIA boarding schools in existence at that time.

During these interviews, the former pupils were asked to recount the type and frequency of any negative incidents they observed or experienced while they were enrolled in a particular school. Information about positive experiences in the school was also solicited. Appendix A provides a copy of the interview entitled "Study of Student Life at BIA Off-Reservation Boarding Schools".

In the following detailed analysis of the telephone interviews, a format for summation is followed that closely follows the interview format. Also presented in the summaries are phrases and statements enclosed by parentheses that reflect the reviewer's comments and clarifications. The chapter concludes with an overall summary of the six BIA off-reservation boarding school responses.

Summary of School 1

Each of the four interviewees had attended this school for three years or more. None had attended school elsewhere. Reasons for attendance included friends at the school, lack of school at home, and one mention of prejudice in public school. All enjoyed the school. Students reported that the educational and recreational facilities were adequate. Both academic and personal counseling were readily available.

Rules at the school governed such areas as: work, cleaning rooms, drinking, and dress requirements. Typical punishments were restriction from activities, extra work, and for repeated, severe offenses (e.g., AWOL, drinking), students would be sent home. Punishments were usually administered by dormitory staff, or in serious cases the superintendent would do so.

In general, there were no language restrictions--except by, as one student stated, "some teachers who thought students were talking about them." Only one interviewee reported that he had a class that covered native culture. The chief cultural activities were pow-wows (which didn't include all students). There was a period of political activity in support of native rights, but few students were really militant. Participation in decision making was through dorm and student councils.

In general, town relationships were satisfactory, though one interviewee reported some prejudice. Sports, shopping and movies were the students' chief activities there. Sometimes students were caught shoplifting, and usually were helped out by the staff, but also were punished in the regular ways and required to make restitution.

Frequency and mode of contact with parents depended on distance. (There was no voluntary mention recorded of homesickness, etc.)

Relationships with principal, vice-principal, and secretary were always reported to be non-bureaucratic and usually warm. Teachers reportedly got along with students, especially Alaskan Indians who "seemed more respectful" toward teachers. Incidents involving students in trouble were referred to the principal.

There was some mention of conflict with dormitory staff, but no common theme or reason for the lack of harmony emerged. The chief problems, drinking and inter-tribal conflict, were handled by staff or referred to the superintendent. Extra work and notices to parents seem to have been the main sanctions.

All subjects reported incidents of running away, but the frequency of such occurrences varied according to the interviewee. Punishments consisted of notices sent to parents and, for extreme cases, expulsion.

Students appeared to get along well, and conflicts seemed to be personal rather than ethnic. It appears that cliques probably were small and defined by tribe or behavior (drinking and marijuana, sports, being quiet and minding one's own business).

Forced sexual relations between students were rumored but not confirmed. Similarly, two of the four interviewees heard of sex between staff and students, and one mentioned a specific student and several staff members.

Two interviewees reported that most students used alcohol, while two respondents reported that relatively few students drank. Reasons for drinking included adjustment problems and "because friends drank". Here and earlier there was reference to an alcohol abuse program. The reports on marijuana use varied, but two participants said only "troublemakers" were involved and no one really knew how the marijuana was obtained.

All of the interviewees recognized at least four of the classmates they were asked about and could give some description of them. However, they were often

unsure whether they graduated and usually did not know their present whereabouts. They all reported they had good relations with other students and staff. Each cited continued contacts with one or more classmates. All respondents graduated, and three went to college for one to four years (three are employed outside the home, and the fourth is a housewife). All were very positive about their experiences, and three would send their children there, while the fourth said the "school (staff) has gone downhill."

Two suggested no improvements. The others would like to see a greater emphasis on preparation for college and careers, a more activist staff, and more staff concern with student performance.

Summary of School 2

Two of the four persons interviewed had been in residence at least two years, the others for more than three years. Three did not like public school because of boredom and failure, and two of those had relatives who had gone to this school. The fourth's mother died and she had no other alternative but to go to a BIA ORBS. All respondents reported generally pleasant experiences at the school, but two did note problems of fighting among tribes. The educational facilities were generally described as adequate, though one participant mentioned outdated textbooks. Recreational resources seem to have been better than average. Academic and personal counseling was available. Help with problems was solicited from dormitory staff, counselors, and friends, and two persons also received help from a minister.

Behavioral rules covered drinking and drugs, hours, cleanliness, fighting, school attendance and grades, and there was one mention of a dress and hair code. Punishment for violating the rules was usually extra work. However, privileges

were sometimes restricted and parents were occasionally notified of infractions. Punishments were administered by the dormitory staff. (There was no explicit mention of school administrators or security personnel. Also, there was no comment on appropriateness of rules.)

One respondent said that there was an "opportunity to use their own language", and two noted that they received in-class instruction in Indian culture. Activities which involved Indian culture were pow-wows, Indian clubs, and dancing, and there was one mention of craft work. Two interviewees said that there was little native rights activism on campus, but a third reported some conflict between students and White teachers regarding this issue. Three former students reported an AIM visit which apparently caused some trouble, but indicated that most students were not active supporters of the organization.

All interviewees reported that the student government worked hard. For example, it was involved in attempts to influence decision-making about textbooks and drug/drinking problems, and supported a walk-out from class.

There was wide variation in reports on student-town relations. One said there was prejudice, and that merchants "expected" students to shoplift and start fights. He felt students did not generally participate in community activities. The other three said that relations were reasonable and that the school officials tried to avoid trouble by restricting visits to town. Two of them said that police would be called for major trouble, but the dorm staff handled minor problems. Punishments involved extra work, restrictions on activities and occasionally students were sent home. One mentioned the threat of being sent to a "school where there were bars on windows" for serious trouble.

Contact with families was as frequent as desired by students and seemed to be encouraged by the school. Many students were from the surrounding area. One said he went home every weekend, unless there were special activities.

Students had little contact with the principal, but for the most part, had positive feelings about him and felt that he was concerned with the school. However, one respondent said "he had a mean way of acting--wouldn't talk to you." Other administrators and clerical staff were seen as "nice" and were viewed as people who "wanted to help kids." Teachers got along with students, with minor exceptions, and one interviewee said "Many teachers got involved after hours." When they had trouble with a student, teachers tried to deal with it or called in a counselor. Administrators were called only as a last resort. Dormitory staff were reported as being very good to students. Trouble (drunken or fighting students) was handled by the staff unless it was "really serious," then security or police might be called. Incidents were associated with drinking, weekends, holidays, or other celebrations. Running away was not very frequent and seemed to stem from home-sickness. Sanctions for this were extra work or denial of permission to go home. One student mentioned teasing by other students as a problem.

It appears that there was more than average conflict among students, even though all interviewees said they got along well together. Two said some students were stereotyped as shy, loudmouths, bookworms, half-breeds, and so on, and were picked on. There is some suggestion that this stereotyping was by tribal groups.

Forced sexual relations between students were mentioned by two interviewees but no concrete examples were given. None knew of sex between students and dormitory staff or teachers, though one had heard stories and had been approached by a "kitchen worker" himself.

All interviewees reported that most students drank occasionally. There was little agreement on who drank, but alcohol was obtained through older students or townspeople. One said forty to forty-five percent smoked marijuana, but the others said "not very many" or "none." Marijuana came from purchases in town or from home. One thought paint sniffing was a big problem.

When asked about classmates, interviewees recognized almost all of them and could give descriptions of most of them, but in a majority of cases they could not be sure whether they graduated.

All interviewees seem to have adjusted well in school, made friends, and got along with most students and staff. All had graduated. Three still have contact with a few people from the school. All had further schooling. Two are now unemployed and one is in college.

All were quite positive about the school but two did not think they would send their child there. Suggestions for improvements included more discipline, vocational classes, self-government, staff who are knowledgeable about Indians, and activities. (These suggestions did not seem to be critical needs in all cases.)

Summary of School 3

Two of the three former students interviewed had been at the school over three years, the third had been there for four years. The only reasons given for attendance were to leave home and that older siblings liked it. All liked the school. Two emphasized activities and the other mentioned vocational development as reasons for their positive feelings. All appeared to find educational and recreational facilities adequate, as well as the academic and counseling programs.

Rules covered hours, class attendance, grooming, and prohibition on outside memberships (an earlier dress code was "voted out" by students and administration). Drinking and fighting were prohibited. Punishments included extra work, restriction from activities, or expulsion, and were administered by the dormitory staff (with administrator support) or honor students.

There was no apparent restriction on use of native languages, though they did not seem to be used in classes. There was a four-year required course on Indian history and culture, and an Indian club. (There seems to have been more emphasis on native heritage here than in the other schools.)

There was considerable conflict over native rights at one point, but participation in AIM was prohibited and some militant students were expelled. Also, it seems that most students were opposed to AIM or felt that "you kept your feelings to yourself--you were there for school and not to make trouble."

All said that the student inter-tribal council participated effectively in decision-making (examples were "programs," and "problems of students," but not policies).

Student-town interaction was somewhat limited by school rules. But two interviewees said that merchants and local boys hassled girls, with one rape reported. The third reported little contact with town. School reactions to student misbehavior were to restrict or expel the student, and one interviewee suggested that the town was put off limits when there was trouble there.

Contact with families was frequent by phone, letter and visit. There was no mention of homesickness.

Descriptions of the principal varied from "okay" to "power-minded." Other non-teachers mentioned were secretaries and cantina help. Teachers were seen as being helpful. Apparently, they tried to handle trouble themselves, but called in a counselor or the principal or superintendent for problems they couldn't resolve. Dormitory staff were reported as "(real) good." There appeared to be little conflict between staff and students. Dormitory staff tried to talk to students when they were troublesome, and one interviewee mentioned referral to counselors by dormitory staff. More serious trouble included inter-tribal conflict, drinking before graduation, and the AIM incursion.

Running away frequently occurred because of homesickness, failure, or "for fun." Two respondents indicated that there were four or five (or more) runaways per month, but one interviewee thought not that often. Sanctions for "running" were work, restrictions, and being sent home.

One respondent said students did not get along because of tribal prejudice. The other two said there were tribal gangs.

One interviewee said there were a few instances of forced sex between students, and that they were thrown out of school. No sex with staff was reported.

Two interviewees reported that less than ten percent of the students drank, but the third said "at least one-half of the students drank occasionally and everyone did so on the weekends." All agreed that alcohol could be obtained from townspeople. The same interviewee who reported more drinking estimated that one-third smoked marijuana.

Overall, the interviewees could describe about two out of three classmates mentioned, but were usually unaware of their present whereabouts. All said they got along well with students and staff, but none have current contact with anyone from the school. All graduated and two had further training. Two are now employed; the third has been employed outside the home, but is now a housewife, and is currently enrolled in CETA radio school.

All liked the school experience, but only one would send children there. School problems that needed attention include drinking, student apathy, lack of responsibility and self-respect.

Summary of School 4

Of the three interviewees, one had attended public school for three years, and one was at a mission school less than a year. Reasons for attendance were idiosyncratic. All thought it a pleasant place and liked the mix of tribes.

It seems that educational facilities might have been below average, but recreational facilities were not. Only two reported the availability of academic counseling. All said that dormitory staff helped with problems.

The only rules mentioned involved curfew times, but another comment suggests that drinking was not allowed. Sanctions for violations were restriction of activities or extra work and were administered by dormitory staff.

The use of native language was permitted and encouraged outside of classes, but there was very little instruction in Indian culture. There was an Indian Club and some pow-wows.

Two students said that AIM was on campus for one year, and one (who was in residence four years) said that this was troublesome and a large group of students and staff asked them to leave. Other comments centered on inter-tribal conflict with the largest tribe on campus. There was little or no evidence of student participation in decision-making.

Student-town relationships seem to have been "normal" with no special prejudice noted. Only two of the three remembered any trouble, and it appears civil authorities dealt with the problem in those cases.

It seems that there was very little contact with families, either by phone, mail, or visits.

Comments on non-teaching administrators indicated almost no contact. Teachers tried to handle trouble with students by themselves, and the administration was involved "as a last resort." Dormitory staff got along well with students, but called the Security Patrol for serious trouble. Usual problems were drunkenness, fighting, and failure to get up for classes. One interviewee mentioned "riots" when students other than the dominant tribe first arrived. There was only one runaway reported, and nothing was done, since he never returned.

Two of three interviewees said students did not get along with each other and all agreed there was much inter-tribal conflict. Individuals were picked on by other tribes. (There seems to have been much more conflict of this sort here than at other schools.)

There was no report of forced sex between students or of sex with staff.

Estimates of numbers of students drinking varied from "twenty percent" to "all." Alcohol was obtained from older students and people in town. Estimates of marijuana use varied from none to "quite a bit," and it seems to have been on the increase during the time the respondents were in school.

The interviewee who had been at the school for four years knew four of the five classmates named; the others knew none.

All seemed to emphasize that they "stayed away from trouble" or "didn't get caught" while at the school. (The respondents showed little involvement in either the social or academic aspects of the school.) All graduated and two had further education. Two are currently unemployed.

Reports of experiences were mixed, with fighting noted by all. None would send their children to the school. Suggestions for improvements included "more Indian culture in the school," increased instruction in native languages, more native teachers, more structure, and greater opportunities for students to earn money.

Summary of School 5

Five former students were interviewed. Four of the interviewees were there over three years and did not attend another school; the fifth was there less than two years and attended a public high school for less than one year. Reasons for attendance centered on personal and family ties and lack of alternatives. All reported that their overall school experience was satisfying, though some cited

(initial) adjustment problems. Educational and recreational facilities were adequate, with modest exceptions. There was less consensus on the nature of counseling services and their use, except that dormitory personnel could be helpful with problems.

Rules covered hours, passes and curfew, drinking and drugs, smoking areas, and chores and (work) details. Less frequently mentioned rules covered study hours, class tardiness, property and safety, and opposite sex dormitories. Sanctions for violations included restrictions from activities, extra work, and being sent home for repeated offenses. Sanctions were generally administered by dormitory personnel, and sometimes counselors or administrators, but never by teachers.

All reported that their native language was not used in instruction, but its use otherwise was not restricted. The four three-year residents reported one class that covered native culture and some related activities. There was no report of activities (or interest) in support of native rights. Student participation in decision making was via Student Council; no examples of policy changes were remembered, but some specific activities were initiated.

None of the interviewees reported that she or he personally had any conflict with residents of the nearest town, but all indicated that there was prejudice against students from the boarding school particularly from local adolescents. However, relationships with town adults were better. Serious conflicts (which seem to have been infrequent) would be stopped by police. Dormitory personnel would then retrieve the student and determine punishment. Repeated offenses usually resulted in restrictions or expulsion.

Direct contact with parents and other relatives were very infrequent for three interviewees, and adequate for the other two.

Reactions to non-teaching academic staff were varied. The principal was said to be old, to have frequent contact with students, but did not provide a sense of concern or caring to most. Two mentioned the secretary (an Indian) warmly, and two unidentified staff persons received positive comments from students.

Relations between teachers and students were good, and any occasional trouble was handled by the teacher. The principal was called in only in extreme cases. (There was no mention of bureaucratism, time-serving, or anti-native attitudes.) Comments suggested that some of the students who had conflicts with teachers were repeat offenders.

In general, dormitory staff got along well with all but "problem" students. Depending upon the severity, conflicts were resolved within the dormitory, with the help of counselors or security guards, or with parents. The major problem mentioned by all interviewees was drunkenness.

While all interviewees reported that students got along well together, they also reported that there were gangs or cliques, based on place of origin, and/or ethnicity. Most reported that some students were picked on, chiefly because of "personal" characteristics. Two interviewees reported knowledge of forced sex between students, but none knew of any involving the staff.

There was fair consensus that about fifty percent of the students drank but that far fewer used marijuana, which "was just getting in." There was much less consensus on social types who drank, except perhaps for "problem" students. Most alcohol seemed to come from older students.

All of the interviewees knew at least three of the five classmates they were asked about, and three knew all of them. They could give anecdotally supported descriptions of most, and knew whether they graduated. However, only three were able to report current knowledge of their former classmates.

All of the interviewees reported good, though varied, adjustments to the school. Four graduated from the school. Four have clerical-type or lower professional jobs, and the fifth is a housewife. All reported positive experience with the school, but two said they would not want to send their children there. Only one suggested improvements in the facilities.

(Overall, it appears that these interviewees had positive experiences in the school, though they can cite others who did not. However, they do not attribute those problems to the school.)

Summary of School 6

All five interviewees were at the school over two years, four for more than three years, and two of those over four years; one student briefly attended another BIA school (and graduated there). Three gave bad home and public school situations as reasons for attendance, and the other two cited attractions at the school. All liked the school (some liked it very much), but one felt that college preparation was lacking and another thought it too strict. (None mentioned adjustment problems or conflict between individuals or groups.)

Educational and recreational facilities seemed good (perhaps better than elsewhere), and readily available. Academic and personal counseling were quite satisfactory. Cottage matrons did most of the personal counseling, but did refer students to school counselors. One student reported going to teachers for help, even though "they . . . weren't supposed to . . ."

Rules covered dress, curfews, attendance, and drinking. Infractions brought restrictions of activities and extra work. Punishments were administered by dormitory personnel and counselors.

Use of native languages was encouraged and there was instruction in Native American language, history, and arts/crafts. The main cultural activities were pow-wows. It appears that there was some (and perhaps some strong) interest in AIM, by a minority of students. However, participation was restricted or actively discouraged by the staff. There was disagreement about the effectiveness of the Student Council, and the range of matters it handled.

Community student relationships were said to be satisfactory (they seem to have been much better than at some other sites), though students were "watched closely" by merchants according to two interviewees. Participation in town activities (e.g., socials, sports events) varied. Any trouble involving students in town was handled by the counselors and dormitory staff) and could result in extra work, restriction, or expulsion for repetition.

Contact with families varied by distance and the student's preference. Homesickness did not appear to be a problem.

The principal (an Indian) and most other non-teaching staff were well liked. Relations were also good with most teachers; teachers tried to deal with troublesome students by themselves before calling in the principal. Four interviewees said that students' relationships with dormitory staff were good, but one disagreed saying "discipline was a big problem in the dorms." Dormitory staff responses to trouble varied from "cover for the student" to referrals to the "disciplinary center," a counselor or police. Such trouble, usually related to alcohol use, mostly occurred on weekends.

Running away occured frequently and was usually to "have a good time" or to escape from poor adjustment to school.

While four of the five interviewees said students got along well with each other, all agreed that there were fights between students. There was wide varia-

tion of opinion regarding the basis of gangs and their significance. One reported that a "student was beaten to death the year before I got there--gangs were broken up after that," but no one else mentioned this. Getting "picked on" may have been tribally based according to two interviewees, but two more thought it was done by "big guys" or for "showing off". Three of the five reported forced sex between students, but none knew of any sex between students and teachers or other staff.

There was agreement that a large majority of students drank, and three students thought academic problems exacerbated drinking or vice versa. Alcohol came through older students, local Indians, or other kids in town. Estimates of marijuana use varied from "rare" to "same as drinking," with similar variety in descriptions of users, from "everyone" to "average" to "losers". Respondents were less certain of the sources of marijuana.

Four of the interviewers knew and could describe the five classmates named in the interview. However, there was little later contact. Only one knew the current whereabouts of two persons named, and two could report on one each.

All interviewees said they got along (pretty) well with other students and (most) staff. All graduated and four of the five had some further college or vocational training; one is now unemployed.

In general, the school experience was positive, though there were negative mentions of drinking, restrictions, and poor attitude of some staff. Two would send their own child to this school, two would not, and one would prefer a local tribal school. Suggestions for improvements from four interviewees included giving bad students more chances to improve, upgrading academic standards, providing more recreational facilities, and hiring "teachers who want to teach kids and younger dormitory staff and counselors who'll understand kids better."

Overall Summary of Six BIA Off-Reservation Boarding School Students' Responses

The preceding summaries were prepared for all six sites where three or more former students were interviewed. In five of the six schools, respondents had considerable experience in the school--from two to four years in residence. In general, they probably represent students who were the most well adjusted to the school setting. None attended involuntarily, and none reported significant conflict with school personnel. Also, they appear to be more successful subsequently, in education, employment, and family and community life than their peers. These characteristics also seem to apply to respondents at other sites with fewer than three completed interviews. It is possible that they bring better-than-average objectivity to the reporting task, as well as observational skills and a comparatively broad perspective on the school experience. Almost all of them report quite uniformly positive experiences in the several schools. However, it should be noted that these respondents can not be said to be a representative sample of all BIA-ORBS students.

Two general impressions emerge about these ORBS and the experience they provided for the students. First, while there seemed to be some genuine differences in the quality of life the range was not extreme. Some schools appeared to be better places to live and learn than others; but none could claim complete--or perhaps even satisfactory--success, and none fail altogether.

Second none of these institutions could be characterized as oppressive. All attempted to regulate student life and behavior but fell short of perfect observance of rules, and all seemed to tolerate degrees of nonconformity. In general, it appeared that dormitory staff were particularly important in mediating institutional effects on students.

Although other generalizations are tentative at best, it is possible to identify some common themes in the responses of the participants. For instance, it seems that the great majority of teachers and dormitory personnel provided positive experiences. Teachers and dormitory staff who participated in supervising dormitory life had greatest impact on the quality-of-life at these schools. The administrative staff seemed to have less importance in the lives of the students.

The rules under which supervision was carried out were never the object of any direct criticism. In fact, students often expressed the need for more rules and stricter enforcement to cut down on those aspects of school life which were seen as undesirable (e.g., drinking, fighting, inter-tribal conflict).

Inter-tribal conflictwas one of the most negative aspects of the school experience for respondents. Drinking was a source of difficulty both in the dorms and in town. Most respondents did not experience postive relationships with local community members. Community relations (bad or good) did not seem to have a great effect on the school experience. The other dimension of off-campus relations--contact with relatives--may have been a more influential factor in individual adjustment, since homesickness was important for some respondents.

One indirect measure of the perceived quality of life may lie in the students' hesitation to send their children to the school they attended. While almost all interviewees reported that their experience in the school was good and valuable, only a minority said they would be willing to send a child there. Reasons centered on "changes" that supposedly have taken place in the interim--most often in personnel. Whether such reports are accurate descriptions of the respondents true feelings, or are a covert expression of underlying dissatisfaction with their own school experiences cannot be assessed from these interviews.

Another indirect reflection of the respondents' school experiences might be inferred from the frequency of contacts with former students and staff members. None reported more than one or a few such contacts. While it is difficult to predict whether friendships will endure, it seems plausible that positive school experiences would promote efforts to maintain lasting relationships.

CHAPTER V

PHASE 2

SCHOOL VISITATIONS TO SELECTED BIA OFF-RESERVATION BOARDING SCHOOLS

Introduction

Following the study of the quality of life in BIA ORBS during the mid-'70s, a review of the current situation in these schools was begun. The analysis of Phase I information resulted in a modification of the project's emphasis from institutional "abuse" to student problems and quality of life.

Three ORBS were chosen to verify information gathered in the Phase I survey of former ORBS students. Several members of the research team were assigned to visit each school. During the school visits, information gathering sessions were held with school administrators, interviews were conducted with other employees and students, and questionnaires were given to students and teachers. Appendix B includes the Interview Protocol used with staff and students at the three BIA schools. Summaries of the three school visitations are presented below. The concluding section attempts to identify the commonalities characterizing these schools. As an adjunct to the interview sessions, members of the research team also had occasion to participate in longer periods of observation in the academic area and the home living area. Selected observations in these settings are included to provide more of the background within which the interview data are reported.

BIA School A

A four member team visited this school from March 19, 1984 to March 22, 1984. What follows is a summary of the data they collected.

Staff Interviews

A total of forty-four staff members (34% of the employees) were interviewd by the research team (see Table 1 for an organizational chart of the school). The length of employment among those interviewed ranged from one to eighteen years with an average of seven years.

Staff members identified many positive aspects about working at the school. The aspect most frequently cited was the opportunity to work with Indian students and to meet their academic and home living needs. Some appreciated the fact that the school was run by Indians, while others reported a closeness among the staff members and a closeness with the students they served. Some staff stated that the facilities were superior. Others appreciated the freedom and support from the administration for development of curriculum.

The list of negative aspects associated with working at the school was much longer. Among the less positive things about working at the school were:

* The proposed closing of the school;
* "Close to the bone" funding;
* Flagrant breaking of rules by students;
* Inability to help each student with multiple problems;
* Not having a standard eight-hour work day--irregular working hours;
* Indian preference in hiring;
* Working weekends;
* A bureaucracy which prevented free decision making;
* Federal control over purchasing (forced to use the GSA when local purchases would be cheaper);

TABLE 1

Staffing Organization for BIA School A

ADMINISTRATION

Education Program Administrator	- 1
Secretary-Steno	- 1
Education Clerk	- 1
Supply Clerk	- 1
Administrative Officer	- 1
Supply Technician	- 1
School Psychologist	- 1

HOME LIVING SERVICES

Education Technician	- 1
Secretary Typing	- 1
Home Living Specialist	- 1
Clerk-Typist	- 1

INTENSIVE RESIDENTIAL GUIDANCE

Guidance Counselors	- 4
Tutor	- 1

BOYS AND GIRLS GUIDANCE

Education Aide (dorms)	- 6
Home Living Assistants	- 10
Night Attendants	- 8
Dorm Manager	- 3
Supv. Guidance Counselors	- 2
Supv. Education Aide	- 1

RECREATION

Recreation Assistants	- 8
Recreation Specialist	- 1
Banker	- 1

FOOD SERVICES

Cooks	- 4
Food Service Worker Leader	- 1
Food Service Workers	- 3
Cook Leader	- 1
Food Service Manager	- 1

ACADEMIC

Education Aide (Academic)	- 4
Teachers	- 36
Secretary-Steno	- 2
Clerk-Typist	- 1
Teacher-Supervisors	- 3
Assistant Principal	- 1
Registrar	- 1

FACILITY MANAGEMENT

Custodial Workers	- 4
Boiler Plant Equipment Mechanic	- 1
Water Treatment Plant Operator	- 1
Utility Systems Repairer Operator	- 2
Maintenance Worker	- 2
Clerk-Typist	- 1
Foreman, Utility Systems	- 1
Guard	- 1
Foreman, Maintenance Mechanic	- 1
Masonry Worker	- 1
Facility Manager	- 1
Grand Total	130

* Lack of school supplies;
* Lack of replacement parts for maintenance in the buildings;
* Poor attitude of employees (must be paid to do anything beyond the work day);
* Employee irresponsibility;
* Unpleasant weather;
* Supervisors not supporting the staff;
* Personal problems which carried over to work;
* Not enough time to do what should be done;
* Lack of Indian teachers;
* No spring vacation;
* Unrealistic demands of administrators;
* Non-professional dorm staff;
* Lack of sufficient counseling;
* Militaristic authority structure;
* High student turnover;
* Lack of inter-departmental communication;
* Drinking and drug problems among students;
* High pressure situations due to student behavior problems; and,
* Shortage of staff.

When asked about their future plans, a large majority (86.4%) of the staff stated that they had no intention of leaving the school. Seven (14%), however, said they were very ready to leave the school and would accept another job if they had an offer. Those hoping to leave were looking for better working hours, better pay, and a more geographically interesting environment. Some of these staff had problems with the federal bureaucracy, as well as with the local school administration.

A third area explored in the staff interviews was the amount of fighting among students at the school. Fifty percent of those interviewed acknowledged the fact that fighting was a serious problem at the school. Estimates of the frequency of fights ranged from one every two days to one every three weeks. Fighting was between individuals not tribes, and many fights involved girls fighting over boys. Ten years ago most of the fights were between boys, now, however, the majority of the fights are between girls. Most fights occur on evenings and weekends. Approximately 20% of the staff, however, said that the amount of fighting at the school was no different than at other public schools. They did acknowledge the fact that there were fights, but said that they did not reach the proportion of a serious problem. In fact, 30% of the staff stated that fighting was not a problem at the school.

Most of the staff felt drinking and drugs were more serious problems than fighting. Eighty-six percent of the staff interviewed indicated that drinking was a problem at the school and reported that most of the drinking occured on weekends. The school was trying to get help from the sheriff to control the problem.

Ninety-one percent of the staff stated that drugs were a very serious problem and most of the staff suggested that substance abuse was due to a combination of peer pressure and lack of positive self image. An Intensive Residential Guidance (IRG) program addresses serious student problems. The IRG staff members act as small group leaders in weekly sessions and coordinate information and guidance sessions for the students. Staff members were somewhat divided in their assessments of the IRG program's effectiveness. Some were enthusiastic about the program while others were skeptical of its success.

The staff was also questioned about the educational opportunities afforded the students at the school. In particular, they were asked whether it was adequate

for student needs. Thirty-six percent of the staff indicated that the educational opportunities available were inadequate. These individuals reported that only between 3% and 5% of the student body go on to higher education and expressed that the curriculum for those students was substandard. They stated that many students attain only minimal abilities to read and write. They also felt that very little homework was assigned and the dormitories were not conducive to study. By not emphasizing homework and not requiring study hours in the dormitory, the school as a whole does not seem to encourage study habits or studying at night. According to these staff members, students are prepared mainly for vocational training, not college. Furthermore, staff expectations are low and the students are not challenged to rise above a mediocre level.

The rest of the staff interviewed believed that the school was meeting the academic needs of students although several of them acknowledged that the program was elementary and meeting only minimal requirements. Since the majority of the students attending the school required remedial work, however, they felt the school was more than adequately meeting this need.

Another area explored with the staff was the school's ability to meet the emotional needs of the students. Approximately 45% of the staff felt that the school was doing an acceptable job meeting the emotional needs of the students, but the rest disagreed. Some of the staff stated that there were not enough people with whom the students could talk. For example, they stated that there were only four counselors to deal with four hundred students. In addition, they felt the home living staff was understaffed and unqualified to deal with most counseling problems. Suggestions were made to upgrade the pay for dormitory help and to hire more qualified employees. The counselors always seemed to be busy and the aides rated themselves as incompetent to handle emotional problems without additional training.

The staff was much more positive concerning the school's ability to meet the social and recreational needs of the students. For the most part, they indicated that there was much more for the students to do at this school than was available to pupils attending public schools. Also, they indicated that there were even fewer activities for students at home, on the reservations. Many of the staff believed the students took for granted the recreational opportunities that they had.

Several of the staff, however, did have suggestions to upgrade the social and recreational programs available at the school. One suggested a larger recreation building, and another recommended more activities for weekends. One person suggested that an effort be made to redistribute the activities more evenly by offering less on weekdays and more on weekends. Several staff felt that the recreation personnel should be upgraded. Many felt that the activities provided the students were too routinized and predictable.

All staff members, including those who had only occasional contact with the students expressed willingness to provide help with personal or academic problems. Forty-one percent of those staff members who had direct contact with the students stated that they regularly provide academic and personal assistance to the students.

The staff offered numerous ideas for changing the school to make it a better place for students. Among the suggestions were the following:

* Provide additional facilities (swimming pool, recreation building, canteen);
* Provide additional activities;
* Require students to attend mandatory counseling when major discipline infractions such as drinking and marijuana usage occur;
* Improve study habits (study halls) and prepare students for outside work;

* Offer better meals;
* Provide more on-campus housing for staff;
* Construct newer buildings such as larger classrooms instead of trailers, larger gym;
* Employ more qualified dormitory staff;
* Replace tired school administrators with enthusiastic ones with new, fresh ideas;
* Coordinate more team effort between dorm and school staff;
* Eliminate compensatory time for employees;
* Enforce discipline throughout the school;
* Provide alternatives to suspension;
* Offer more fringe benefits for staff;
* Assign fewer students per room (two instead of four); and
* Encourage more involvement of staff with students after hours.

Finally, staff were asked what they would do to reorganize the school and dormitory. Here, too, their suggestions were multiple and varied, from doing nothing to closing the school. The following suggestions were offered:

* Instead of two large dorms, there should be smaller dorms housing fifty to seventy-five students each. Students could be separated into three groups (honor students, regular students, and correctional students);
* More emphasis should be placed on academic training;
* An effort should be made to get home living and academic departments to work together;
* Upgrade dorm staff positions (more training for aides);
* Administrators and teachers should be seen more after the work day;
* Make dormitories homier, more pleasant, and less like jails;

* Have longer lunch breaks;
* There should be more social gatherings for staff;
* Eliminate ninth graders (they are too young for boarding school);
* Have live-in dorm staff;
* Expand the work-study program to include more students;
* Additional materials and supplies for the dorms should be provided;
* Provide more exposure to Indian professionals;
* Improve the IRG program (it seems to reward students for bad behavior);
* Reduce staff attrition; and
* Provide more counselors.

Student Interviews

The ten students interviewed were randomly selected from the general school population and were interviewed over a three-day period. Each interview lasted between thirty and forty-five minutes. The students were very cooperative and seemed to provide sincere responses. The sample was equally divided between males and females, ranged in age from 14 to 19, and had been enrolled from five months to almost four years.

Four students were attending an ORBS for the first time, and were unable to state a preference for this or any ORBS. Four interviewees preferred another ORBS to this school. Reasons given for this preference included the minimal level of activity at this institution, the proximity of other schools to their homes with corresponding reductions in travel time and expense, crowded dorm conditions, and the unpleasant institutional atmosphere at this school. Two students did, however, prefer this school to any other ORBS. One stated that there was more freedom here, and another appreciated its large size, as well as proximity to home.

Only six students elected to attend the school. Three of the remaining four students were ordered by the courts to attend the institution as an alternative to incarceration.

Seven interviewees indicated a preference for ORBS over public schools. Reasons for this choice included the following:

* ORBS are academically easier;
* There is an absence of prejudice;
* A more relaxed and comfortable environment is present;
* There is an emphasis on Indian matters;
* Less fighting and substance abuse take place;
* The school prepares for the college experience; and
* The school has good discipline.

Two students who preferred public schools stated that there were too many regulations and work details at the ORBS. One respondent had no public school experience.

The overall consensus among the students was that they get along very well although they did report cliques by tribes and geographic areas.

Fighting was seen as minimal, with only occasional conflicts here and there. Students acknowledged that some students were picked on, but usually in a teasing fashion. Likely candidates for this type of harassment were identified as loners (those who didn't make friends easily, or those who acted or dressed out of the ordinary).

Being authentic, friendly, and acknowledging the contributions of other tribes were mentioned as positive means of getting along with fellow students.

The interviewees readily acknowledged that rampant substance abuse occurred at the school. Only six students felt that drinking was a serious problem

while all ten respondents stated that drug use was a very serious problem. Estimates of those involved in drugs varied from one fourth to all of the residents. Marijuana was the only drug identified. Several students felt that the school administration, dorm staff and teachers were unaware of the magnitude of the problem. The interviewees admitted to smoking marijuana in the bathrooms, on school grounds, off-campus, and in the dorms. They stated that the drug was easy to obtain. Students could purchase it downtown, get it on home visits or obtain it through the mail.

Six students indicated a preference for a more challenging curriculum. In particular, they desired more academic competition. Several students expressed a fear that higher education would be very difficult for them since their high school curriculum had been so watered down. One respondent stated that a student could perform at the top of the class here and yet be at the lower end of the spectrum in another school. Two students were satisfied with the "nice and easy" pace of the program. One interviewee thought it was just right and one found the special education class too difficult.

Eight of the ten students felt "at home" at the school. Life there was pleasant and it was easy to make friends. A perceived plus for the school was the sense of freedom and independence the students felt by being away from home and on their own. Eight students had experienced feelings of loneliness or homesickness but acknowledged that these feelings had somewhat diminished with time.

Only three interviewees stated that there was enough to do at the school and these responses were conditional. To prevent boredom, it seemed that a student had to be a joiner, have a work-study job or be a member of the honor dorm. Without an activity card (revoked for major infractions), students felt there was little to do on campus. The other seven students stated, rather emphatically, that

there were not enough activities. Life seemed to be routinized and ordinary. Suggestions to remedy this included more competitive sports; bicycling; more movies; improving the canteen; organized gym activities; more weekend activities; and more time downtown.

Nine of the ten students related that the teachers tried very hard to get to know the students and help them. One respondent stated that the job of a teacher was not an easy one, because it was difficult to get the class to participate or to show much enthusiasm. Another thought that most of the students were not that interested in their class work and did not seek out teachers for academic help. This is not to say that students did not view the teachers as friends and confidants. Many teachers helped the students by forming friendly relationships with them and all reported that it was very easy to get help with their studies. Teachers, friends, dorm tutors, and dorm aides were identified as willing sources of academic assistance. The students agreed, however, that studying was virtually over at the end of the academic day and homework was rarely given. Both students and staff appeared content to meet the minimal academic requirements for graduation. The dorm tutor was used more in a counseling and recreational capacity than in an academic one.

Half the students interviewed preferred to talk over a personal problem with friends rather than school staff. Three of the students, however, said they would call upon dorm staff or counselors first. A few students said they might confide in other adults, namely the coach, home living director, principal, or IRG advisors.

Students suggested improvements in these areas: academics, recreation, discipline, group living, food service, and school location. The recommendations are listed below:

Academics

* Make school more interesting and more difficult.
* Extend the time period between classes.
* Upgrade the quality of teachers.
* Employ more Indian teachers.

Recreation

* Permit more time off campus. Students who have reached the age of eighteen should be able to sign themselves off campus.
* Extend off-campus curfew time to 11:00 p.m. on Fridays, 10:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and 11:00 p.m. on Sundays.
* Provide more activities, e.g., horseback riding, swimming, and roller skating.
* Provide more activities for students whose major privileges have been revoked.

Discipline

* Reduce the penalty for major infractions from twenty-five to fifteen hours.
* Eliminate detention.
* Reduce the penalty for minor infractions from five to three hours.
* Give students the benefit of the doubt before writing them up for academic minor offenses such as sleeping in class.

Group Living

* Carpet the dorms.
* Provide more comfortable beds.
* Improve the cheerfulness of the structural environment by painting, etc.

* Hire younger dorm staff.

Food Service

* Diversify the menu.

* Provide more student input into menu planning and food preparation.

School Location

* Move the school to a more scenic location.

Following the individual student interviews, two groups of student leaders (the president of each class and members of the student council) were interviewed.

The four class presidents were asked to share things about the school that they liked and thought were worthwhile. Some of the things they mentioned included the sports program, the chance to meet new people, the opportunity to get away from home and people they are tired of, and the peaceful and quiet dormitory life. When asked about the things they didn't particularly like at the school, the list included the following: food (the meat is greasy); not enough freedom for those students who are not members of the honor dormitory; not enough space to walk around; and anti-Indian prejudice experienced in inter-school athletic activities.

The class presidents felt that the curriculum was much too easy and suggested additional study in mathematics and computers. Other recommendations to improve the school included hiring more Indian teachers. Students would also like the teachers to socialize a bit more with them. Another complaint students had concerned their exclusion from academic meetings. They reported little student-staff dialogue about academics and would like to participate in staff meetings. They also thought that students were permitted to withdraw from the school much too easily. Due to the ease in withdrawing, students did not give themselves or the school enough time before making a decision to go home on their own or to be sent home. The students also reported that drinking and smoking are both serious problems and they would like the school to address these issues.

The class presidents did not display hesitancy in making their observations and were very willing to express their opinions. Overall, they were content with life at the school, however, they did have suggestions to make things better.

Some of these suggestions included: acquire more land; improve existing buildings; build an indoor swimming pool; provide horses; establish more recreation areas; and permit more religious freedom (to practice religion in the traditional way).

The student council was composed of three students, but existed in name only. For example, the other offices had been unaware that the president had resigned her post.

The remaining officers of the student council (and the ex-president, who agreed to be interviewed) felt their the organization did not have any significant input or influence in the school's policies or operation. They reported that the administration was always willing to listen to their complaints, but rarely acted on things the students proposed. Furthermore, they had run unopposed in the student elections and felt their positions were those of volunteers lacking support from an active and interested student body.

Some things they liked at the school included the following: people from various tribes living together and learning from each other; the opportunity to meet new and interesting people; the opportunity to build close relationships; and independence.

Their list of dislikes was more extensive and included: food (not enough--students have big appetites and the cafeteria runs out of food); students aren't permitted to have pop or candy until after school; students miss their parents and relatives; the buildings are outdated and depressing; the dorms are crowded; there is a lot of stealing; activities are routine; and the dormitory matrons do not put forth their full energies for the students.

The student government leaders believed that the academic program was too mediocre and thought the students should work harder.

Some of the recommendations they made to improve life at the school included: the creation of an open campus for seniors (18-year-olds should be permitted to check themselves out when they wanted); updating and improving the structures on campus; the construction of better dorms; more visits by the Bureau of Indian Affairs so that they get an accurate perspective of the school's operation; and a survey of boarding schools conducted by the BIA to provide supplemental information on students and life here.

Classroom Observations

Observations were made in five regular classes, the special education class, the vocational class, and during a special school assembly.

In the remedial reading class there were two teachers and three aides. Students were separated into groups and kept busy with their individual tasks throughout the class period.

The other classes revealed the following problems:

1. Some teachers were not putting much effort into their work, e.g., they did not notice students cheating on exams.

2. In some classes, students showed little interest in learning and did not make much effort to participate in class discussion.

The quality of teaching in the five classes revealed quite a range. In the reading classroom there was a lot of significant teacher-student interaction. In most of the other classes, however, students seemed to be bored, teachers did not display much enthusiasm, and the lessons were not very imaginative. The students were very soft spoken, non-participative, and appeared disinterested in academic work.

Dormitory Observation

The female dorm was observed over a period of three evenings. The students were generally well behaved in the dormitory and seemed happy and relaxed in the environment. The dorm staff, however, was somewhat aloof. They seemed tired and did not have much energy for the girls, and functioned more as gate keepers than as mother substitutes. The matrons spent a lot of time checking cleaning details done by the girls and doing cleaning details of their own. Bell ringing and announcements over the microphone were frequent. Most dormitory activity centered around the dormitory counselors sought out by the girls.

There was little supervision of the girls outside the dorm since personnel stayed in doors. All girls were expected to be in the dormitory by 10:00 p.m. and in their own rooms by 10:30 p.m. At 11:00 p.m. it was "lights out." In the morning, the first bell went off at 6:30 a.m., then at 7:00 a.m. another bell sounded--the breakfast call. At 8:30 a.m. the electricity was turned off in the building to discourage loitering. Throughout the day the dormitory was open, and students were free to come and go with permission of the dormitory staff.

Space in the dormitory was limited and at the beginning of the school year students were crowded four to a room. By the end of the school year, however, the rooms contained only two or three students. The girls did a good job of keeping the dormitory clean and rewards, given to students who did superior jobs keeping their own rooms clean, served as added incentive.

Conclusions

Both staff and students seemed fairly satisfied with this school. An important factor seemed to be that people who live and work there, with a few exceptions, got along quite well. Nearly a third of the staff were related, mostly through marriage, to someone else on the staff. Most of the staff had a sincere

desire to help the students in various ways; the students were aware of and appreciated the concern.

Both staff and students tended to agree that the academic program was weak. Better discipline, more rigorous courses, more emphasis on learning, and better teaching were students' suggestions to improve the school.

Staff and students agreed that dorm life could also be improved. The need to hire dorm staff trained in counseling and substance abuse were matters that concerned both staff and students. Although the school's IRG program addressed student problems, the staff thought more teamwork was needed. Students stressed the need for a wider variety of after-school activities. While some of the suggestions are not easy to implement, many are sensible, realistic, and worth attempting.

BIA School B

An initial school visit was conducted from September 26, 1983 through September 28 by a team of five from Penn State. The five team members conducted a total of 37 interviews.

The school principal scheduled meetings between the research team and members of different organizational units of the school as well as with members of the student government. (See Table 2 for an illustration of the school's structure.) These meetings allowed the project staff to identify some of the collective perceptions and sentiments of the people at the school. The individual interviews provided in-depth descriptions of how those belonging to various categories perceived the school and its functioning as an organization.

TABLE 2

Staffing Organization for BIA School B

ADMINISTRATION
1 Principal
1 Administration Manager
1 Secretary-Steno
1 Switchboard Operator
1 Property/Supply Clerk
1 Property/Supply Tech.
1 Laborer
1 Personnel Assistant
1 Criminal Investigator
2 Policemen
TOTAL - 11

ACADEMIC
1 Assistant Principal
1 Secretary-Steno
1 Registrar (Clerk)
22 Teachers
1 Academic Counselor
1 Aide
2 Substitute Teachers
1 Librarian
TOTAL - 30

RESIDENTIAL
1 Residential Director
2 Clerk/Typists
2 Counselors
1 Social Worker
2 Home Living Specs.
4 Supv. Group Aides
53 Home Living Assts.
TOTAL - 65

RECREATION
1 Recreational Super.
1 Bus Driver
3 Recreational Aides
2 P/T Rec. Aides
TOTAL - 7

FOOD SERVICE
1 Cook Foreman
4 Cooks
5 Food Service Workers
TOTAL - 10

TITLE I
3 Teachers
2 Educational Techs.
1 Educational Specialist
1 Aide
TOTAL - 7

SPECIAL EDUCATION
1 Psychologist
1 &2/3 Teachers
1 Clerk
1 Consultant Speech/Hearing
TOTAL - 4 & 2/3

IHS MENTAL HEALTH
1 Rec. Therapists
1 P/T Mental Health Spec.
TOTAL - 2

FACILITY MANAGEMENT
1 Facility Manager
1 Maint. Worker Foreman
4 Maintenance Workers
1 Laborer
1 Electrical Worker
2 Facility Manager Clerk
TOTAL - 10

TOTAL EMPLOYEES - 146 & 2/3

The project staff anticipated that the visit to BIA School B would either confirm the conclusions drawn from the previously compiled telephone interviews or would yield new information which would modify the conclusions drawn from earlier findings. Most of the conditions reported by former students during Phase I were found at School B. However, the overwhelmingly remedial nature of the academic program was not anticipated.

This analysis presents the team's findings in three sections. The first part examines the interview responses topically and is followed by an analysis of the responses by departments. The combined analyses, as well as conclusions, are presented in the third section.

A total of 24 staff and 13 students were interviewed. The interviews were conducted on the basis of approaching people and asking them if they had the time to answer a few questions. Therefore, those interviewed were not those who had a particular "ax to grind." Also, the interviewing process was assisted greatly by the principal who had advised the staff and student leaders of the research team's arrival and purpose.

The average tenure of the staff interviewed was 5.8 years. The average length of stay for the students interviewed was 2.3 years. These numbers have limited meaning, however, as the statistical distribution was U-shaped (bimodal and symmetrical). One noticeable observation concerning the sample interviewed, however, was the rapid turnover in both staff and students.

The staff overwhelmingly stated that the best thing about being there was the students. The other factors given as desirable aspects of working at this school were the facilities and the opportunity to serve a receptive minority segment of

the population. Three teachers liked the degree of classroom flexibility afforded them. Other positive factors mentioned by the staff included getting to know the students better than normally possible in a public school environment; a sensed atmosphere of change; good staff, and the presence of significant numbers of Indian staff. The students elected sports and institutional facilities as the best things about the school, as well as the opportunity to make new Indian friends. Other positive aspects mentioned by students included the quality of dormitory life, good food, independence experienced in being away from home, and good staff.

Poor morale was identified by the staff as the greatest problem at this school. (Eight out of twenty-four interviewed cited this as the number one problem.) A number of other problems were also cited, including: dislike of fellow employees; uncertainty and paranoia surrounding job security and pay; ineffective personal relationships; negativism; staff fighting, bickering and backbiting; lack of understanding of feelings by others; and lack of involvement in decision-making. Other negative aspects of working at the school were: student drug and alcohol abuse; excessive paper work and red tape; and the overworking of the staff to compensate for an inadequate budget. Other negative areas mentioned by more than one staff member included administrative sensitivity, poor institutional communication and coordination, administrative inactivity, staff turnover, and frustration with the Washington bureaucracy. Less frequently cited problems included poor funding, provincialness of the departments, underutilization of Indian staff skills, nepotism in hiring, lack of an Indian cultural environment, and student apathy.

The students selected alcohol and drug problems as the worst thing about the boarding school experience. The remedial nature of the curriculum was also a major difficulty according to students. Individual students mentioned the following

problems: vandalism; staff bickering and backbiting; lack of activity funds and inadequate activities; dormitory regulations; inconsistent rule enforcement; poor administrative attitudes; family separation; bad food; inappropriate student behavior (shoplifting); overcrowded dormitories; smoking rules; unavailability of a store; and cutting off power from an entire dorm section when pot smoking is suspected.

Forty-four percent of the staff said they would go elsewhere if provided the opportunity and 36% of the students said likewise. This suggests the existence of considerable dissatisfaction and unhappiness with life there. However, it should be noted that many of those reporting that they would go elsewhere if an opportunity presented itself had worked at the school for some time and had not left as yet.

The staff saw the need for better communication among themselves. They felt this would be facilitated by: the creation of a staff/faculty forum to solve problems; development of staff unity; clarification of staff roles; follow-through on incidents; more trust among staff; and better communication between the principal and the administration. More off-campus activity was the second most frequently suggested improvement. Other issues mentioned by individual staff included: the need for more "local" control of school affairs; more in-service training for supervisors, teachers and counselors; less teacher time spent on administrative procedures with more time available for important student-related matters; more job security for teachers; development of a seventh period class for electives; reinstatement of summer educational leave assistance programs to update staff education; providing more snacks; controlling vandalism; demanding more accountability from the students; more flexibility in certain rules and regulations; providing more student exposure to the community; more emphasis on Indian culture; and clarification of the school's mission.

There was less consensus among the students regarding the things they wanted changed. Two students would stop staff bickering and backbiting, increase the availability and openness of the principal, and make the curriculum more advanced. Other items mentioned by individual students included off-campus privileges on weekdays; better use of staff time; better use of surrounding land; adoption of an open campus policy; student consultation in decision-making; raising campus morale; making more counseling available; curtailment of drinking; creation of an honor's dormitory; more activities; and better food.

Most interviewees (both staff and students) felt that tribal conflicts were minimal and decreasing. Fighting was related to boyfriend/girlfriend problems; jealousy; boredom; and rivalry between drinking and non-drinking students.

Lack of discipline was listed as a problem at BIA School B by 56% of the staff. However, 44% did not regard it as a serious problem.

There was a consensus among the staff and students that drinking was a serious problem on campus. Sixty-seven percent of the students agreed with the majority of the staff and identified drinking as a problem while 33% stated it was not.

There was considerable agreement on the perceived inadequacy of the academic program. All but two staff stated that the academic program was inadequate and the students concurred.

The final area surveyed concerned the relative importance attached to care and protection of students as opposed to academic growth. Theoretically, the majority of staff and students believed both aspects should be given equal emphasis at a boarding school. The reality of the situation as assessed by staff and students, however, indicated that the care and protection of students was the principal objective at this school.

In order to provide a more detailed analysis of the interview data, five major groupings of staff personnel were established. These are:

Administrative

Residential/Home Living

Recreation

Academic

Support Services Staff

Each small group of interviewees tended to exhibit certain attitudes and perceptions which were representative of the larger group.

Administrative

Five staff members from the administrative personnel group were interviewed. Four out of the five described the students as one of the best aspects of being at the school. Specifically, they liked both the opportunity to know the students better than what is possible in a normal public school setting, and the perceived docility of the Indian students as opposed to non-Indian students. All of the administrative staff interviewed described aspects of the BIA/Federal bureaucracy as the worst aspect of being there, yet none would voluntarily leave the school if they had the opportunity. All had a common perception that inter-student conflict was currently minimal and that drinking was the major problem among students. They also indicated that student discipline was a concern, but that staff lacked the authority to control behavior effectively. Another common perception was the inadequacy of the academic instruction program.

Administrators differed in their prioritization of the importance of care and protection of students versus the academic work of students. In general, the administrative personnel seemed knowledgeable about new policies being developed by the principal and school board and were supportive of them.

Residential Home Living

The residential/home living personnel constitute the largest group among the staff. All felt that the students and the facilities were the best aspects about being there. Eighty percent of the group characterized the worst aspect as staff conflicts, which they ascribed to a lack of communication and low morale, resulting in high staff turnover. Two of the five interviewed would leave for a better job.

In regard to change, all indicated that communications could be improved by more interaction on the part of the principal and administration with the rest of the staff. Student conflicts were considered by residential staff to be a problem area; however, they felt this was being adequately addressed with changes in admissions' policy and housing arrangements. All stated that conflicts were more serious in past years than in the current academic year. Four of the five identified drinking as a serious problem that was not being adequately addressed. All residential staff interviewed indicated satisfaction with current rules and discipline; however, three of the five indicated that enforcement was often arbitrary. All residential staff felt that the academic instruction program was inadequate and not meeting student needs. All residential staff interviewed believed that the care and protection of students should be as important as

academic instruction. Only one stated that academic instruction was stressed more than the care and protection of students; the remainder perceived a balance between the two areas. In general, the residential/home living staff indicated their dissatisfaction with the school as a bureaucracy. Frustration was evident among most of the staff who felt they lacked adequate power or authority to work effectively with the students. The administrative staff was seen as conducting arbitrary hierarchical policy-making with organizational decisions being made within a political context and not within a practical working context based on discussion at staff meetings.

Recreational

The recreation staff pointed out that their function was separate from the academic, physical education and the home living areas. They indicated that recreation programs needed to be organized seven days a week and often from eight to twelve hours a day. Only two of the recreation staff were interviewed. Both saw the nature of the students and the facilities as the best aspects about the school. Both indicated dissatisfaction with their working arrangements. One staff member identified drinking and drug use as the worst aspect of working at this school while the other stated that staff conflict was the greatest problem. Both felt the organizational structure of the school was inadequate in terms of sufficient numbers of personnel and job responsibilities. One indicated a desire to address the problems of staff conflict. Both believed that student conflicts were currently minimal. Also, both regarded alcohol abuse as a problem, but thought that steps were being taken to deal with the problem. Neither believed discipline to be a problem. One person stated that the academic instruction program was

inadequate. One perceived the care and protection of students to be more emphasized than academic instruction, while the other believed that there was a balance between the two areas. In general, the recreational staff regarded their budget as inadequate to provide for student needs and the continuous demand for more recreational activities.

Academic

Nine interviews were conducted with staff members from the academic area. They described the best aspects of the school as the students, the "flexibility of instruction," and the facilities. The bureaucracy and inter-personnel conflicts were cited as the worst aspects of the school. In regard to recommending changes, the majority proposed improving communications; although several recommended making changes in the academic program. All of the academic staff interviewed indicated that inter-tribal student conflict was not as serious a problem as it had been in the past. Virtually the entire group indicated that alcohol abuse was a problem. Reaction to the new policies regarding alcohol abuse was mixed. Several felt the new policies and procedures were working, while others expressed resentment or exhibited indifference toward the current measures being taken. All the academic personnel reported that lack of student discipline was a problem. Several described it as the main problem, yet the rest seemed to feel that the situation was improving. The perceptions of the group regarding the quality of the school's academic program were quite different from that of the other groups. Many felt the academic program was adequate. (Only three described the situation as inadequate.) Fifty percent of the group thought that care and protection of students should be balanced with the academic work. The other fifty percent believed that care and protection were more important. Most believed that care and protection were receiving more emphasis at BIA School B. In general, the

morale among the academic staff was lower than that of the other staff groups. As a result, feelings of frustration and hostility were readily visible among this group.

Support Services Staff

The attitudes and perceptions of the support services group seemed to be more supportive of the organizational bureaucracy than other personnel groups. All those interviewed had been there over ten years and had worked with a number of different principals and dealt with a number of policy changes. Their perception of academics was different from other groups. Most favored vocational training as the primary academic thrust. They viewed lack of discipline and school board politics as the worst aspects of the school. Most support services staff were not satisfied with their lot and consistently reflected a desire to leave the school if opportunities were present. They perceived a lack of support for their functions within the organization.

Students

Ten seniors, two juniors, and one freshman were interviewed. As a group they described the best aspects of the school as the facilities and the opportunity to be around other Indian students. In terms of the worst aspects, they cited staff conflicts, school regulations, curriculum inadequacies, drinking, student misbehavior and the food. Thirty-six percent of the group would prefer attending another school. The most important changes that the students believed were needed were greater accessibility to the principal, more activities, and changes in school policies and regulations. Three members of the group also recommended changes in academic programming. Staff conflict was brought up as something that needed to be changed. The only student conflicts cited by the group were those due to drinking and jealousy. Most of the group indicated that alcohol abuse

was a problem; however, they played down the seriousness of the occurrences. Concerning the matter of discipline, the group was evenly split with half feeling it was adequate and half feeling it wasn't. All of the students interviewed perceived the academic preparation as inadequate. Most students felt that academic instruction and the care and protection of students should be balanced; however care and protection were more emphasized at this school.

Conclusion

Earlier investigations tended to depict the staff at BIA schools to be unsympathetic to Indians and hostile towards Indian culture. On the contrary, the staff at this school tended to see Indian youths as being more attractive as students than those attending public schools. The staff seemed to think that non-Indian students in public schools were more rebellious and difficult to manage than Indian students.

The majority of the administrators and teachers who were interviewed believed that the main educational function of the school was to provide remedial education to the students. They referred to their low scores on standardized achievement tests as justification for this belief. Despite the rational basis of this staff belief, the students, on the other hand, are rather dissatisfied with what they perceive to be a watered-down academic program. This discrepancy is something the staff and students not only need to know exists, but seems to be an issue worthy of serious debate.

School B is not a large school in terms of students enrolled. However, the school has a staff of appproximately 145 people--giving the staff a ratio of about one to three students. The striking thing about the visit was that most of the staff felt extremely busy, if not over-worked. Part of the problem was that abiding by BIA regulations involved much paperwork and maneuvering to get things

accomplished. Furthermore, the fact that it was a boarding school meant that some staff, principally the dormitory staff and security personnel, were on duty at night and on weekends. So it was not surprising that we were told frequently about how much more could be done "if we could hire more people."

However, what most staff meant by "doing more for the kids" was keeping the students occupied during non-school hours. There seemed to be an implicit assumption that lack of organized activities lead to drinking and other undesirable behavior. Furthermore, most of the staff seemed to feel that the organized activities must be led by an employee of the school and that the activities must be recreational in nature.

Much of the disatisfaction and specific criticisms from staff and students at BIA School B stemmed from recent changes initiated by a fairly new principal. In particular, changes dealt with problems such as drinking, drug abuse, and unauthorized purchases by staff. A certain amount of time and a consistent application of revised rules may be necessary before students and staff can rate the quality and extent of any changes. However, the emphasis on recent changes in personnel and regulations is not intended to mask what may be other, more serious communication problems.

The problems associated with communication difficulties should be addressed by those at the school. Based on student observations, the students considered conflicts among staff to be an undesirable aspect of attending this school. Most of the staff were probably unaware of the students' feelings about this matter. The students favorably evaluated the school administration's efforts to reduce alcohol and drug abuse among their peers. They also thought that tribally-based conflict had been effectively controlled. Now they would like to see less conflict among the staff and to receive better academic preparation for their future lives.

BIA School C

The third site visit was made to BIA School C from May 7 to May 9, 1984. This summary consists of two parts. The first is a descriptive overview of the facility and is followed by a classroom observation and a summary of the staff interviews.

The physical plant of BIA School C was a mixture of temporary and very old buildings and some newer construction that was less than ten years old. The dormitories in which the older students resided were newer and smaller than those "typical" of small colleges and universities. They were also similar to the student housing facilities of other off-reservation boarding schools.

School C, however, did have a unique arrangement for housing their elementary students. Elementary students lived in dormitories that were designed to accommodate students in a family-living environment. The cottages were attractive, and the furnishings were new and well-maintained. Originally, boys and girls both lived in these cottages. One side of the cottage was for boys and the other side for girls. The original idea behind this was that it would allow children from the same family to stay together as much as possible. Older siblings would be able to take care of their younger brothers and sisters in a family-like environment. If there were five boys and girls in a family, all would be assigned to the same cottage. At present, boys from grades two through six were in one cottage; girls in grades two through six were in another; while the seventh and eighth grade boys occupied another cottage, the seventh and eighth grade girls another.

The original maximum capacity for each cottage was twenty students but later remodelling permitted 26. About 24 students were currently in each of the cottages. Under the original living arrangement, students were sometimes

responsible for preparation of their own meals. Presently, however, all students eat in a common cafeteria with the younger children being served first. The two large dormitories housing the high school boys and girls were attractive, home-like and comfortable. At BIA School C, living room areas are bright, well-furnished, generally had fireplaces, and students seemed at ease in them.

The recreation available to students included facilities such as a game room, softball/baseball fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, tether ball, and organized soccer for the younger students. Plans to provide additional recreational services, as well as promoting pride in individuals and the school, are scheduled for implementation in the 1984-85 academic year and include an honor dormitory, increased organized recreational activities, and clubs.

Student and Classroom Observation

During after school hours, students were observed making use of all the recreational facilities and equipment. The game room, which was equipped with pool tables, table tennis equipment, video games, and a snack bar, was available to elementary students only until the dinner hour. After dinner it was available only to high school students which included grades 9 to 12. All the sports facilities and playing areas were located within steps of the dormitories.

Public telephones and soft drink vending machines were located outside a small building, and functioned as a "control center" where the evening supervisor was located. Another telephone inside the building was available for student use although the supervisor did not appear pleased about the frequency of its use. Both telephones were busy constantly with students apparently calling home for various reasons. Since the end of the school year was eminent, many callers were asking for money to meet expenses for certain activities including graduation. Others were inquiring about family matters and speaking with various family members.

Students who were asked to give an opinion of the school generally stated that it was "better" than the public schools they had attended previously. The presence of other Indian people and the absence of discrimination were the reasons given for attending the school. However, they also mentioned being lonely for their families.

A large number of students at School C live in the area and frequently "check-out" to make home visits over the weekend. Due to the proximity of student homes, the reduced number of students on weekends may contribute in turn to fewer discipline incidents than at schools A and B. As an example, dormitory staff, when interviewed, were concerned primarily with school staffing policies and maintenance problems; and student behavior was not mentioned prominently.

A teacher suggested that the project team observe student behavior while her class was in session. The class consisted of about fourteen 7th graders and met in the afternoon. The teacher gave each student worksheets as the students entered the room. During the first 10 minutes of the class, the students filed in and talked among themselves and to the teacher. The teacher repeatedly asked them to be quiet and to settle down. The students seated themselves in groups, except for two students who sought isolated seats in the conference-style arrangement in the classroom.

In filling out the worksheets, the students talked among themselves and also asked the teacher the meanings of several words (the exercise was one of identifying proper and common nouns). She gave them the meanings and also tried to give additional information about the noun. Two of the students were without pencils; when they asked the teacher for a pencil, she told them she had no extras. As the students completed the worksheets, the teacher instructed them to help themselves to paper and to use the remainder of the period for sketching. Some of

the students completed the assignment before the period was half over; others did not appear to have completed the worksheets by the end of the period. At least five students, after the completion of the worksheets, grouped themselves around the teacher's desk, opened her gradebook, and began computing, or attempting to compute, their grades. Those who had C's or D's informed their classmates and did not appear surprised or upset. The teacher asked them about four or five times to leave her gradebook alone but she did not remove the gradebook from the desk or put it away.

At one point, two of the students who were lying on the floor were asked to get up and get into their chairs. Also, two of the students who had computed their grades asked the teacher if they could do make-up work to receive higher grades; one of the students told the teacher he wanted to make an A. She did not comment on his wish for a higher grade but did tell him make-up work would be available.

Two senior high students who appeared to be aides and a teacher came into the classroom at different times. Each of the three required attendance or grade report information from the teacher. Also, there were at least three intercom messages which were not directed to either the teacher or the students but were announcements and messages to other staff members.

Interview Summaries

A total of 15 staff members were interviewed at BIA School C. These included 4 administrators, 1 guidance counselor, 3 home living personnel, a property and supply clerk, and 6 teachers. (Table 3 presents the staff structure of School C). Numerous school employees were transferred from a recently closed school. However, none of those interviewed were transfers. The range in the number of years the interviewed staff members had been at BIA School C was from less than one year to 15 years with a mean of 8.8 years.

TABLE 3

Staffing Organization for BIA School C

ADMINISTRATION	
Principal	- 1
Assistant Principal	- 1
Secretary	- 1
Business Manager	- 1
Supply Clerk-Typist	- 2
ACADEMIC	
Education Specialist	- 1
Teachers	- 17
Education Technicians	- 5
Education Aide	- 1
Clerk-Typists	- 3
Teacher Supervisor	- 1
RESIDENTIAL AND GUIDANCE	
Supervisor Guidance Counselor	- 3
Guidance Counselor	- 1
Social Service Representative	- 1
Recreation Specialist	- 1
Recreation Assistants	- 2
Head Education Aides	- 7
Education Aides	- 10
Home Living Assistant	- 6
FOOD SERVICE	
Cook Foreman	- 1
Cook	- 4
Food Service Worker	- 3
FACILITY MANAGEMENT	
Facilities Manager	- 1
Facility Management Clerk	- 1
Maintenance & Oper. Foreman	- 1
Plumber	- 1
Maintenance Worker	- 2
Painter	- 1
Air Cond.	- 1
Tractor Oper.	- 2
Custodial	- 3
Guard	- 2
Grand Total	88

When interviewees were asked to identify the best and worst things about working at the school, they listed the best aspects as working with kids, classroom instruction, and salary. The "worst" aspects included poor student attitudes, truancy, poor communication among staff, excessive permissiveness for students, the negative attitudes of staff members toward students apathetic attitudes of students, lack of administrative organization, student discipline problems, the assignment of extra-curricular activities and variable shift schedules. Only one staff member directly responded to the question about leaving and indicated that he would leave only for the purpose of getting a "change of scene."

Another area of interest concerned problems directly related to the student population. Fighting was not considered by most of the respondents to be a serious problem and the amount of fighting that did occur was thought to be about par with that found in the public schools.

Student drinking was considered to be a major problem. Estimates of problems with student drug use varied. Some equated it to the problem of drinking; others claimed no knowledge of student drug abuse.

All but one of the teachers indicated that the academic program at BIA School C was not meeting the needs of the students. Reasons given for this inadequacy included the lack of teacher input into curriculum decisions, low academic standards, the inability or lack of desire of teachers to motivate students. However, none of the teachers provided specific suggestions to improve the educational program. Administrators, on the other hand, viewed the educational program as adequate. One administrator suggested that those teachers who do complain about the program could be categorized as "mediocre" to "don't care" types.

The non-academic staff members either did not respond to the question directly (i.e., did not offer an opinion about the adequacy/inadequacy of the educational program) or did not feel that they had enough information to make a judgement. One staff member did suggest that greater communication between the home staff and the teaching staff might be beneficial.

Only three staff members indicated that the emotional needs of the students were being adequately met. The other respondents either were not sure or indicated that they were not being met. One teacher was not aware of the counselor's duties and therefore could not evaluate the counseling services.

Social and recreational needs of the students were also probed. Of the 12 who responded to the question, four indicated that social and recreational needs were being adequately met while four indicated that these needs were not being adequately met. Three respondents did not answer the question but instead described the types of activities that were offered. One respondent indicated that although there was a social/recreational program with supplies, it did not seem as though those in charge of the program knew what they were doing.

The willingness of staff members to help students in the evenings for personal or academic problems did not seem to extend beyond what could be conveniently accommodated within their working schedules. Teacher responses ranged from providing an hour at the end of the school day to help students and make-up periods for work missed while the student was absent to statements indicating that students did not care to do assigned work, let alone extra work. One teacher stated that a specified period had been set aside each day for teacher counseling of students but that it did not appear to be working. Only one administrator answered that he would "probably" provide help; however, it would depend on the nature of

the problem. One staff member indicated that he does help students by allowing them to work in his warehouse. Another staff member stated that time does not always permit staff to provide individual help.

Suggestions to make the school a better place included: more staff to cover evening activities; an increase in the number of recreational activities available to students; construction of a new gym and swimming pool; construction of new dormitories in place of the existing cottages; development of a vocational training program; an increase in communications between staff and students; more restrictions governing alcohol usage by students; the creation of a year-round educational program; periodic evaluation of the instructional program; the creation of long and short term objectives by both the professional and non-professional staff; stricter discipline; more administrator support of teachers; a greater opportunity for teachers to share ideas; the promotion of a change in employee attitudes and morale; a reduction in student absenteeism; and eliminating the "dead-weight" in the staff ranks.

Finally, the staff were asked what they would do to reorganize the structure of the school and dormitory operations. The following suggestions were offered: place problem students in a separate dormitory staffed with personnel qualified to work with them; increase operating budget to facilitate needed changes; get teachers to motivate students; and maintain family-unit cottages.

Conclusions Drawn from the Three School Visits

The visitations conducted by the Pennsylvania State research teams to three BIA ORBS confirmed the general conclusions drawn from the survey of former ORBS students. Current institutional conditions were not found to be ideal, however, they were not blatantly abusive as indicated in past reports such as the Meriam Report.

There seemed to be seven major problem areas in these schools. These included: staff morale; student problems; student needs; inadequate curriculum; administrative problems; inadequate funding; and bureaucratic problems.

Morale problems were deep seated and pervasive. Among the most dissatisfied groups were the teachers. Negative employee attitudes were common and were manifested in high staff turnover.

Student problems were serious and broad-based. For the most part, they included alcohol and drug (marijuana) abuse, fighting, and dropping out.

Another concern focused on meeting the emotional needs of students. Most staff expressed reservations concerning their ability to adequately handle the diverse emotional needs of the students.

Academic life and, in particular, the curriculum were assessed as remedial and sub-standard. Students were not being challenged intellectually. Dorms were not conducive to study and little homework was assigned. Parents were not significantly involved in their child's schooling.

Administration-related problems were also numerous. Administrations were viewed by their staffs as inactive, insensitive and "ham-strung" by the Federal bureaucracy.

A sixth problematic area concerned funding. "Close to the bone" funding and stretching the staff to compensate were commonly mentioned problems.

The final and most obvious problem concerned institution-wide frustration with the Federal bureaucracy. Employees felt that decision making was hampered if not prohibited and also felt swamped in paper work and red tape.

In boarding schools, the school structure is much more complex than that of an average public high school. It is also even more elaborate and differentiated

than that of a typical private boarding school because it is part of a federal bureaucracy and is characterized by a wide scope of staff responsibilities and a high degree of division of labor.

The complexity of the school structure has a number of important consequences for the kind of experiences the students and staff are likely to have at the school. First, the complexity makes communication among the members difficult. The people in positions with less authority were most likely to complain that they were not informed about what was going on. The administrators, on the other hand, were likely to complain that they constantly wrote memos for informational purposes, but the memos were not either read or quickly forgotten. This breakdown in communication is a serious problem because it has a negative effect on staff morale and contributes to feelings of helplessness and apathy.

The second consequence of the complex organizational structure of the boarding school is the existence of various units whose members often feel that they are either competing with another unit for funds or that they are not responsible for a given function because it is some other unit's responsibility. To illustrate, it was observed that organizing the students' recreational activities during the non-class hours was a task that members of some units felt their unit could or should perform given additional resources. On the other hand, few outside of the academic staff showed much interest in promoting the academic development of students. Thus, the structural complexity of the school probably promotes inter-unit rivalry, while at the same time contributes to an attitude of "that's not our job" in terms of certain school functions or tasks. It also promotes criticism of other units' failure to perform adequately. By fostering an "us-them" attitude, it creates a situation where other units are perceived as often failing to do their work in a satisfactory manner.

These seven problem areas were assessed by the research teams after conducting intensive interviews with staff and student during site visits. Also, during these visits, attitudinal questionnaires were distributed to teachers and students. Chapter VII, details these findings.

CHAPTER VI

PHASE 3

SELECTED NON-BIA SCHOOL IDEOLOGIES, ATTITUDINAL COMPLIANCE, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Introduction

Following the school visitations to three selected BIA ORBS, five non-BIA boarding schools were chosen to conduct a comparative study. These five schools represented widely diversified philosophical approaches to education. They included a finishing school for girls, coeducational preparatory school, military academy for boys, coed Quaker school, and coed school for orphans.

Two members of The Pennsylvania State University Research Team were assigned to visit each school. The private school visits were shorter than those to BIA schools and were limited to one-day excursions. The school visits included general information gathering sessions with school administrators, interviews with employees representing various areas of responsibility, interviews with students (in four schools) and the administration of survey questionnaires to students and teachers.

This chapter presents the philosophies of the five schools, an assessment of attitudinal compliance with their school philosophy, and a summary of observed characteristics. The chapter concludes with a synthesis of ideologies and practices that appear to work for the selected non-BIA boarding schools.

It should be noted that the positive tone of this chapter may not accurately reflect the actual private boarding school experience. The research staff did not have the autonomy in interviewing students and staff members as in the BIA ORBS. Administrators were able to control interviews, and to some extent, the impressions of their institutions.

Private School A

General Description and Philosophy

Private School A is a non-profit country boarding school for approximately 150 seventh to twelfth grade girls and occupies a 1,000 acre campus. The school was founded in the mid-nineteenth century by residents of a nearby town to educate young women, since public high schools did not admit them. In 1857, it was acquired by an individual and since then has operated continuously under the direction of four generations of one family.

There are basically two types of students at the school. The first type is represented by approximately 35 students who are enrolled in a study skills program. The second type student is very bright, but "disorganized." For many of the students there, public school has not worked out; for others, attendance is a family tradition. For the most part, students at Private School A are low-average academically; however, there is a broad spectrum of ability.

According to its stated goals, the school provides academic, personal, and cultural guidance; offers a diversified athletic and extra-curricular program; and fosters spiritual (an informal Episcopalian affiliation) and social values among the students. Academics, sports, and the arts are also stated to be important. The school encourages self discipline and individuality, and is concerned with what they term the "whole development of the individual girl." The overriding philosophical characteristic of the school is support through individualized education and a family-like atmosphere.

Academic Program

The academic program appears to be challenging but not stressful. Students are not deliberately groomed for ivy league universities. The school provides a wide range of courses that have the potential to offer challenges for the gifted, artistic training for the talented, and a supportive academic environment for the

average or low achievement student. This is undertaken through two supervised study programs. The objective of the two-track system is to challenge, not frustrate, the student. One track is acccelerated and competitive; the second is a standard curriculum. An intensive "study skills" program is provided for a limited number of students whose study skills are weak and who have problems in course work. All 7th and 8th graders, as well as students with minor learning disabilities, work on a regular basis with the study skills teachers. The program is designed to help students improve their skills and move into the mainstream academic curriculum. Enrollment in study skills classes is limited to a maximum of three students, which allows teachers to devote a considerable amount of time to each individual.

Supervised periods of study supplement the school day. An early study hour is held each morning from 6:30 a.m. to 7:30 a.m. Students who are identified as needing extra study time are sent to this early morning study hall and must sit in the library and work. A one-half hour study period is also set aside at the end of the school day for students requiring additional help. During this time, all teachers are available for tutoring. A final period of quiet study is provided in the dormitory from 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m., Sunday through Friday.

In addition to academics, there is an emphasis on the development of good sportsmanship, team spirit, physical fitness, and artistic talent. The campus provides athletic fields, tennis courts, a tennis backboard, and complete facilities for the riding program (including trails, two paddocks, stables for as many as fifty horses, and a large indoor riding hall) which is rated among the top four or five in the country. Each girl is scheduled for a minimum of three hours of sports a week, although most girls choose to take one or more sports every weekday. Students are taken all over the eastern part of the U.S.A. for horse shows and other equestrian training. Soccer and volleyball are available as varsity sports, and soccer competitions are held with public schools. A new gymnasium and dance studio,

tennis, swimming, and skiing are also available on campus. There are many opportunities to pursue the fine arts with the band, chorus, drama, art, etc.

Organization

Incorporated as a nonprofit foundation in 1957, the school is directed by a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees (twenty members). There are one full session and two executive sessions each year. Alumni are active with the school, help to refer and screen candidates, and provide additional funding.

A single family has controlled the school for the past four generations; one member currently serves as president, another serves as chief financial officer and on the Board of Trustees. The transition of power is slowly evolving, however, and the Headmaster, who is not a member of the controlling family, currently is being groomed for the position of school president. He has been assigned more administrative responsibilities including all internal and executive decisions, and is now in charge of all academic programs, teacher accountability, and class scheduling.

The student/teacher ratio is 8:1. The administration's position is that teachers have neither time nor energy to double as group life personnel; therefore, teachers only have teaching responsibilities. Private School A maintains a staff of housemothers 24 hours a day in the dormitories. The school's philosophy is that a kind, helpful person should be available to students at all times in the living areas. The housemothers also handle arrangements for rooming, weekend activities, and travel.

A Student Council consisting of three seniors, two juniors, one sophomore, and one freshman, meets periodically with the Guidance Director and acts as a clearinghouse for student ideas and provides a liaison between students and the administration. The three senior members of the Council, together with four representatives of the faculty and administration, comprise the Guidance Committee, which looks into any major disciplinary offense.

Dormitory Life

All 9-12 grade students are housed in the school's main building. The 7th and 8th grade students are housed in another building. Generally, there are two girls per room with a semi-private bath serving two rooms.

Discipline

A merit/demerit system helps maintain daily discipline. Serious discipline infractions usually result in dismissal from the school. Students with poor attitudes and those who have not adjusted to the school are not invited back the next year.

All students perform daily, 15-minute chores before the evening meal. Assignments include caring for classrooms, dormitories and grounds, preparing the dining room, and feeding the school's horses. Maids clean the bathrooms, but the students are responsible for keeping their own rooms in order. Each girl waits on tables one day a week in the dining room.

Summary

Four aspects seem to contribute to the quality of life at this school: an enthusiastic, caring faculty; minimizing academic frustration; student selectivity; and small size. The school provides student support through both individualized education and the family-like atmosphere. The smallness of the school seems to foster a readily acknowledged intimacy between staff and students as well as among students.

Students appear to be interested in doing well academically, in sports and in the arts. The school administration states that a day at the school presents "a smorgasboard of activities," and the girls seem to respond well to the myriad of things to do. Recreation is highly regarded by the students and their enthusiasm and high level participation are apparent to even a casual visitor.

Private School B

General Description and Philosophy

Private School B is a coeducational, college preparatory boarding school with approximately 350 boarders in grades 9-12.

The school was established in 1893 as an independent secondary school for boys and became coeducational in 1971. The 160 acre main campus adjoins a 140 acre school farm. There are two playing fields each for baseball, soccer, football, lacrosse, and field hockey; also available are 17 tennis courts, and an all-weather track. The school's academic center is a five story structure with 49 classrooms, a lecture hall, four science laboratories, and art studios.

The school's stated mission is to provide a challenging academic program with multiple extra-curricular opportunities for students who excel or strive to excel. The staff portrays the school as a place for students who have done well and boasts that there is something and someone for everyone there. The multiplicity of activities and the advocacy of close relationships are intended to reduce boredom and loneliness. Private School B admits students of average to superior ability who have been achieving well in school and who seem suited to take advantage of the school's scholastic, athletic, and extra-curricular activities.

Academic Program

The curriculum provides a broad-based college preparatory course of study. Class size ranges from one to 15 students with a student/teacher ratio of 7:1. The work in grades 9 and 10 is largely skill oriented. Toward the end of grade 10 and throughout the last two years, students are expected to apply these skills to more sophisticated concepts. Upper level students have access to a number of one-term offerings that are designed to supplement the full year courses in each discipline. The school reports that most graduates are admitted to college. The curriculum

appears to be rigorous and demanding. Students study from 7:15 to 9:45 p.m. in their dormitories under the supervision of study proctors and faculty advisors. Study sessions are held Sunday through Thursday.

Complementing the school's academic program are multiple extra-curricular activities. There are 20 academic clubs, as well as 35 varsity and junior varsity athletic teams. The squash and swimming teams are particularly well-known. The gymnasium contains a wrestling gym, fencing and weight rooms, an indoor track, three basketball courts, a nine-lane swimming pool, eight squash courts, and locker facilities.

Organization

Private School B is directed by a 30 member Board of Regents, which include alumni and parents. The Headmaster has held his position for 12 years. The faculty includes 59 full-time teachers who double as houseparents, athletic coaches, and club sponsors. Each faculty member advises eight to ten students and is responsible for sending reports, including grades, to parents at least six times during the year. Staff members are expected to be totally committed to the school. All administrators teach at least one class and many teachers are assigned administrative duties. Beyond classes and extra-curricular activities, the staff eats meals with students, acts as study hall monitors and academic advisors, is available for personal counseling, and serves as dormitory supervisors.

An elected student council, composed of students and faculty, has responsibility for many aspects of school life. It was evident, however, that the Headmaster was the directing force. His authority did not appear to be resented or questioned and the staff respected him immensely.

Dormitory Life

Students are housed in several large dormitory facilities. The basic living unit is the dormitory wing. Each wing provides rooms for eight to 28 students and

two senior prefects, one or two faculty apartments, common rooms, and a study shared by several faculty members whose homes are on or near the campus. There are no more than two students to a room. The students share large communal showers. Teachers are assigned comfortable living quarters within the dormitories and are on call around the clock. Student prefects are also assigned to live on each wing and assist with the supervision of the students. Seniors who have demonstrated responsibility and leadership qualities, and who are considered good role models, are chosen for these positions. They also serve as monitors at dining tables and act as liaisons between students and staff.

Discipline

Observations and discussions with students and staff members indicate there is considerable pressure on students to behave, to dress neatly and to use language acceptable to the staff. Students and staff seem to have reached an unwritten agreement concerning this and deviance is infrequent. This code is further reenforced by the majority of the students' compliance with it.

Minor infractions are handled by a student-faculty committee, while the Dean of Admissions handles serious violations. Another factor affecting discipline is the apparent assumption that no student is any one person's sole responsibility. Since teachers and administrators constantly interact with the students, they can monitor student development. As individuals become aware of either disturbing behavior or desired behavior, they can respond immediately to the behavior or consult each other for an appropriate response. The feeling is that acceptable behavior and guidance are the responsibilities of everyone.

Summary

Private School B appears to satisfy its goals of providing a challenging academic program, multiple extra-curricular opportunities, and a rewarding place

to go when students excel. Here, athletics is combined with study. Students are presented with difficult academic work and they seem to work hard to do well. They appear to be enthusiastic and enjoy the time devoted to athletics as well as other activities. The staff appear to be dedicated and loyal to the school. For the most part, they state that they are happy to be there, feel they are doing something worthwhile, and are committed and zealous about their assigned areas of responsibility. Despite the reportedly mediocre pay for such a required commitment, the teachers consider their remuneration acceptable.

The staff and students at the school view themselves as being a part of someplace special. Those associated with the school (staff and students alike) seem to take pride in being there and demonstrate this feeling by their behavior. An effort is made to convey a sense of refinement and elegance which permeates school activities and is apparent to campus visitors as well as new students or staff. The school boasts of a competent, dedicated, and loyal faculty with notable staff employment longevity.

Private School C

General Description and Philosophy

Private School C, a military academy and junior college, is an all male boarding school with more than 650, 7-12th graders and occupies 120 acres with 105 buildings. The facilities include: six barracks, dining hall, theatre center, classrooms, chapel, library, student union building, arsenal, five faculty apartment buildings, more than forty faculty homes, faculty dining hall and club, and a gymnasium complex. Also on campus are nine athletic fields, indoor and outdoor swimming pools, tennis courts, indoor polo pavilion, bowling alleys, indoor rifle range, stables, hobby shop, and music practice rooms.

The reported I.Q. of students at the school is 109. The typical student is average or below average in performance and has potential to do better. Many students arrive with flawed study skills. Many come from broken homes, have discipline problems, and have attended other schools before entering a military academy. It is reported that "aimless, shiftless students" are sent to the school in hopes that they might do better in this strict, challenging environment.

Private School C emphasized what they term the "educational triangle" of academic, military and physical training along with the "whole man" concept in which every facet of a cadet's development is encouraged.

The staff at Private School C believes that the military aspect of the program fosters respect for authority, integrity, self-discipline, and patriotism and provides the orderly and wholesome atmosphere necessary for obtaining a quality education.

Four goals form the cornerstone of the school's educational philosophy. The first is academic excellence which encompasses a wide variety of measures such as: standards of admissions, small classes, individual attention, dedicated faculty, a challenging curriculum, and academic honors. Other ways of promoting academic achievement are through extra instructions at the end of the school day and the mandatory study hall from 7:30 p.m. to 9:40 p.m., Sunday through Thursday nights.

Character development is a second goal. The cadet resolution, which establishes moral values as a basis for decision-making and exemplary conduct, stresses honesty and integrity in relations with others; excellence in all endeavors; respect for all; self discipline as the basis for developing strength of character; acceptance of responsibility for one's actions; establishing personal, worthwhile, life-long goals; and being recognized as a citizen of outstanding integrity. Other elements which the staff states enhance character development are mandatory chapel attendance, the honor code, sports, R.O.T.C. (which attempts to instill

respect for authority, love of flag and country, acceptance of responsibility), and cleanliness, courtesy, and consideration in group living.

The school's third goal, self-motivation, is supported by the emphasis on competition and recognition. The school recognizes achievements with awards, prizes, and incentives. Praise and encouragement are seen as the most effective ways to motivate people and to enhance their self-esteem. Decentralization is another motivational technique employed by the school. This provides cadets with opportunities for choice and self-determination. According to school officals, self-motivation is also enhanced through individual goal setting. The establishment of goals gives young people a sense of direction and greater meaning in life. In addition, student motivation is encouraged by instructor example and through counseling.

Leadership training, the fourth goal, is achieved by providing a laboratory of leadership experience in the self-governing corps of cadets and the R.O.T.C. Program. The school's wide ranging sports program and extra-curricular activities provide opportunities for leadership, as well as to enable cadets to acquire physical skills, gain knowledge, broaden their intellectual horizons, compete in a sportsmanlike way and work cooperatively with others. All cadets get a chance to lead others in some activity.

Academic Program

The military approach of the school, modeled after West Point, aims to develop future leaders and to create an orderly atmosphere for learning. Students are grouped by ability in one of three academic levels: honors, intermediate, or general.

Instructors seem to treat the students well. They appear to tolerate a relaxed atmosphere in the classroom since the cadets have such a rigid schedule

once the academic day ends. Nonetheless, classes are demanding and much homework is assigned.

The school also has a system to accommodate a student's academic deficiency. It advises a student when he is failing and provides a two-week period to make up the work and try to prevent the failure. In addition there is a summer training program for incoming students which begins five weeks before school opens in the fall. The training is reported to be rigorous and accentuates both the strengths and weaknesses of student.

Although the academic program is rigorous, the military aspect of life and the sports program seem to take precedence.

Organization

The institution is governed by a 24 member Board of Trustees, which includes 13 alumni. An Alumni Board of Visitors conducts an annual comprehensive survey of school life. Of the 32 faculty, only eight have been on active duty in the military, and only two had military careers.

A retired Lt. General heads "the chain of command" and is the undisputed leader of the school. His decisions appear to be made autocratically.

The student corps is self-governed and based on a military model with rank based upon time and progress made at the school.

The Corps of Cadets is organized into one mounted batallion (horse, truck and motorcycle) and one infantry batallion. There are ten companies, each with a Tactical Officer responsible for administration, training, and discipline.

A Student Advisory Council represents the cadets in dealings with the school administration; there is also a Dean's Council, composed of cadet captains, which meets with the Dean to discuss the academic program. Three members of the Council serve on the Faculty Curriculum Committee.

Discipline

Adherence to rules is important in this school. For example, twenty-four cadets were dismissed last year for behavioral reasons such as manifest disregard for the rules or "scandalous conduct," (i.e., alcohol and drug abuse, cutting classes, and theft). Another 99 were dismissed for academic reasons.

Students are reviewed each year by the staff and administration who jointly decide which cadets to invite back. Also some students are dismissed at Christmas break if their performance has not been satisfactory. Although certain military decorations are awarded for excellence, the principal disciplinary focus is punitive. Students are expected to follow the school's regulations and failure to do so results in the issuance of prescribed demerits for each offense.

Dormitory Life

The daily schedule, Monday through Friday, is as follows: reveille at 6:00 a.m.; breakfast at 6:30 a.m.; military duties, classes and lunch between 7:30 a.m. and 3:10 p.m.; extra instruction, athletics and recreation from 3:15 p.m. to 5:45 p.m.; dinner at 6:20 p.m.; supervised study from 7:30 to 9:40 p.m.; and leisure time from 9:40 p.m. until taps at 10:15 p.m.

Students are assigned to barracks in companies. Tactical officers, who are paid more than the teachers, supervise the boys' activities when they are not in class. Other personnel are on duty at night since tactical officers do not live on campus.

The school attempts to foster a sense of cohesion in the various company barracks. Apart from the band barracks, however, these efforts do not seem to have been very successful.

Summary

Officals at School C believe they are successful in instilling a degree of self-respect and a sense of responsibility in their students. They believe that the program is particularly helpful for "boys in difficulty" who seem to respond well to the strict, disciplined environment.

Private School D

General Description and Philosophy

Private School D is a coeducational, college preparatory Quaker school for boarding and day students in grades 9 through 12. It is one of several schools founded in the last quarter of the 19th century by Quakers who believed in independent education. The school encompasses 230 acres including meadows, woods, streams, a pond, several athletic fields, and an outdoor amphitheater. There are also five classroom buildings. A sports center provides an eight-lane, 25 meter pool, and facilities for indoor tennis, basketball, and other recreational activities. Other athletic facilities include two gymnasiums, a riding ring and stables, 17 outdoor tennis courts, and several playing fields.

At present, the school enrolls 305 boarders and 205 day students. One third of the faculty and approximately 10% of the students are Quakers. The student body is an economically diverse group. Approximately one hundred students are relatives of alumni. Private School D attracts the academically average and slightly below average student.

The school program is based on the premise that without dignity, nobility, and self worth, young people are not only exploitable themselves but will learn sooner or later to exploit others. But assured of dignity, they may grow to celebrate their gifts in freedom, calling forth the gifts of others and nourishing the human community. The ultimate purpose of schooling in the Friend style is to nourish

dignity and to assure students of their inestimable worth. Sometimes this is a matter of attempting to refine gifts already visible and sometimes it means uncovering and nurturing gifts which have been neglected.

Academic Program

The quality and scope of the school curriculum allow for considerable individualization. A long-standing philosophical position of the school is that students mature at different rates and are not equally talented in all subject areas. A student in an accelerated math course may need remedial work in English. Consequently, the schools offers four levels in the curriculum:

Track Four:	Advance placement (examination given for college credit)
Track Three:	Enriched college preparatory courses
Track Two:	Regular college preparatory courses
Track One:	Courses for students who have difficulty with abstract concepts, or who may manifest weak basic skills

Students are assigned a level based on admissions data and move from one level to another based on their progress. Classes are relatively small with 10 to 16 students per class, which aids in efforts to individualize the curriculum.

The school day begins at 8:00 a.m. At the end of the day, there is an academic assistance study hall available for students who have problems using their unassigned periods effectively. Advisors may assign their advisees to this study hall.

An advanced placement (AP) option is available at School D. The AP program enables students to take accellerated courses in English, history, mathematics, the sciences, and foreign languages. Students in these courses cover work regularly offered to college freshmen and in the spring may take the advanced placement test of the College Boards.

For a two-week period at the end of the winter term, a variety of programs outside the usual scope of the curriculum is provided. Depending upon academic standing and parental approval, seniors design and carry out an independent project either on or off campus. With guidance from a student/faculty committee, some seniors explore various career options, while others select social service work, or creative pursuits. Projects have included working with American Friends Service Committee, Amnesty International Campus Network, a state hospital, a day care center, a state school and hospital, Friends Home, Friends Weekend Work Camp, a health center, and a tutoring center.

The atmosphere at Private School D seems relaxed and friendly. The academic environment is structured, however, and standards of behavior reflect a strong sense of purpose. Students are expected to conscientiously pursue their studies as well as show concern for others.

The school endeavors to provide a diversity of activities outside the classroom. In addition to social and cultural opportunities, students use the art and ceramic studios, woodshop, photography laboratory, pool, athletic fields, and music rooms. Broad participation in sports at a level suitable to each student is also encouraged. Intramural and interscholastic sports programs are available in the following areas: tennis, soccer, football, track, cross-county, basketball, softball, baseball, lacrosse, swimming, diving, wrestling, field hockey, archery, and golf. The opportunity to participate in horseback riding, modern dance, volleyball, gymastics, and aerobics is also available.

Participation in community projects is considered to be an important part of the school experience as well. Tutoring in an urban neighborhood center, working with patients in a mental hospital, assisting in a recreational program for youthful offenders, and providing recreational therapy for emotionally disturbed children are examples of projects in which students have been involved.

Organization

From the Friends' point of view, everyone is equal, and this belief is reflected in the relationship between students and teachers and in the organizational structure of the school. The school is directed by a committee and the Headmaster is only one member of that group. There is no single person in charge since Quakers make decisions through consensus. The entire staff is involved in the decision-making process so that when a decision is made, it means everyone has agreed to a certain course of action. Meetings can go on for hours and sometimes even days, but eventually a decision with which everyone can live is reached.

The Student Council, Dormitory and Day Student Councils, Social Council, and class officers provide the framework for developing and administering responsibilities of self government. Students also serve on the School Committee (the School's Board of Trustees) and on such faculty-student committees such as the Discipline, Campus Life, and Educational Policies Committees.

Teachers at this school do double duty by staffing the dormitories and must be available at all times. This living arrangement gives the faculty a chance to get to know much more about the students; provides them opportunities to do more things with students; and hopefully leads to positive relationships between students and faculty. Teachers are not required to be state certified, nor are they necessarily professionally trained. The school does not believe that certification necessarily marks one as a good teacher, nor does it believe that lack of it should bar one from being a teacher. However, most of the teachers have Master's degrees in their speciality area.

Dormitory Life

The physical hub of the school is one building, which houses the administrative offices, dining room, post office, reception and recreation rooms, and school stores. In addition, most of the female students live there except for a

few who reside in a small dormitory unit on another part of the campus. The two major boys' dormitories house freshmen, sophomore and juniors. Four smaller dormitory units house seniors.

Dormitory life demands that each student live responsibly and demonstrate respect for others. All students care for their own rooms which they share with another person. Every dormitory has a resident head supervisor and a resident faculty member who also lives on each hall. In addition, there are two senior prefects who live and work on each hall.

The dormitory supervisor interviewed had a very positive attitude. She felt dormitories are not places where children simply sleep. She felt that dormitories can be more powerful tools for education than the classroom. Several techniques are employed to realize the educational potential of dormitory life: informal forums, discussions about values and ethics or current events, role playing with prefects, using outsiders to reduce interpersonal conflicts, and teaching students how to talk with parents.

Discipline

Lack of compliance to the rules does not seem to be a major problem in School D. Nonetheless, when students do not live-up to the school's standards, they are expelled. Last year a total of ten students were expelled for serious disciplinary reasons. Overall, however, discipline of students does not appear to be a major concern in the school.

Summary

Private School D appears to meet its objectives of individualized education. Faculty and students feel valued by the administration and the emphasis on human dignity and the value of each individual is apparent throughout the school. The staff appear content with the religious thrust of the school. The students, on the

other hand, report being overwhelmed by the Quaker approach. Some of them stated that they are only exposed to what the school wants them to know and other aspects of life seem removed for them. Some students related that life at the school seems a bit artificial and, at times, they are not really in touch with what is going on in the outside community. Students stated that the school is bringing in fewer outside speakers; as a result, they are repeatedly hearing the same material and themes. The students admitted, however, that they have intimate relationship with the teachers and think the teachers care about them.

The aspects of Private School D which contribute to the quality of life there include the value placed on the faculty and students; the consensus decision-making process; contented and competent faculty; adequate financial resources; and the Friends' emphasis on vigorous academic study, personal growth, shared responsibility, social justice, simplicity, sincerity, and cooperation.

Private School E

General Description and Philosophy

Private School E is a privately-endowed, coeducational school located in a rural setting on 10,000 acres of land. A majority of its 1,250 students do not receive adequate care from their families, and are considered either biological or social orphans. The school has become widely known for the quality of its educational offerings and for the personalized attention given to the social, physical, and emotional needs of each student. Students are admitted through referral agencies, but family ties are maintained through letters, regular visits and special functions.

All costs for education, board, lodging, clothing, and health services are borne by the school. After graduation, job placement assistance is available and an

educational aid plan helps qualified students to continue formal study beyond high school.

To be eligible for placement at the school, a child must meet the following criteria, she or he: is not receiving adequate care from one parent; is at least four, and less than 16 years of age; comes from a family with a limited income; has the potential for scholastic achievement; has no serious behavior problems; has no unusual physical disability; and seems likely to benefit from the school's program. Since the school is not equipped to deal with special needs, students with major handicaps are not admitted.

Academic Program

The school offers a K-12 program with three divisions: the junior division for grades 1-4; the intermediate division for 5-8; and the senior division for 9-12.

Within the senior school, college preparatory, business, and vocational curricula enable each student to seek the program best suited to his or her abilities and interests. For students planning to enter a profession, there is a rigorous college preparatory program with a sequence of courses which provide background for further study in their chosen field. Others may choose business training or one of the vocational courses which include: agri-business, auto mechanics, carpentry, electricity, electronics, food services, general building trades, machine shop practice, plumbing and heating, sheet metal and refrigeration, and printing.

The business curriculum includes basic academic subjects with specialized courses in mathematics, business methods, accounting, data processing, and business skills. The business wing includes a classroom designed to function as a simulated office. Students work at electric typewriters situated at office desks. The instructor functions in the capacity of an office manager and provides assistance to the students when needed.

The vocational curricula are for those who plan to enter industry immediately following school, or who have shown some outstanding manual skill. The training program extends over a three-year period, with half of that time spent in classroom instruction and the other half devoted to practical experience. Students do such things as: build real houses, work on automobiles, prepare and serve nutritious meals, design and create their own wearing apparel, and gain experience in retailing and general business activities. Special "shops" or facilities are available for vocational training in the following areas: printing, heating and plumbing, masonry, auto mechanics, woodworking and carpentry. Seventy percent of the students choose the vocational curriculum in the high school, yet more than 54% of the senior class in 1983 went on to pursue some form of higher education.

Specialists in remedial mathematics and reading, and professional counselors are available to help the students who have academic difficulties. Summer school provides special opportunities for those who desire enrichment courses as well as for those who must make up incomplete or unsatisfactory work.

Among the available recreational activities are individual hobbies, skating, swimming, trapping, and fishing. Extra-class activities include participation in art, music, drama, student government, photography, scouting, student publications, and athletics.

Organization

The overall organization of the school is not clear. The enormity of the physical plant guarantees grouping of employees under departmental supervision.

Teachers do not have responsibilities outside of the classroom and do not live on campus. Houseparent couples staff the group homes and provide general supervision, give instruction in home chores, assist in recreational activities, and provide counseling for each student. Houseparents have a considerable amount of power and can remove students from activities and organizations.

The School Senate has one representative elected from every house, sport, club, etc. If the Senate approves an action, it then goes on to the administration. The administration reported that many student recommendations and requests are acted upon, thereby giving the students some voice in their own governance.

Dormitory Life

Fourteen to sixteen students live in individual homes managed by a houseparent couple. The houseparents have their own quarters within the home are free during the school day and have off every other weekend.

Student rooms are spacious and attractive. There are ample dining areas, playrooms, and recreational areas. Bedrooms are shared by two students. The appearance of the homes both inside and outside was orderly and clean. Even the dresser drawers had assigned sections for various clothing accessories such as socks, underwear, and t-shirts. In the basement are personal lockers for the residents, a common shower room and dressing area.

The student's lives are tightly structured. For students in the senior division, the day begins at 5:45 a.m. with specific work details in the dairy barn. Once these chores are completed, they return to the house to eat breakfast and get ready for school. Upon the completion of the school day at 3:30 p.m., students return to their group homes. After changing into their work clothes, each student spends approximately two hours performing afternoon chores. The remainder of the evening is spent having dinner, studying, and spending free time with fellow residents.

Discipline

According to students, approximately one-fourth of the population does some drinking and a much smaller number smoke marijuana. The students attribute this small number of violators to the severe penalties for being caught--a possible 30 day activity suspension and an additional 30 hours of work duty. Repeated offenders would be dismissed from the school.

Structure and control are prevalent themes throughout the school. The students are expected to adhere to the rules and regulations and a merit/demerit system is in effect. For those who cannot make the needed adjustments to the expectations and responsibilities required of each student, an immediate dismissal from the school can be anticipated.

Summary

It appears that the school is achieving its goal of providing needy children with opportunities for educational and social development. Although academics appear important, the overwhelming priority of the school is the care and protection of orphans. Also, the material needs of the children are generously met.

The students interviewed agreed that they were happy at the school and were receiving a good education. They stated that there was a feeling of closeness between the administration and students, and noted that administrative staff sometimes call students in simply to tell them how well they are doing. The students stated that teachers and administrators treat them as their own parents would.

Some students did mention that the cloistered life at the school was a bit of a problem for them. They stated that with such sheltering they don't feel prepared to leave. Also, some students complained that houseparents have too much influence over their lives. Although it is possible to disagree with houseparents, students report that some houseparents take it better than others. According to them, many of the houseparents seem to be set in their ways and it is often difficult to get them to change.

There are several things that appear to be important in evaluating the school. The school's generous endowment results in an annual cost per child of $17,500.

With ample funding, salaries are competitive and attractive. The work environment is pleasant and there is relatively little staff turnover. The neatness and orderliness of the school seem to create a pleasant environment for all. The school dress code requires jackets and ties for all administrators, ties for teachers, and neat attire for students. In addition, there is an active alumni group which is very interested in the school and is active in the school's improvements.

Conclusion

In the five non-BIA boarding schools visited, many of the students had needs much like those of youngsters attending the BIA ORBS. They were placed in boarding schools to escape chaotic and troubled home situations, improve scholastically, or in some cases to keep them "out of trouble.".[1] Obviously, there were also students at these schools who were relatives of alumni, from wealthy families seeking a high quality education, and gifted students who needed accelerated programs. These students, however, were in the minority.

We are not suggesting that the BIA and private school students are identical. However, they do share some similar problems and characteristics. Because of these similarities it seems possible that those factors which contribute to a positive school climate in non-BIA schools might be of some use in BIA ORBS. We are not advocating that BIA ORBS adopt the program or philosophy of one (or more) of their non-BIA counterparts, but rather that individual ORBS consider how they might adapt some of the practices of these non-BIA schools to meet their own particular needs.

---

[1] A possible exception to this might be Private School B which advertises itself as "a place to go when one has done well." It should be noted, however, that this school, too, had a fair share of special needs students.

Seven positive features characterized the non-BIA schools. The first was school philosophy. Each of the five non-BIA schools had a unique philosophy of which most staff and students seemed aware. With an established sense of purpose, each school was able to develop a unique image or school character and to give the school a sense of mission. These philosophical foundations helped to chart each school's program. Issues such as discipline and decision-making were closely tied to the school's philosophy.

School administration was the second factor. In each of the private schools, effective leadership played a key role. Extremes were observed in managerial style--from the hard line military style to required consensus at the Quaker school. In all cases, however, management was not aloof from staff and students. The absence of cumbersome and controlling bureaucracies enhanced the school leaders' abilities to successfully manage their respective institutions.

The third characteristic of the non-BIA boarding schools was an adequate funding base. The approximate average annual cost per student in each non-BIA private school was as follows:

Private School A	$ 9,500 (tuition)
Private School B	$ 9,200 (tuition)
Private School C	$ 8,600 (tuition)
Private School D	$ 8,525 (tuition)
Private School E	$17,500 (The school provides all material needs of students for 10 months each year.)

On the other hand, the average annual cost per student at the BIA schools was as follows:[1]

BIA School A	$7,757
BIA School B	$7,907
BIA School C	$8,466

Staff attitudes constituted a fourth factor. Teachers in the private schools seemed more satisfied than their counterparts at BIA schools (see Chapter VII). Although private school salaries were lower, and work loads and expectations higher than those at BIA ORBS, the private school staff, generally were not critical of the remuneration they received.

In some instances, teachers doubled as houseparents, spent hours after school in tutorial sessions, and participated in extra-curricular activities. In addition, some of the schools had no employment contracts. In spite of all this, staff members at the private schools seemed competent, dedicated, and loyal. Why did teachers remain at these schools in the face of the extra duties, low pay, and great expectations? We speculate that they did so because they identified closely with the philosophy of their respective institutions; they were working for a "cause", not "just for money."

The fifth characteristic was the emphasis on academics. Although most students were only average or slightly below average, they worked quite hard to excel. Academic programs were rigorous and students were expected to do their best. Students were challenged, yet not frustrated. Significant amounts of work were assigned for night study and adequate teaching personnel were available to

---

[1] U.S. Department of the Interior. (1983 April). A report on off-reservation boarding schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Office of Indian Educations Programs.

assist students at that time. In each school, blocks of time were reserved for serious study. In addition, small class sizes made individualized learning easier and tracked courses insured that students were appropriately challenged. For the most part, students acknowledged that academics have always been difficult for them and attendance at the private school was helping them to improve considerably.

A sixth feature which contributed to the quality of life was the group living arrangements. In two of the five schools, teachers doubled as houseparents and this appeared to foster close ties between students and their houseparents/teachers. In some of the schools where non-teachers were hired as houseparents, signs of employee factions emerged and houseparents seemed like overseers rather than family members.

The seventh and final feature which seemed to make a positive contribution to these schools was community involvement. In most schools, students were expected to be involved in public service projects and become a part of the surrounding community. Alumni as well as interested community members also actively participated in school issues. In most cases, support from the community was welcomed.

These factors were seen as distinctively positive aspects of the private schools. Every institution has flaws and these schools had their imperfections. Nonetheless, each seemed to have a unique sense of purpose which everyone at the school shared. In general, the administrative, academic, social and personal characteristics were congruent with the school's mission and reflected the school's overall philosophy.

CHAPTER VII

PHASE 4

ATTITUDINAL DATA COLLECTION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Introduction

To obtain further information that might be useful in assessing the quality of life at BIA ORBS, a survey was conducted involving BIA and non-BIA students and teachers at the schools discussed in Chapters V and VI.

A sample size of 1,410 students was obtained. Of that number, 708 were BIA students and 702 were non-BIA students. The BIA sample contained three subgroups, that is, students from BIA School A (351 students), BIA School B (244 students), and BIA School C (113 students). The non-BIA sample contained 702 students. These were from five schools: Private School A (120 students), Private School B (214 students), Private School C (115 students), Private School D (91 students), and Private School E (162 students).[1]

Of the 229 teachers in the teacher sample, 68 were BIA teachers and 161 were non-BIA teachers. Of the BIA teachers 30 were from BIA School A, 26 from BIA School B, and 12 from BIA School C. The non-BIA sample included 14 teachers from Private School A, 42 teachers from Private School B, 34 teachers from Private School C, 33 teachers from Private School D, and 38 teachers from Private School E.

Two questionnaires were used to measure student and teacher attitudes toward school and themselves. The student questionnaire was a modified version of an instrument originally developed for Development Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C. The BIA ORBS students received a questionnaire with 44 survey

[1]These labels correspond to the schools as they were described in Chapters V and VI.

items. The non-BIA private boarding school student questionnaire had 38 items. The non-BIA private boarding school students were given a shorter questionnaire which did not contain items measuring student attitudes toward Indian cultural heritage. (See Appendix C for the student survey used. It should be noted that the final six survey items were eliminated from the instrument administered to the non-BIA private boarding school students.) The teacher questionnaire was a slight modification of the Educational Quality Assessment survey used by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The modifications included deletions of survey items not relevant to boarding schools. (The teacher survey is contained in Appendix D.)

The analysis of the student and teacher responses provides information concerning the similarities and differences among three groups of students and three groups of teachers. The student groups include BIA ORBS students (704), non-BIA private boarding school students (702), and a third group--American Indian and Alaska Native public school students (7,300). The data from the American Indian and Alaska Native public school student sample were obtained from the work by Joseph E. Trimble and Susan Richardson entitled "American Indian and Alaska Native student attitudes towards self and school" and prepared for Development Associates, Inc. The three teacher groups include BIA ORBS teachers (68), non-BIA private boarding school teachers (161), and a third group--Pennsylvania secondary teachers (statewide sample). The Pennsylvania secondary teacher results were from the state's 1980 Educational Quality Assessment.

The student analysis is divided into two parts. The first part is a comparison analysis of the last 35 survey items on the questionnaire. The analysis compares the responses of BIA and non-BIA students on the selected items. The second part is a comparative analysis of the BIA student; non-BIA private school student and American Indian and Alaska Native public school student responses. This part

expands the comparison to a third sample compiled for Development Associates, Inc.

The teacher data analysis is presented in two parts. The first part is an item analysis of the responses to the survey items by the BIA and non-BIA teachers. Part two is a comparative analysis of BIA teachers, non-BIA private boarding school teachers and Pennsylvania secondary teachers.

Student Responses to Survey Items

Part One--BIA and Non-BIA Item Analysis

For most of the survey items, there were only slight differences (if any) between the responses of BIA and non-BIA school students. In a few instances, however, marked differences were observed between the BIA and non-BIA samples.

Chi-square (x^2) tests were employed to determine if there were statistically reliable differences between the observed frequency counts and the expected frequency counts of BIA and non-BIA student survey responses. The H_O hypothesis was that the observed frequency patterns would have been expected on the basis of chance alone. When the survey items were tested, the differences in 21 survey items[1], (60%), were significant at or beyond the .01 level.

BIA students indicated lower regard for their teachers' work performance, stronger feelings of uselessness, and a lower sense of self-respect. Furthermore, they indicated that their teachers had less respect for student opinions than non-BIA students. They appeared to attach greater importance to what they were

[1]Survey item numbers 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38.

learning, however, and were more likely to think their school's rules were fairer than non-BIA students.

The non-BIA students expressed higher regard for their teachers; believing that their teachers were more concerned with student achievement, were more willing to talk to students about academic problems, and placed more emphasis on the completion of homework.

Concerning school, non-BIA students expressed a stronger desire to remain in school, displayed greater interest in school activities and classes, and were more inclined to feel that their school was better than most.

There was a large difference between the two groups in their desire to improve their performance in school. The non-BIA students wished for higher marks (although they rated their performance in school higher), saw themselves as being more able, were more likely to express the attitude that school could make a difference in their lives, and felt considerably more pressure in school than their BIA counterparts.

Part Two--Comparative Analysis

The data from the two samples in this study permitted a comparison with a third set of data (collected for Development Associates, Inc., between 1981 and 1982) from a sample of approximately 7,300 American Indian and Alaska Native students in grades 7 through 12 enrolled in public schools. Although this sample differs slightly from the sample used in the PSU study (in which grades 7 and 8 were not included), there was little difference among 7th, 8th and 9th grade student responses and the 10th, 11th and 12th grade student responses. Therefore, they collapsed the scores across grades.

A factor analysis on the survey items conducted for Development Associates, Inc., yielded seven factors. According to Development Associates, Inc., "the factor

structures of the items lend credibility to the domain identified for assessment and substantiate the internal consistency and homogeneity of the items used as scales." In order to compare our responses to those reported by Development Associates, we shall utilize the factors they used to present these data. These factors are:

1. Attitude toward school. The dominant factor loads highest on eight items that appear to emphasize teacher behavior, school activities, and a positive orientation towards school.

2. Cultural pride. This factor loads highest on eight distinct items that emphasize pride in tribal affiliation, learning about Indians and one's tribe and the importance with which one's tribe is held.

3. Self-esteem. Made up of seven items, this factor contains an orientation towards doing things well, self-satisfaction and positive attitudes, and having good qualities.

4. Value of education. This factor loads strongly on six items that emphasize interest in classes and learning, doing well, and staying in school and the difference school makes in one's life.

5. Academic self-concept. Items tapping some aspect of one's performance in school form this four item factor.

6. School fairness. Two items load strongly on this factor that appears to tap a school's rules and school climate dimension.

7. Self-derogation. Wanting more respect and feelings of uselessness make up this two-item factor.

The following presents each of the seven factors and the items which were loaded into each.

1. Attitude towards school--Items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

   4. My teachers try to see that everybody learns.

   5. It's easy for me to talk to my teachers about my school work problems.

   6. Most of my teachers are like friends.

   7. I would drop out of school if I could.

   8. Most of my teachers won't listen to my opinion if it's different from theirs.

   9. There are interesting activities to look forward to in this school.

10. I like most of my teachers.

11. This school is no better than most.

Table 4 presents the percentage of positive responses for the attitude toward school factor.

2. Cultural pride--Two additional items used by Development Associates were not used by PSU. Therefore, this factor included only survey item numbers 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 (two less than Development Associates).

39. Indian history and culture should be taught more in school.

40. Do you like to tell other people about your Tribe?

41. How proud are you to be a member of your Tribe?

42. Do you like to learn new things about your Tribe?

43. Would you like to have non-Indian students learn about your Tribe?

44. Would you like your tribal language to be taught in school?

Table 5 presents the percentage of positive responses for the cultural pride factor.

3. Self-esteem--Items 26, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, and 35.

26. When I do something, I do it well.

29. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

30. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

32. I am good at learning.

33. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

34. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

35. I am able to do many things well in school.

Table 6 presents the percentage of positive responses for the self-esteem factor.

4. Value of education--Items 7, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 20.

7. I would drop out of school if I could.

15. How interested are you in most of your classes?

16. Do you feel that most of what you are learning is important?

18. Do you feel that most of the things you do at school are a waste of time?

19. Do you feel that school can make a real difference in your life?

20. If you do well in school, will this help you later?

Table 7 presents the percentage of positive responses for the value of education factor.

5. Academic self-concept--Items 22, 23, 24, and 25.

22. How good do you want to be in school? Do you want to be...

23. Compared to your classmates, where do you think you rank in school performance?

24. How do you rate yourself in school ability, compared with your classmates?

25. What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting?

Table 8 presents the percentage of positive responses for academic self-concept.

6. School fairness--Items 37 and 38.

37. The rules of this school are unfair to students.

38. Students are under too much pressure in this school.

Table 9 presents the percentage of positive responses for school fairness.

7. Self-derogation--Items 28 and 31.

28. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

31. I certainly feel useless at times.

Table 10 presents the percentage of positive responses for self-derogation.

These seven factors can be combined to form three basic attitudinal scales: school related, self-related, and cultural identification attitudes. Table 11 presents the combination of the seven factors into three attitudinal scales.

TABLE 4
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL: PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES

	SURVEY ITEM	BIA[1] n=708	NON-BIA n=702	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113	PS A n=120	PS B n=214	PS C n=115	PS D n=91	PS E n=162
4.	My teachers try to see that everybody learns.	88[2]	91	87	91	92	75	90	93	90	94	87
5.	It's easy for me to talk to my teachers about my school work problems.	65	77	59	60	71	67	81	81	76	82	65
6.	Most of my teachers are like friends.	68	65	63	65	73	71	75	65	51	75	64
7.	I would drop out of school if I could.	82	84	89	81	82	79	84	89	77	86	81
8.	Most of my teachers won't listen to my opinion if it's different from theirs.	69	75	72	71	65	73	73	82	68	83	71
9.	There are interesting activities to look forward to in this school.	68	70	75	73	69	51	76	67	51	77	82
10.	I like most of my teachers.	86	89	80	87	89	81	89	89	78	95	91
11.	This school is no better than most.	57	66	49	62	56	47	63	81	51	69	61
	TOTAL	72.9	77.1	71.8	73.8	74.6	68.0	78.9	80.9	67.8	82.6	75.3

1 The school identification code for all tables is as follows: BIA = three Bureau of Indian Affairs off-reservation boarding schools; NON-BIA = five private boarding schools; AI = American Indian and Alaska Native American public schools; BIA A = BIA School A; BIA B = BIA School B; BIA C = BIA School C; PS A = Private School A; PS B = Private School B; PS C = Private School C; PS D = Private School D; PS E = Private School E.

2 This figure represents the percentage of positive responses to the item. Responses, A and B were considered positive, except for items numbers 7, 8, 11, 18, 28, 31, 37 and 38. These items were reversed, therefore, C or D signified a positive response.

TABLE 5
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD CULTURAL PRIDE: PERCENTAGE OF POSITVE RESPONSES

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=708	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113
39. Indian history and culture should be taught more in school.	89	83	92	85	84
40. Do you like to tell other people about your Tribe?	77	53	79	80	69
41. How proud are you to be a member of your Tribe?	97	89	98	96	96
42. Do you like to learn new things about your Tribe?	91	83	93	94	86
43. Would you like to have non-Indian students learn about your Tribe?	61	63	65	54	58
44. Would you like your tribal language to be taught in school?	80	68	87	74	71
TOTAL	82.5	73.2	85.7	80.5	77.3

Note: Non-BIA students were not surveyed on these items.

TABLE 6
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD SELF-ESTEEM: PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=708	NON-BIA n=702	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113	PS A n=120	PS B n=214	PS C n=115	PS D n=91	PS E n=162
26. When I do something, I do it well.	88	87	88	86	91	87	89	88	85	85	85
29. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	88	94	89	86	91	84	91	95	93	97	96
30. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	85	94	89	85	90	83	94	95	93	94	94
32. I am good at learning.	88	87	83	86	91	91	89	89	83	90	87
33. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	79	77	83	79	80	79	79	78	74	79	70
34. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	78	82	82	75	82	81	78	85	82	86	81
35. I am able to do many things well in school.	80	85	85	79	81	86	87	84	83	82	87
TOTAL	83.7	86.6	85.6	82.3	86.6	84.4	86.7	87.7	84.7	87.6	85.7

TABLE 7
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD VALUE OF EDUCATION: PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES

	SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=708	NON-BIA n=702	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113	PS A n=120	PS B n=214	PS C n=115	PS D n=91	PS E n=162
7.	I would drop out of school if I could.	82	84	89	81	82	79	84	89	77	86	81
15.	How interested are you in most of your classes?	80	85	83	80	82	79	81	88	80	86	86
16.	Do you feel that most of what you are learning is important?	85	83	83	87	85	80	85	85	79	80	84
18.	Do you feel that most of the things you do at school are a waste of time?	73	74	72	75	74	67	80	81	63	75	72
19.	Do you feel that school can make a real difference in your life?	90	94	85	90	91	88	88	98	90	98	95
20.	If you do well in school, will this help you later?	94	95	90	93	97	89	93	94	93	95	96
	TOTAL	84.0	85.8	83.7	84.3	85.2	80.3	85.2	89.2	80.3	86.7	85.7

TABLE 8
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD ACADEMIC SELF CONCEPT: PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=708	NON-BIA n=702	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113	PS A n=120	PS B n=214	PS C n=115	PS D n=91	PS E n=162
22. How good do you want to be in school? Do you want to be....	76	92	73	72	83	70	95	96	86	94	89
23. Compared to your classmates, where do you think you rank in school performance?	28	49	33	26	30	31	48	58	42	42	44
24. How do you rate yourself in school ability, compared with your classmates?	33	60	32	31	35	35	55	67	57	57	56
25. What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting?	73	92	72	72	78	68	94	88	90	98	91
TOTAL	52.5	73.3	52.5	50.3	56.5	51.0	73.0	77.3	68.8	72.8	70.0

TABLE 9
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL FAIRNESS: PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=708	NON-BIA n=702	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113	PS A n=120	PS B n=214	PS C n=115	PS D n=91	PS E n=162
37. The rules of this school are unfair to students.[1]	66	54	80	66	60	76	53	59	46	70	44
38. Students are under too much pressure in this school.[1]	65	41	79	72	50	75	54	42	25	55	32
TOTAL	65.5	47.5	79.5	69.0	55.0	75.5	53.5	50.5	35.5	62.5	38.0

TABLE 10
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD SELF-DEROGATION: PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RESPONSES

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=708	NON-BIA n=702	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113	PS A n=120	PS B n=214	PS C n=115	PS D n=91	PS E n=162
28. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	27	50	28	29	29	21	49	64	43	56	35
31. I certainly feel useless at times.	42	49	40	45	39	41	46	59	44	38	47
TOTAL	34.5	49.5	34.0	37.0	34.0	31.0	47.5	61.5	43.5	47.0	41.0

1 In the questionnaire used by Development Associates, the term "students" was preceded by "Indian."

TABLE 11
POSITIVE ATTITUDE SCALE PERCENTAGES

SCALE	BIA n=708	NON-BIA n=702	A I n=7,300	BIA A n=351	BIA B n=244	BIA C n=113	PS A n=120	PS B n=214	PS C n=115	PS D n=91	PS E n=162
School Related											
Attitude Towards School	72.9	77.1	71.8	73.8	74.6	68.0	78.9	80.9	67.8	82.6	75.3
Value of Education	83.7	86.6	83.7	84.3	85.2	80.3	85.2	89.2	80.3	86.7	85.7
Academic Self Concept[1]	52.5	73.3	52.5	50.3	56.5	51.0	73.0	77.3	68.8	72.8	70.0
SUB TOTAL SCHOOL RELATED ATTITUDES	69.7	79.0	69.3	69.5	72.1	66.4	79.0	82.5	72.3	80.7	77.0
Self Related Attitudes											
School Fairness[1]	65.5	47.5	79.5	69.0	55.0	75.3	53.5	50.5	35.5	62.5	38.0
Self-Esteem	83.7	86.6	85.6	82.3	86.6	84.4	86.7	87.7	84.7	87.6	85.7
Self-Derogation	34.5	49.5	34.0	37.0	34.0	31.0	47.5	61.5	43.5	47.0	41.0
SUB TOTAL SELF RELATED ATTITUDES	61.2	61.2	66.4	62.8	58.5	63.6	62.6	66.6	54.6	65.7	54.9
TOTAL, SCHOOL AND SELF RELATED ATTITUDES	65.5	70.1	67.9	66.1	65.3	65.0	70.8	74.5	63.4	73.2	66.0
Cultural Identification											
Cultural Pride	82.5	--	73.2	85.7	80.5	77.3					

[1] The careful reader might notice that these two sub-scales seem to be incorrectly categorized; i.e., "Academic Self Concept" would seem to belong to the "Self Related Attitudes" category and "School Fairness" should belong to the "School Related" category. However, this is the way Development Associates grouped the scores and we followed their format in order to compare our results to theirs.

Generally, the non-BIA group had more positive attitudes. On five of the seven factors (attitude towards self, academic self-concept, value of education, self-esteem, and (absence of) self-derogation), the scores of the non-BIA group were more positive than in the other samples. This result should not be surprising since many of the students from the private school sample were from rather privileged backgrounds. The percent of positive responses on the first six factors, as shown in Table 11, were as follows:

Non-BIA Private Boarding School Students	=	70.1
American Indian and Alaskan Native Public School Students	=	67.9
BIA ORBS Students	=	65.6

The small difference among the three student groups is noteworthy. Overall, the BIA school student attitudes are only slightly less positive in their attitudes toward school and self than American Indian public school students and private boarding school students. Examining some of the individual items by school type reveals only slight differences.

Concerning school-related attitudes, 80%[1] of the American Indian public school students, 89% of the non-BIA students, and 86% of the BIA students liked most of their teachers (item 10). In item 9, 75% of the public school students, 70% non-BIA, and 68% BIA students said that there were interesting activities in school. However, in item 36, 51% of the public school students, 69% non-BIA boarding students, and 73% of the BIA ORBS students felt that teachers did not care what

[1]The figures provided were obtained by summing the A and B percent total responses.

students thought.[2] In item 13, 79% of the Indian public school students, 77% of the non-BIA, and 85% of the BIA students felt good about going to their school. In items 14 and 15, almost three-quarters of the public school students (72 and 83%), and more than four-fifths of the non-BIA (82 and 85%), and BIA students (85 and 80%) indicated they enjoyed school and were interested in classes. Eighty-three percent of the public school students, 83% non-BIA and 85% BIA, also felt that learning was important (item 16), and 85% of the Indian public school students, 94% non-BIA and 90% BIA students, indicated that school can make a difference in one's life (item 19). Interestingly, though, in item 17, 70% of the day students, 75% non-BIA, and 66% of the BIA students expressed the opinion that the most important part of one's education comes from real experience rather than school learning.

All three student groups expressed very positive attitudes about education and the importance of learning. In item 20, 90% of the public school students, 95% non-BIA and 94% of BIA students, felt that doing well in school will help later in life. Seventy-three percent of the public school students, 92% non-BIA and 76% BIA students wanted to be above average or among the best in school (item 22).

In the second major area, self-esteem, all three student groups expressed rather positive feelings about themselves. Eighty-eight percent of the public school students, 87% non-BIA, and 88% BIA felt that when they did something, it was done well (item 26). Eighty-nine percent of the public school students, 94% non-BIA, and 85% BIA said they were able to do things as well as others (item 30). In item 32, 83% public school students, 87% non-BIA, and 88% BIA said they were good at learning. Eighty-five percent of the public school students, 85% non-BIA, and 80% BIA students said they were able to do many things well in school (item

---

[2]The distribution for items 36, 13, 14 and 17 is not shown in the tables.

35). On the whole, 83% of the public school students, 77% non-BIA, and 79% BIA were satisfied with themselves (item 33) and 82% public school students, 82% non-BIA, and 78% BIA said they took a positive attitude toward themselves (item 34). On the other hand, in item 28, 7?% of the public school students, 50% non-BIA, and 73% BIA students said they wished they could have more respect for themselves. In item 31, 60% of the public school students, 51% non-BIA, and 58% BIA students said they felt useless at times.

In the cultural area, the BIA ORBS student responses were considerably more positive than the Indian public school students. In item 41, 89% of the public school students and 97% of the BIA ORBS students said they were proud to be members of their tribe. Eighty-three percent of the public school students and 91% of BIA students liked to learn new things about their tribe (item 42), and in item 44, 68% of the public school students and 80% of the BIA would like their tribal language taught in the school. Only 53% of the public school students compared to 77% of the BIA students liked to tell other people about their tribe (item 40).

Teacher Responses to Survey Items

Part One--BIA and Non-BIA Item Analysis

Frequency distributions for three groups of teachers are compared in this section. The groups include BIA teachers from three ORBS, non-BIA teachers from five private boarding schools, and Pennsylvania secondary teachers surveyed in the 1980 State Education Quality Assessment.

The non-BIA teachers responded positively to many more items than the BIA teachers. Survey item numbers 5, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 31, and 32 particularly demonstrate this. For example, for item number 5, "There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students," 74% of the non-BIA teachers and only

28% of the BIA teachers, selected A (Not a Problem) as a response to this item. Item 17 measures satisfaction with the school's physical facilities. Here, 88% of the non-BIA teachers selected response A, indicating that the available physical resources were viewed as being adequate for student needs. Contrastingly, 44% of the BIA teachers selected response A. In item 18, 84% of non-BIA teachers and 56% of the BIA teachers indicated that they do not feel they work with too many students each day. Item 20 concerns teacher control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum, and instructional programs. Eighty-eight percent of the non-BIA teachers (as opposed to 59% of the BIA teachers) selected the A category indicating no problem with this area. Item 21 measures satisfaction with the degree of input into the development of new programs. As with previous items, the non-BIA teachers responded much more positively (83% selected A as compared with 43% of the BIA teachers). Item 24 concerns the quality and/or the lack of instruction equipment and materials. Response A was selected by 79% of the non-BIA teachers as compared to 41% of the BIA teachers. Item 33 involves perceiving too little support given by administrators on discipline items. Eighty-six percent of the non-BIA teachers selected the "Not a Problem" response compared with 22% of the BIA teachers. In the last survey item where a significant difference was noted, 76% of the non-BIA teachers as compared to 21% of the BIA teachers chose the A response indicating that classroom disruptions by students were not a problem.

Part Two--Comparative Analysis

Thirty-one items were considered in this comparison (item numbers 2 through 33 of the three teacher groups). Table 12 presents the percentage of positive responses on each item for the three samples. In twenty-three of the 31 items (74.2%), the BIA teachers had responses much like the Pennsylvania secondary teachers.[1] In eight of the items[2] (25.8%) the non-BIA response was much like that

of Pennsylvania secondary teachers. Item 16 concerned academic pressure on the students. The BIA teachers expressed the view that there was much less pressure on students for academic achievement than did the non-BIA and Pennsylvania secondary teachers. BIA teachers also expressed less support from support staff than did non-BIA and Pennsylvania teachers (item 25), and less teacher input into solving administrative problems (item 27).

---

1 Survey item numbers: 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 31, and 32.

2 Survey item numbers: 14, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 33

TABLE 12
SCHOOL RELATED ATTITUDINAL SURVEY: PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE REPONSES BY TEACHERS

	SURVEY ITEM	BIA[1] n=68	NON-BIA n=161	PST	BIA A n=30	BIA B n=26	BIA C n=12	PS A n=14	PS B n=42	PS C n=34	PS D n=33	PS E n=38
3.	The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	60[2]	87	67	53	62	75	92	98	77	100	74
4.	Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	58	88	61	56	58	66	100	98	83	100	69
5.	There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students.	75	96	82	80	73	67	100	100	91	100	93
6.	There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom.	78	94	80	87	61	92	100	100	88	100	84
7.	Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	71	94	78	70	77	59	100	100	88	97	90

1 On this table school identification is as follows: BIA = three Bureau of Indian Affairs off-reservation boarding schools; NON-BIA = five private boarding schools; PST = Pennsylvania secondary teachers; BIA A = BIA School A; BIA B = BIA School B; BIA C = BIA School C; PS A = Private School A; PS B = Private School B; PS C = Private School C; PS D = Private School D; PS E = Private School E.

2 These figures represent the percentage of positive responses. To calculate, the A (not a problem) and B (moderate problem) percent responses were summed.

TABLE 12 (Cont'd)

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=68	NON-BIA n=161	PST	BIA A n=30	BIA B n=26	BIA C n=12	PS A n=14	PS B n=42	PS C n=34	PS D n=33	PS E n=38
8. Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	63	93	72	66	73	33	100	100	94	97	79
9. Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	35	79	42	40	43	8	86	95	73	97	50
10. The parents do not support what the school does.	56	93	71	63	54	39	86	97	100	91	89
11. The parents do not place a high value on education.	54	92	63	57	54	50	100	98	92	97	81
12. Students in this school have poor study habits.	16	67	37	3	23	33	57	90	50	100	29
13. The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous.	54	90	74	53	54	58	92	98	76	100	84
14. Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	85	92	91	86	84	83	79	97	86	91	97
15. The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	78	75	80	83	69	84	93	81	79	84	47

TABLE 12 (Cont'd)

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=68	NON-BIA n=161	PST	BIA A n=30	BIA B n=26	BIA C n=12	PS A n=14	PS B n=42	PS C n=34	PS D n=33	PS E n=38
16. The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	97	97	91	100	96	92	93	95	94	100	100
17. Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students.	72	98	74	86	53	75	93	97	94	100	100
18. I work with too many students each day.	85	96	80	83	89	83	100	100	89	97	97
19. Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	92	97	94	90	89	100	100	97	97	100	95
20. Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum, and instructional programs.	88	97	92	89	85	92	100	98	94	100	98
21. When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	75	94	87	86	65	67	100	95	97	94	89
22. There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	60	70	75	76	58	25	92	95	68	97	13

TABLE 12 (Cont'd)

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=68	NON-BIA n=161	PST	BIA A n=30	BIA B n=26	BIA C n=12	PS A n=14	PS B n=42	PS C n=34	PS D n=33	PS E n=38
23. I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	73	85	73	80	69	58	93	91	67	87	89
24. My teaching is limited by the quality of or lack of instructional equipment and materials.	72	94	85	90	54	66	100	97	89	97	97
25. The support staff in this school is not cooperative.	72	94	91	90	54	66	100	96	82	97	95
26. The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	75	96	90	73	73	84	93	98	100	97	92
27. There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	36	80	66	53	19	34	86	98	65	91	63
28. There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e. everyone is doing his/her own thing.	60	85	76	66	54	59	79	95	94	97	55
29. Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	66	93	80	73	62	58	86	98	92	94	92
30. The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	43	81	63	50	31	50	78	97	79	91	58

TABLE 12 (Cont'd)

SURVEY ITEM	BIA n=68	NON-BIA n=161	PST	BIA A n=30	BIA B n=26	BIA C n=12	PS A n=14	PS B n=42	PS C n=34	PS D n=33	PS E n=38
31. Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	56	97	78	63	57	33	92	100	97	100	89
32. Too little support on discipline is given by the parents.	49	94	50	53	53	25	100	95	89	100	92
33. Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	67	92	82	86	54	42	100	98	88	97	82
TOTAL	65.2	89.7	75.0	70.5	61.3	59.9	92.6	96.5	85.5	96.5	79.4

Conclusion:

This chapter has analyzed the results of questionnaires measuring student and teacher attitudes toward school and themselves. The results provided information concerning the similarities and differences among three groups of students (BIA ORBS students, non-BIA private boarding school students, and American Indian and Alaska Native public school students) and three groups of teachers (BIA ORBS teachers, non-BIA private boarding school teachers, and Pennsylvania secondary teachers).

In the first part of the analysis of the student survey some differences between BIA and non-BIA students were seen in areas of self-respect, academic achievement feelings of uselessness and fairness of school scores. In these instances the non-BIA student responses were more positive than the BIA students. The area with the greatest difference between the groups was pressure to do well in school. BIA student responses indicated much less pressure to perform in school than the non-BIA students.

Part two of the Student Survey Analysis, included a third data set comprised of American Indian and Alaska Native public school students. The non-BIA sample gave the most positive responses, followed by the American Indian and Alaska Native public school students and BIA ORBS students. In the cultural area, however, the BIA ORBS student responses were considerably more positive than the American Indian and Alaska Native public school students.

The Teacher Survey Analysis revealed far greater differences than the Student Survey Analysis. Part one, the Item Analysis, presented the differences between BIA and non-BIA teacher responses. Teachers at private boarding schools were, in general, more satisfied with their school and their work than the teachers at the BIA ORBS. In only one of the thirty-one items did the BIA teachers answer more positively than the non-BIA teachers. This concerned competition among

students for grades. BIA teachers stated that it was not a problem and non-BIA teachers reported that it was a moderate problem at their school. In the other thirty survey items, the non-BIA teacher responses were more positive than the teachers at BIA schools. The groups varied greatly in their feelings concerning support by parents and administration in discipline matters. Non-BIA teachers responded much more positively on these items. Another related area concerned parental values and interest in their child's school work. The non-BIA teacher response was much more positive than the BIA teacher response. The second part of the Teacher Survey Analysis, a Comparative Analysis, introduced a third sample, Pennsylvania secondary teachers. The BIA teacher responses more closely resembled that of the Pennsylvania secondary teachers in a majority of the items, suggesting that teachers at a private boarding school tend to be in a rather atypical school environment. In our assessment, private boarding school tend to be the least bureaucratized among the three types of schools included in this study. Therefore, part of the reason for the private boarding school teachers responding so differently from the BIA and public school teachers could be attributed to this factor.

CHAPTER VIII

PHASE 5

ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF LIFE AT BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS OFF-RESERVATION BOARDING SCHOOLS

INTERVENTION STRATEGY

Our suggestions for improving the quality of life at BIA off-reservation boarding schools for both students and staff are based on the major findings from this study. We shall identify and discuss findings as a preface to the presentation of intervention strategies.

Major Finding 1: We did not uncover any evidence of blatant and systematic physical or psychological abuse directed towards students by BIA ORBS staff or abusive behavior among students. When former students did recall a case of a youth being abused, it seems to have been an individual case and not something which was perpetrated by a group of staff members (See Chapter IV). Our recent interviews with staff and students suggest the likelihood that this is still true at the present time (See Chapter V). The inhumane conditions which were described in the Meriam Report and assumed by other researchers to have continued seem to no longer exist.

Major Finding 2: Our interviews and survey suggest that the students enrolled in BIA ORBS are, in general, fairly satisfied with their school (See Chapter V). However, the fact that these schools have a high attrition rate (approximately 40 to 50% annually) suggests that many students do not find the BIA ORBS entirely to their liking and/or these schools are inappropriate placements for them. There are many possible reasons for students wanting to leave the ORBS.

Among these are homesickness, loneliness, problems with peers, problems with discipline and dissatisfaction with the academic program (See Chapter V).

Major Finding 3: Like most public schools, the BIA ORBS have problems with student drinking and fighting. According to the staff who have been working at the schools for a number of years, these problems are not as severe now as they were earlier. These more experienced staff acknowledged that students drinking openly on campus and fighting along tribal lines by groups of youngsters were fairly common occurrences even as recently as a few years ago. While the situation seems to have improved considerably, the staff is aware that the problems have not been solved permanently. Since, the youngsters who attend ORBS are literally cut-off from close family contact, it is likely that they will engage in illegitimate behavior (such as drinking) in order to be accepted by the only "family" available (See Chapters IV and V).

Major Finding 4: Many students want a more academically rigorous training than what they are presently receiving. However, the staff tends to view the students as being not very competent academically and see the parents of students to be relatively uninterested in their children's education as well. While there is undoubtedly some validity to these staff perceptions, it can cause self-fulfilling prophecy to occur. To the extent that the staff believes that the students have low academic abilities and the parents are not interested, they might teach accordingly and the students can end up performing more poorly on achievement tests than they would have had they been expected to learn more by their teachers. For example, our observation was that teaching and learning were treated rather casually by both teachers and staff at the three BIA ORBS which we visited. Students often drifted into class late, teachers tended to take their time starting their lessons, and many students worked very slowly. Class participation was minimal and students frequently demonstrated cognitive disengagement by

withdrawing, daydreaming, doodling, speaking among themselves and sleeping. There was little evidence of students being encouraged to study or do homework after school hours (See Chapter V).

Discussion:

It seems that most of the difficulties noted above have a common basis. They appear to be a result of the BIA ORBS becoming excessively bureaucratized. Many ORBS personnel think and behave within a bureaucratic frame of reference. This pattern is not conducive to the development of a sense of collective responsibility for what happens at the school. Many on the staff expect extra pay to work longer hours or to do anything for the students beyond what is called for in their job description. When a new activity is contemplated, the typical reaction is to wonder whether enough money can be located in order to pay people to do it. Evidently it is rather uncommon for staff members to volunteer to take on additional duties.

The result is the opposite of what many of the students probably need. If we give credence to published material and the information provided in our interviews with the staff, many of the students have had family experiences which are less than ideal. Divorce, alcoholic parents, low income and so on, characterize the families of many students. A few of the youngsters have been toughened by the experience and may experience difficulty living by the schools' rules and regulations. Others may need all the kindness and understanding they can get from the staff.

Clearly these students, given their diverse backgrounds, need individualized attention which is diffused in scope and not specifically confined to the bureaucratic manner of treating clients as cases. However, the division of responsibility evident at the BIA ORBS we visited, does not offer the continuity in

attention which many of these youngsters need. As a consequence, instead of developing a warm and trusting relationship with staff members, the students become highly dependent on each other for comfort and support. (This dependency is analogous to the situation in public schools, but BIA ORBS need not create the same situation with which the public schools are confronted.) This dependence on peers undoubtedly promotes a strong desire among the students to be accepted by others. This wanting to find acceptance by one's peers can lead to acquiescing to peer pressure such as a girl giving in to a boy's demand for sexual contact, taking part in drinking because the others do it, etc. This pattern is not diminished or weakened by a concerted adult effort to teach students how to cope with ambiguity, complexity, competition, success, failure, and disappointment. Furthermore, the near absence of adult presence in the social life of the students often results in a lack of awareness on the part of the staff of conflicts and problems which can lead to fights. If someone on the staff, for example, was aware that two girls were competing for the affection of the same boy, a potential fight could be headed off. As it stands now, the cause of a fight is usually uncovered after the fact.

One major step which we feel must be taken in order to improve the quality of life at the BIA ORBS is to debureaucratize the organization as much as possible. It is likely that debureaucratization will encourage those at an ORBS to relate to each other as people and not as job categories or people with vastly different responsibilities. We shall present a brief overview of the literature to serve as a preface to our recommendations.

Rationale for the Proposed Intervention Strategy

Those who have been following the recent publications on improving business organizations and on making schools more effective might have noticed that the

characteristics associated with the more effective companies or schools overlap to a considerable degree. This convergence seems to be a result of two separate groups of researchers pursuing different avenues of inquiry and ending up reaching conclusions which are basically very similar. If this view is somewhat accurate, it suggests that the undesirable consequences of bureaucratic structures and procedures are finally becoming apparent to more people.

Within the past hundred years, this society has witnessed a gradual proliferation of bureaucratic organizations both in the government and in private business. This process was related to the propagation of the belief that privately-owned bureaucracies were more rational and government bureaucracies were less corrupt than unbureaucratic organizations. This belief system was exemplified by the "scientific" management approach in industry and the strident calls for government reform during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Partly as a result of this change in beliefs, the social landscape of this country has become cluttered with bureaucratic organizations. The completeness of this change is suggested by Meyer and Rowan's observation that managers, executives and administrators have to express a belief in the efficacy of bureaucratic structure and procedures in order to be accepted as rational members of the administrative and managerial class (Meyer and Rowan, 1977).

The recent publications alluded to earlier are antithetical to this dominant belief system because the underlying idea in the recent studies is that bureaucracies are not very effective organizations in terms of either manufacturing goods or producing academic growth among the young. This view is not entirely new. One of the earlier works which questioned the prevailing practice in industry was the Hawthorne studies conducted by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) during the 1930's. The Human Relations movement which began as a result of the Hawthorne studies has, as its core, one of the principle ideas of the

new movement--morale and productivity improve when workers are treated as human beings rather than as mere cogs in a machine.

The Human Relations school of thought did not lead to a restructuring of American industry. It did not even provoke a serious examination of the rationale underlying the organizational structure of American companies. However, the growing competition from foreign companies during the past several decades has created a social climate conducive to raising serious questions about the ways in which American companies are organized and function.

The core theme of the various criticisms directed at the large American companies is that most of them are overly bureaucratized. Centralization of power, rules and regulations to promote standardization, and specialization in work are now said to restrict cooperation, discourage creativity, and weaken motivation to work; thereby lowering productivity (Ouchi, 1981 and Peters and Waterman, 1982 are good examples of this recent literature). The proposed solutions to the problems created by bureaucratization in industry include developing clear organizational goals, utilizing participative decision-making, adopting flexible work schedules, emphasizing teamwork, making over-lapping assignments, and, above all, ensuring that each worker feels his or her contributions are valued by the other members of the organization.

A pattern somewhat similar to what happened in American business is observable in the educational history of this country during the last century. School or educational reform inexorably led schools in the direction of greater bureaucratization (e.g., see Callahan, 1962 and Katz, 1971). The proponents for bureaucratizing schools gained even more credibility after the Russians launched Sputnik and the pace of consolidation and centralization of schools quickened. Therefore, the number of school districts in this country declined from 40,520 in 1960 to 16,960 in 1972. However, the promised improvement in science and math

skills among the young failed to materialize, leading some people to wonder why the new schools failed to produce the improvements which had been anticipated.

No coherent explanation for this failure emerged for some time. There were, however, a few studies which provided some provocative hints about schools' potential effect on students. One of these found that the transition from elementary school to an intermedidate school had a rather strong negative influence on students' self-concept (Simmons, et. al., 1973). Another study reported that students in smaller high schools (less than 500 enrolled) tended to report higher rates of participation and stronger motivation than students enrolled in larger schools (Garbarino, 1980). Furthermore, Anderson (1973), who found that schools' bureaucratic structure accounted for a large proportion of the variance in alienation scores among students, speculated that less bureaucratized modes of school operations may produce higher levels of student learning.

Some educational researchers now are claiming to have found the answer to the puzzle of why school consolidation did not bring about a marked improvement in student performance. Largely a product of work conducted within the last decade, this recent spate of studies is based on the finding that schools can improve the level of learning among their students beyond what would be expected if the administrators and teachers accept learning as a school goal and work together to achieve it (for a good summary of these studies, see Mackenzie, 1983 and Gregory, 1980).

What is interesting about the more concrete features of the "effective" schools which have been identified in various studies is that they are very similar to the characteristics of the more "productive" companies described earlier. That is, these effective schools foster participation in decision-making, encourage cooperation, allow for autonomy and flexibility in conducting work, and focus attention on promoting learning as the schools' goal.

The message contained in these various studies is quite unambiguous when it is stripped down to its essential idea--people are more productive workers in less bureaucratized organizations and students learn more when teachers and administrators do not behave like bureaucrats. This is because in the "new" organizations, reward and punishment are based on actions and behaviors which are related to the attainment of organizational goals and not, as it often is in bureaucracies, based on superficial acquiescence to authority or observing rules and regulations. Bureaucrats are not punished for refusing to accept responsibility and "passing the buck." On the other hand, sharing decision-making and other responsibilities, cooperating to attain common goals, and allowing people to exercise considerable autonomy and flexibility in performing tasks are practices which are commonly utilized to foster group cohesion and motivation in non-bureaucratic organizations and groups. It may be in the interests of most people to resurrect some basic practices and implement them in our schools as well as our companies.

Listed below are our recommendations for improving BIA ORBS as places where people live, work and study. These recommendations are not based only on the insights and information obtained by our study, but some are also related to other studies described in Chapter II of this report. We shall note the relevant pages in parentheses at the end of each recommendation. The interested reader is encouraged to refer to the conclusions reached by others who have studied various aspects of BIA ORBS in the past.

Recommendations Concerning Structural Changes

1. Relationship with the BIA: BIA should grant greater autonomy to each school to conduct their day-to-day activities: partly because of high turnover among BIA administrators in Washington and widely fluctuating policies cause

problems for the schools. And, decisions should be made at the school level without need for clearance from higher authority. Some degree of control from the central office can be maintained through regular inspections conducted periodically to ascertain that violations of BIA policy are not taking place. In this manner the staff and students at each school will be more likely to feel they have a say in the functioning of the school, the paperwork required will be reduced, and administrators can give more attention to school problems and needs (See pp. 12-14, 17, 18, 30, 32-34).

2. Size: The number of students enrolled in each school should be kept as small as possible. While accountants might argue that there is economy in size, the psychological costs in large organizations can be anonymity, loneliness, and alienation. Students are far less likely to fall between the organizational cracks if every student and staff member know each other by name. If a small enrollment does not justify employing a teacher with a highly developed skill such as a strong background in physics, cooperative arrangements should be worked out with a nearby public school to permit students from the BIA ORBS to take courses at the public school which are not available at the ORBS (See p. 28).

3. Work: The staff should be encouraged to assume multiple assignments whenever possible. Administrators can teach one class a day or assume the responsibility of supervising a study group. Teachers who are willing should be encouraged to double as dormitory staff in return for free room and board as well as a reduced teaching load. Compartmentalization and specialization of tasks and responsibilities among staff result in fragmented and transient relationships with students. Multiple assignments will help bridge the gap

between the academic, recreational and dormitory activities at an ORBS. Hiring a husband and wife where the two work in different parts of the school organization would help to provide links between those parts, but this is probably not as efficacious as a person performing multiple and overlapping assignments. Duplication of duties should be viewed as a desirable state of affairs because it will mean that more people will know what is going on and remind each other of problems which must be addressed and work which remains undone (See p. 48).

Recommendations Concerning Procedural Changes

1. Statement of Purpose: Each school should develop a statement of purpose. As it is now, our interviews revealed considerable differences of opinion about the mission of the school, what it should be trying to accomplish, and what it is actually doing. A clear statement of purpose will be helpful in identifying goals and priorities. The school's goals should be straight-forward and achievable. A statement of purpose which is vague or has a multiplicity of goals will not be an improvement over the existing situation. This statement of purpose for the school should be developed through a democratic process, not imposed from above. It should be a product created by a team made up of people representing the school board and the various functional areas of the school organization (See pp. 30 and 33).

2. Sense of Purpose: This recommendation is related to the first. A stronger commitment to what these schools are all about seems needed. In light of our finding that students want a more demanding academic program than what they are presently getting, it would seem that the teachers should set higher standards of performance (for both themselves and students) and raise

their expectations in terms of what the students are capable of learning. Certainly, more homework and supervised study will help to alleviate student complaints about boredom and not having enough to do in the evenings. More than this, it will better prepare the students for life after ORBS. This is not to suggest that teachers should merely assign lots of extra work for the students to do at night. The assignments should be instructional, not busy work and there should be arrangements made for tutoring (peer as well as staff) if the students need guidance or assistance. It is not merely common sense to suggest that most people find life to be more satisfying when they feel they are engaged in activities that are important. Most people do not enjoy spending hours every day sitting around with little to do since they tend to view it as a waste of their time. Greater commitment to improving skills and obtaining knowledge (not exclusively confined to academic areas) on the part of everyone is likely to contribute to the creation of a more satisfying environment for most people (See pp. 34, 37, 39).

3. Problem Solving: There should be more participative problem-solving and decision-making. Administrators do not always know the right answers. This is especially true when the situation is complicated and many people are affected by the issue. Usually when people are given a say in developing solutions to a complex problem, they are more likely to be committed to solving the problem than if they were not involved in searching for the solution. When policy decisions are routinely made by the top administrators without consulting others, it can result in apathy, emotional disengagement or resentment among lower echelon staff members (See pp. 12, 29-30, 35-36).

4. Contact with Parents: The school staff should do more to communicate with parents and to encourage the students to keep in touch with their parents. Children and parents become strangers to each other the longer they are separated. Every effort should be made to ameliorate this process. Furthermore, the first six months of being away from home is probably the most difficult period for the youngster in terms of loneliness and homesickness. The school staff should do more to help students during this period than they are presently doing. For example, telephones can be made more available for students to call home. English teachers can make writing letters to parents a regular assignment in their classes. Teachers, dorm staff and counselors should inform parents about how their children are faring in the school both academically and socially, and parents should be encouraged to visit the school (See pp. 20 and 37).

5. Caring about Others: A spirit of mutual help and caring should be fostered. Every effort should be made to encourage students to view and treat each other as friends. The staff should eat in the cafeteria with the students and not in separate facilities. Administrators should increase the amount of positive informal contac they have with students as well as staff. In other words, each person should be interested in and care about what others are doing in the school (See pp. 31, 52-53).

Recommendations Concerning Leadership

1. Strength in Leadership: Effective leadership is frequently cited as a major factor contributing to a school's overall success. It has been described as a set of attitudes, activities and behaviors which shape the school's climate and make it conducive to learning. The ideal administrator should be respected,

well-liked, competent, innovative, involved and approachable. We recommend that the BIA appoint consistent and proven administrators with the above mentioned traits to ensure school effectiveness and the highest possible quality of life for all. Leadership should be encouraged within the student population also, with a functioning, effective, responsible student elective body. The students play a part in forming the school climate.

2. Professional Staff: Staff selection, training, retention and career advancement ought to be top priorities for ORBS administrators. Care should be taken to employ and competitively remunerate the most qualified and capable people available. Once employed, administrators should work hard to maintain high staff morale. Our research clearly indicated a dramatic difference between BIA and non-BIA teachers' attitudes. BIA teachers were significantly less satisfied and less happy in their work than teachers working at private boarding schools. ORBS administrators need to address the problem of staff morale and adopt the structural and procedural changes we have recommended to improve the situation.

Summary

Although problems for students and staff at BIA ORBS do not appear to be as severe as in the past, there is still a need for substantial modification and change. Problems facing these institutions should not be accepted, taken lightly or assigned low priority. The challenge to improve these institutions is both current and urgent. We have outlined what we believe are viable means to bettering these schools.

Each of the three recommended areas of change (structural, procedural and leadership) requires simultaneous implementation, follow-through and monitoring.

Without structural change, procedural and leadership improvement will not occur. Therefore, change in one area only will not have the same overall impact as the combined implementation of the recommendations for change in all three phases of school operations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, B. (1973 Summer). School bureaucratization and alienation from high school. Sociology of Education, 46, 315-334.

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garbarino, J. (1980). Some thoughts on school size and its effects on adolescent behavior. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9.

Gregory, L. (1980). Synthesis of case studies, Why do some urban schools succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa and Indiana University.

Katz, M. (1971). Class, bureaucracy and schools. New York: Praeger.

MacKenzie, D. (1980 April). Research for school improvement: An appraisal of some recent trends in Educational Researcher, 5-17.

Meyer, J. and Rowan, B. (1977 September). Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology 83, 340-363.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). Theory Z. New York: Avon Books.

Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.

Roethlisberger, F. and Dickson, W. (1939). Management and the worker. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Simmons, R. et al. (1973 October). Disturbance in the Self Image at Adolescence. American Sociological Review, 38, 553-568.

APPENDIX A

STUDY OF STUDENT LIFE AT BIA OFF-RESERVATION SCHOOL

(Name of Interviewee) _____

(School Attended) _____

(Tribe) _____

(Telephone Number) _____

(When to Call) _____

(Interviewer) _____

(Date and Time Interview Conducted) _____

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW FORM FOR "ABUSE PROJECT"

Introduction

The interviewer should introduce him/herself by identifying him/herself by name, identifying the American Indian Education Policy Center at Penn State and the name and the nature of the Abuse Project. An initial introduction might be amplified in each case in a different manner, depending upon the "feel" of the interviewer for the interviewee, and upon the number of questions asked by the interviewee, and the way in which s/he asks them. A possible interview introduction follows:

"Hello, my name is (name of interviewer). I'm working for the American Indian Education Policy Center at The Pennsylvania State University. The Center trains Indian leaders and conducts research which it hopes will be of long-range benefit for the education of all Indians and native people in the United States. We are calling you because you have agreed to be interviewed at this time about the quality of life at (name of boarding school) where you went to school."

* * * * *

If the interviewee doesn't have the time to participate in the interview, then state: "According to the reply by postcard that you sent to us this was a convenient time for you. That's why I called now. I'm sorry if it wasn't. Can you tell me when a good time to call you again might be?"

Date _____ **Time** _____

* * * * *

"Before we begin this interview, do you have any questions about the American Indian Education Policy Center or this study of the quality of student life at off-reservation boarding schools? I would guess that some of the questions you might have will be answered in the process of this interview, but if there are questions you would like to ask now, then please go ahead."

Allow time for questions and answers. The point is to reassure the interviewee that the interview is worthwhile and that the interviewer is a trustworthy type of person.

I. INFORMATION QUESTIONS

A. How long were you at _____?
(name of school)

(Have interviewee specify the amount of time).

1. less than a year
2. one year or more, but less than two
3. two years or more, but less than three
4. three years or more, but less than four
5. four years or more

If "less than a year" is the answer to Question A, then ask Question B:
(Otherwise, go to Question E).

B. Did you attend another school?

1. No
2. Yes

If "no" is the answer, ask: "Where did you complete your other years?" Then go to Question E.

If "yes" is the answer, ask Question C:

C. What kind of school was it and where was it?

Name _____ Where _____

1. public school
2. BIA on-reservation boarding school
3. BIA off-reservation boarding school
4. BIA day school
5. tribal contract school
6. other, such as a mission or private school

Then ask:

D. How long were you at _____
(name of school mentioned in Question C)

(Have interviewee specify the amount of time).

1. less than a year
2. one year or more, but less than two

3. two years or more, but less than three
4. three years or more, but less than four
5. four years or more

E. Why did you enroll at _____? How did it come about?
(name of school in Question "A")

F. What was it like to be a student at _____?
(name of school)

Was it a pleasant or unpleasant place for students?
(Have interviewees amplify answer).

G. Did the school have adequate educational facilities? Did it have:
1. a library
2. a study room
3. a tutoring center
4. a counseling center
5. an information center for colleges and universities
6. other

H. Did the school have adequate recreational facilities? Did it have:
1. a gym
2. an athletic field

3. a swimming pool
4. a recreation room

5. a TV room
6. a Students' Only room
7. other

I. Were these facilities easily available to the students? What were the conditions for their use?

II. COUNSELING

"Many schools have career counseling services for students so that they can better decide what they want to do with their lives when they graduate. Also, schools sometimes have counseling for students with academic or behavioral problems."

A. What kind of counseling was available at _____?
(name of school)

Did the students receive any counseling on academic or personal matters?

B. Was there any informal counseling?

C. What did students do if they had problems?

III. RULES FOR STUDENT BEHAVIOR

A. What were the rules that students had to follow? For example, was there a dress code? Was there a rule about membership in outside organizations?

B. How were students punished if they broke the rules?

C. Who administered the punishment?

IV. STUDENT LIFE

Now let's talk about your life as a student at _____
(name of school)

A. To what extent did students have the opportunity to use their own language?

B. Were there classes where Indian culture was taught?

C. What activities associated with Indian culture were available to students?

D. How did students at your school feel about Indian or Native rights? Were organizations such as the American Indian Movement (AIM) and the National Indian Youth Council active at your school? (If "yes," what did they do)?

Ask if a militant group came on campus:

E. How did the school staff react to students who felt strongly about Indian rights and who might have been militant in their actions?

If answer to "D" is affirmative, ask: (Also if response to "E" specified a staff reaction.)

F. How did the other students feel about what these students were doing?

G. In what kinds of activities did students have a voice in the decision-making process?

H. How effective was the student government?

V. STUDENTS AND THE TOWN

A. Please describe the town nearest to the school.

B. How free were students to go to town?

C. In what kinds of town/community activities did students participate?

D. How were the students treated by the townspeople?

E. What happened if there was trouble in town?

F. Who helped the student in trouble?
How did _____ help the student in trouble?

G. What were the consequences of getting in trouble in town?

VI. STUDENT CONTACT WITH FAMILY

A. How frequently did students have contact with their families? Was it by phone? Were parents encouraged to visit?

B. How many students wrote to their parents and how often did they do so?

VII. SCHOOL STRUCTURE/SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

A. Let's talk about the school principal. What was s/he like?

B. Were there any other people who didn't teach but who were in the school administration that the students came into contact with? What were their jobs? What were they like?

C. Did the teachers get along with the students?

D. What did the teachers do when they had trouble with a particular student?

E. What about the dormitory staffers? How did they get along with the students?

F. What did they do when they had trouble with somebody?

G. Was there any special time when trouble was likely to happen between dormitory staff and students? When was this? Was there a particular time of the year?

H. What were the problems? How were they resolved?

I. Did any students ever run away from school (or check out for town and not return?)

1. Yes
2. No

If a "yes," then ask: Do you know why they ran away?

If a "no," skip to Section VIII, Question A.

J. About how often did you have students run away (or check out and not return?)

K. How were they punished if they were caught and sent back to school?

VIII. STUDENT/STUDENT RELATIONSHIP

A. What about the students? Did they get along well with each other?

1. Yes
2. No

B. Were there gangs or cliques?

C. How were these gangs or cliques organized?

D. Were there students who got picked on by others?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   (We don't want names, but just the type of students).

E. Why did they get picked on?

F. Do you personally know of any specific instances of forced sexual relations between one student and another?

G. Do you personally know of any instances of sexual relations between students and dormitory staff or teachers?

IX. DRUGS AND ALCOHOL USE

"A recent BIA study of drug and alcohol use at BIA boarding schools suggests that their use is commonplace."

A. In your estimation, about how many of your schoolmates drank beer or other alcoholic beverages?

B. Which students were likeliest to drink? Did you find anything common about those who drank at school?

C. How did they get beer or whatever they drank?

D. How many students used drugs like marijuana?

E. Who were these students? What were they like? How were they doing in school?

F. How did the students get drugs like marijuana?

X. CLASSMATES

A. _____ went to your school. Do you remember him/her?
(Classmate No. 1)

1. Yes
2. No.

If "yes," ask Questions "B" through "F."
If "no," skip to Classmate No. 2.

B. How would you describe him/her?

C. What kind of friends did s/he have?

D. How did s/he get along with the boarding school staff?

E. Did s/he graduate?

F. Do you know where s/he is and what s/he is doing now?

A. _____ went to your school. Do you remember him/her?
(Classmate No. 2)

1. Yes
2. No

If "yes," ask Questions "B" through "F."
If "no," skip to Classmate No. 3.

B. How would you describe him/her?

C. What kind of friends did s/he have?

D. How did s/he get along with the boarding school staff?

E. Did s/he graduate?

F. Do you know where s/he is and what s/he is doing now?

A. _____ went to your school. Do you remember her/her?
(Classmate No. 3)

1. Yes
2. No

If "yes," ask Questions "B" through "F."

If "no," skip to Classmate No. 4.

B. How would you describe him/her?

C. What kind of friends did s/he have?

D. How did s/he get along with the boarding school staff?

E. Did s/he graduate?

F. Do you know where s/he is and what s/he is doing now?

A. _____ went to your school. Do you remember him/her?
(Classmate No. 4)

1. Yes
2. No

If "yes," ask Questions "B" through "F."

If "no," skip to Classmate No. 5.

B. How would you describe him/her?

C. What kind of friends did s/he have?

D. How did s/he get along with the boarding school staff?

E. Did s/he graduate?

F. Do you know where s/he is and what s/he is doing now?

A. _____ went to your school. Do you remember him/her?
(Classmate No. 5)

1. Yes
2. No

If "yes," ask Questions "B" through "F."
If "no," skip to Section XI.

B. How would you describe him/her?

C. What kind of friends did s/he have?

D. How did s/he get along with the boarding school staff?

E. Did s/he graduate?

F. Do you know where s/he is and what s/he is doing now?

XI. SELF-APPRAISAL/SCHOOL APPRAISAL

A. What about you? How would you describe yourself while you were at _____ _____?

(name of school)

B. What kind of friends did you have?

C. How did you get along with the other students at your school?

D. How did you get along with the boarding school staff?

E. Do you still keep in touch with anyone from the school?

F. Did you graduate?

1. Yes
2. No

G. What did you do after you left _____?
(name of school)

(List events chronologically).

H. What kind of job do you have now?

I. Looking back at your experience at _____,
(name of school)

how would you describe it? What were the good things? The bad?

J. Would you send your children to a BIA boarding school?

K. What suggestions would you make in order to improve the quality of student life at _____ and other schools like it?
(name of school)

What would make these schools better places for Indian children?

Closing the Interview

"Thank you for your time and patience. Do you have any other things to add to what you have said? Do you have any other questions about the interview or our purpose in doing it? The phone number here at the American Indian Education Policy Center is (814) 865-1489. If you have any questions or further comments to add, you can reach one of us here at this number. We will in all likelihood not call you again. If you want to know about the conclusions we have reached in our research, please write to us at the Center after next summer (1984). It will take us that long to compile our data and complete our research findings. We thank you again for your time and willingness to be a part of this project. We hope that our findings will improve the lot of Indian students across the United States. Thank you and good-bye."

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR BOARDING SCHOOL STAFF

Record the school, number assigned to interviewee and position of the person being interviewed, and the date.

1. How long have you been working at this school? How would you describe your job? Any particular reason for your working here?

2. What are the best things about working here? What are the worst? Are things at this school so bad you would want to leave?

3. In our study, fighting among students was identified as a problem by former students at BIA boarding Schools. Is that also true here?

4. When we interviewed people who were former students at BIA off-reservation boarding schools, many said drinking was commonplace among students and that this caused various problems. Do you have a similar situation here? How about the use of other drugs by students?

5. We would like to know what you think about the education the students are receiving now at this school. Is it adequate or inadequate for their needs? Why? What do you think needs changing?

6. Do you think the emotional needs of the students are being met adequately at this school?

7. What about the social and recreational needs of students? Do you think they are being met adequately?

8. If a student wanted help in the evening for a personal or academic problem, can they receive assistance? If yes, how and from whom?

9. If there are things about this school which can be changed to make this a better place for the students, what would you change?

10. If you could reorganize the school and dormitory, what things would you change?

PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWING STUDENTS AT BOARDING SCHOOLS

Record the school, number assigned to student being interviewed, and the date.

1. How long have you been at this school?

2. Is this school better for you than other boarding schools? Why? Are you here because you want to be here?

3. How does this school compare with public schools?

4. How do the students get along? Any fighting? Do some students get picked on by others?

5. What do you have to do in this school to get along with the other kids?

6. Is there any drinking going on among the students? If yes, is it a problem?

7. How satisfied are the students with the education you are receiving here?

8. Do you think most of the students feel at home here? Do many of them feel lonely or homesick?

9. Is there enough to do here? Do many of the students feel bored?

10. What do you have to do to get along with the teachers? What about the dormitory staff? What about the principals?

11. Do teachers know the students well and try to help them?

12. Can you get help with lessons when you need it? What about when you are studying at night?

13. Who would be the ones the students would talk to about a personal problem?

14. If there are things about this school which could be changed to make this a better place for the students, what would you change?

PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWING STUDENTS AT BOARDING SCHOOLS

Record the school, number assigned to student being interviewed, and the date.

1. How long have you been at this school?
2. Is this school better for you than most Indian boarding schools? Why? Are you here because you want to be here?
3. How does this school compare with public schools?
4. How do the students get along? Any fighting? Do some students get picked on by others?
5. What do you have to do in this school to get along with the other kids?
6. Is there any drinking going on among the students? If yes, is it a problem?
7. How satisfied are the students with the education you are receiving here?
8. Do you think most of the students feel at home here? Do many of them feel lonely or homesick?
9. Is there enough to do here? Do many of the students feel bored?
10. What do you have to do to get along with the teachers? What about the dormitory staff? What about the principals?
11. Do teachers know the students well and try to help them?
12. Can you get help with lessons when you need it? What about when you are studying at night?
13. Who would be the ones the students would talk to about a personal problem?
14. If there are things about this school which could be changed to make this a better place for the students, what would you change?

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR BOARDING SCHOOL STAFF

Record the school, number assigned to interviewee and position of the person being interviewed, and the date.

1. How long have you been working at this school? How would you describe your job? Any particular reason for your working here?

2. What are the best things about working here? What are the worst? Are things at this school so bad you would want to leave?

3. In our study, fighting among students was identified as a problem by former students at BIA boarding Schools. Is that also true here?

4. When we interviewed people who were former students at BIA off-reservation boarding schools, many said drinking was commonplace among students and that this caused various problems. Do you have a similar situation here? How about the use of other drugs by students?

5. We would like to know what you think about the education the students are receiving now at this school. Is it adequate or inadequate for their needs? Why? What do you think needs changing?

6. Do you think the emotional needs of the students are being met adequately at this school?

7. What about the social and recreational needs of students? Do you think they are being met adequately?

8. If a student wanted your help in the evening for a personal or academic problem, can you provide the assistance if you wanted to help? If yes, how many times during the past year have you provided such help?

9. If there are things about this school which can be changed to make this a better place for the students, what would you change?

10. If you could reorganize the school and dormitory, what things would you change?

APPENDIX C

STUDENT SURVEY

PLEASE READ AND FOLLOW THESE INSTRUCTIONS:

Read each question on this survey. Decide what you really feel, then fill in the circle corresponding with your choice on the answer sheet provided. Fill in only one circle for each statement. There are no right or wrong answers, so it is not a test. Use a No. 2 pencil only--do not use a pen. Make black marks that fill circles completely. Example: A Make clean erasures. Make no stray marks on this form. Survey responses will be held in strict confidence.

PRACTICE EXAMPLE

INSTRUCTIONS: Fill in the circle which matches your choice on the answer sheet. That answer should describe the way you really feel about yourself. Here is a sample already filled out.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The things I learn in school are hard.	A	B	C	D

If B is selected, then mark the answer sheet as follows--

A **B** C D

There is no time limit, but work as quickly as you can. Mark the first answer that pops into your head. Try not to think too much about your answer; it isn't necessary.

		Female	Male			
1.	Sex	A	B			
		1-8	9	10	11	12
2.	Grade	A	B	C	D	E
		14 and Under	15	16	17	18 and Older
3.	Age	A	B	C	D	E

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4.	My teachers try to see that everybody learns.	A	B	C	D
5.	It's easy for me to talk to my teachers about my school work problems.	A	B	C	D
6.	Most of my teachers are like friends.	A	B	C	D
7.	I would drop out of school if I could.	A	B	C	D
8.	Most of my teachers won't listen to my opinion if it's different from theirs.	A	B	C	D
9.	There are interesting activities to look forward to in this school.	A	B	C	D
10.	I like most of my teachers.	A	B	C	D
11.	This school is no better than most other schools.	A	B	C	D

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12.	Sometimes this school feels just like a big family.	A	B	C	D
13.	I feel good about going to this school.	A	B	C	D

		Very Much	Somewhat	A Little	Not At All
14.	Do you enjoy school?	A	B	C	D
15.	How interested are you in most of your classes?	A	B	C	D
16.	Do you feel that most of what you are learning is important?	A	B	C	D
17.	Do you believe that the most important part of your education comes from real experience, rather than from school learning?	A	B	C	D
18.	Do you feel that most of the things you do at school are a waste of time?	A	B	C	D
19.	Do you feel that school can make a real difference in your life?	A	B	C	D
20.	If you do well in school, will this help you later?	A	B	C	D
21.	Do your teachers notice when you do your homework carefully?	A	B	C	D

		Among the Best	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Among the Poorest
22.	How good do you want to be in school? Do you want to be . .	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Compared to your classmates, where do you think you rank in school performance?	A	B	C	D	E
24.	How do you rate yourself in school ability, compared with your classmates?	A	B	C	D	E

		Mostly A's (90-100%)	Mostly B's (80-89%)	Mostly C's (70-79%)	Mostly D's (60-69%)	Mostly E's or F's (Below 60%)
25.	What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting?	A	B	C	D	E

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
26.	When I do something, I do it well.	A	B	C	D
27.	I am proud of my school work.	A	B	C	D
28.	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	A	B	C	D
29.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	A	B	C	D
30.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	A	B	C	D
31.	I certainly feel useless at times.	A	B	C	D

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
32.	I am good at learning.	A	B	C	D
33.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	A	B	C	D
34.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	A	B	C	D
35.	I am able to do many things well in school.	A	B	C	D
36.	Teachers in this school care a lot about what Indian students think.[1]	A	B	C	D
37.	The rules of this school are unfair to Indian students.	A	B	C	D
38.	Indian students are under too much pressure in this school.	A	B	C	D
39.	Indian history and culture should be taught more in school.[2]	A	B	C	D

		Very Much	Somewhat	A Little	Not At All
40.	Do you like to tell other people about your Tribe?	A	B	C	D
41.	How proud are you to be a member of your Tribe?	A	B	C	D

[1]This item and the next two did not have the term "Indian" in the questionnaire used for BIA and non-BIA boarding school students.

[2]This and the next five were not included in the questionnaire used for the non-BIA boarding school students.

		Very Much	Somewhat	A Little	Not At All
42.	Do you like to learn new things about your Tribe?	A	B	C	D
43.	Would you like to have non-Indian students learn about your Tribe?	A	B	C	D
44.	Would you like your tribal language to be taught in school?	A	B	C	D

APPENDIX D

TEACHER SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS:

Read each question on this survey. Each of the items on the attached two pages is a problem for some teachers in some schools. Check the degree to which each one is a problem for you in your current assignment by filling in the appropriate letter (A, B, C or D) listed on the answer sheet provided.

(A) Not a problem--has little or no effect on student performance;

(B) Moderate problem--has only limited effect on student performance;

(C) Serious problem--has considerable effect on student performance;

(D) Critical problem--has crucial effect on student performance.

Fill in only one circle for each statement. There are no right or wrong answers, so it is not a test. Use a No. 2 pencil only--do not use a pen. Make black marks that fill circles completely. Example: A Make clean erasures. Make no stray marks on this form. Survey responses will be held in strict confidence.

		20-29	30-39	40-49	50 and Older
1.	Age	A	B	C	D
		Female	Male		
2.	Sex	A	B		

		Not a Problem	Moderate Problem	Serious Problem	Critical Problem
3.	The students in this school aren't really interested in learning.	A	B	C	D
4.	Too many of my students are indifferent to school.	A	B	C	D
5.	There are too few activities which recognize the talent of our students.	A	B	C	D
6.	There is no time or place for students and teachers to interact outside of the classroom.	A	B	C	D
7.	Not enough teachers are involved in helping students overcome problems.	A	B	C	D
8.	Not enough teachers actively participate in extracurricular activities.	A	B	C	D
9.	Too many parents take little or no interest in their children's school work.	A	B	C	D
10.	The parents do not support what the school does.	A	B	C	D
11.	The parents do not place a high value on education.	A	B	C	D
12.	Students in this school have poor study habits.	A	B	C	D
13.	The achievement levels of my students are too heterogeneous	A	B	C	D
14.	Health and nutrition problems seem to affect the learning of my students.	A	B	C	D
15.	The emphasis on athletics in this school disrupts classroom learning.	A	B	C	D
16.	The competition for grades at this school puts too much pressure on students.	A	B	C	D

		Not a Problem	Moderate Problem	Serious Problem	Critical Problem
17.	Physical facilities of this school limit the kinds of programs provided for students.	A	B	C	D
18.	I work with too many students each day.	A	B	C	D
19.	Lack of freedom to teach the way I want to makes me less effective with my students.	A	B	C	D
20.	Teachers have little control over matters such as textbook selection, curriculum, and instructional programs.	A	B	C	D
21.	When new curriculum programs are initiated, I am not consulted or trained.	A	B	C	D
22.	There are too many outside interruptions during class periods.	A	B	C	D
23.	I have to spend too much time on non-instructional duties.	A	B	C	D
24.	My teaching is limited by the quality of or lack of instructional equipment and materials.	A	B	C	D
25.	The support staff in this school is not cooperative.	A	B	C	D
26.	The teachers don't seem to be able to work well together.	A	B	C	D
27.	There is too little teacher input in solving administrative problems.	A	B	C	D
28.	There is little interaction among teachers in this school, i.e. everyone is doing his/her own thing.	A	B	C	D
29.	Too much time is spent on discipline problems.	A	B	C	D
30.	The values held by the students are in conflict with those of the school.	A	B	C	D
31.	Too little support on discipline is provided by administrators.	A	B	C	D
32.	Too little support on discipline is given by the parents.	A	B	C	D
33.	Disruption of my class(es) by students is a continuing frustration.	A	B	C	D