

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 438

32

UD 015 470

TITLE Educational Disadvantage in New Hampshire.
 INSTITUTION Whittemore-Abelson, Concord, N.H.
 SPONS AGENCY Bureau of School Systems (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
 Div. of Education for the Disadvantaged.; New
 Hampshire State Dept. of Education, Concord. Div. of
 Instruction.
 PUB DATE 75
 NOTE 116p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$5.70 Plus Postage
 DESCRIPTORS Communication Problems; *Educational
 Disadvantage; Educational Needs; Family School
 Relationship; Federal Programs; *Geographic Location;
 Health Needs; Individual Needs; Minority Group
 Children; Psychological Needs; *Research Needs; Rural
 Areas; *School Districts; *Socioeconomic Status;
 State Surveys; Suburbs; Urban Areas
 IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA
 Title I; *New Hampshire

ABSTRACT

This report studies the specific attributes of educational disadvantage which prevent satisfactory achievement in New Hampshire children. It is based on a sample of approximately 10 percent of the state school districts, which are divided into three levels of economic status, three levels of achievement, and an urban, suburban, or rural category. Sections listed are comprised of exhibits that include methodology, educational disadvantage, perception of needs by type of district, and areas for further study. The exhibits are considered to reveal many insights into the elements of disadvantage, the quality of the school-family relationship, the usefulness of current programming for children with special problems, and other subjects. A complex relationship is said to exist between educational disadvantage and levels of economic status and achievement in school districts. Communication problems between school and home, and the tendency by each group to point the finger at the other are listed as findings derived from the study. (AM)

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED114438

EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

By

Whittemore-Abelson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Whittemore-Abelson
Concord, New Hampshire

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER.

UD 015470

2

Copyright Whittemore-Abelson 1975

GOVERNOR OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Meldrim Thomson, Jr.

THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

| | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|
| DISTRICT NO. 1 | LYLE E. HERSOM, GROVETON |
| DISTRICT NO. 2 | JAMES H. HAYES, CONCORD |
| DISTRICT NO. 3 | LEON G. YEATON, DOVER |
| DISTRICT NO. 4 | LOUIS D'ALLESANDRO, MANCHESTER |
| DISTRICT NO. 5 | BERNARD A. STREETER, JR., NASHUA |

NEW HAMPSHIRE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
1974-75

| APPOINTMENT | | TERM EXPIRES |
|-------------|--|--------------|
| 1973 | William P. Bittenbender, Deering Chairman | 1978 |
| 1970 | Donald E. Borchers, Berlin | 1976 |
| 1974 | Mrs. Catherine R. Caouette, Contoocook | 1979 |
| 1965 | Gerard F. Cullerot, D.D.S., Manchester | 1977 |
| 1971 | Daniel A. Gosselin, Enfield | 1976 |
| 1969 | Edward C. Sweeney, Jr., Keene | 1979 |
| 1975 | Ivah A. Hackler, Auburn | 1980 |

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
Newell J. Paire

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
Robert L. Brunelle

DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION
Frank W. Brown, CHIEF

ESEA, TITLE I, OFFICE
Richard B. Hodges, Jr.
Coordinator
Edward G. DeForrest,
Consultant
Mary S. Gile, Consultant
Keith A. Hanscom, Consultant

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Title I ESEA Office, Division of Instruction, New Hampshire State Department of Education, funded under an administrative grant from Title I of P.L. 89:10. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official New Hampshire Department of Education or U. S. Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| INTRODUCTION..... | | 1 |
| Categories of School Districts - Exhibit 1..... | | iv |
| I. CONCLUSIONS..... | | 1 |
| II. METHODOLOGY..... | | 6 |
| Comparative Social and Economic Statistical Indicators By School District - Exhibit 1 - II..... | | 16 |
| Comparative School Achievement Ranks By School District - Exhibit 2 - II..... | | 22 |
| Statistical Summary of School District Groupings and Rankings of Sample School Districts - Exhibit 3 - II..... | | 27 |
| Purpose and Use of Survey - Exhibit 4 - II..... | | 29 |
| Family Characteristics of Parent Sample By Type of School District - Exhibit 5 - II..... | | 30 |
| III. EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE..... | | 32 |
| Social and Economic Statistics By School District - Exhibit 1 - III..... | | 41 |
| Elements of Educational Disadvantage Parents' View - Exhibit 2 - III..... | | 51 |
| Elements of Educational Disadvantage Professionals' View - Exhibit 3 - III..... | | 54 |
| Elements of Educational Disadvantage Comparison of Parental and Professional Views - Exhibit 4 - III..... | | 57 |
| IV. THE PERCEPTION OF NEEDS BY TYPE OF DISTRICT..... | | 60 |
| Educational Disadvantage By Type of School District - Parent Form - Exhibit 1 - IV..... | | 69 |
| Environmental and Health Needs By Type of District - Parent and School Form - Exhibit 2 - IV..... | | 73 |
| Comparative Awareness of Program Availability - Parent Form - Exhibit 3 - IV..... | | 79 |
| Roles of School Personnel By District Parent Form - Exhibit 4 - IV..... | | 81 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Preferences in School Programming Parent Form - Exhibit 5 - IV..... | 82 |
| Parental Participation and Support Parent Form - Exhibit 6 - IV..... | 83 |
| Comparative Attitudes By District Parent Form - Exhibit 7 - IV..... | 86 |
| The Professionals' Knowledge of Special Programs - School Form - Exhibit 8 - IV..... | 89 |
| Income Distribution of Families With Children in Special Education By Type of District - Exhibit 9 - IV..... | 90 |
| V. AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY..... | 91 |
| Consideration of a Number of Variables in Relation to the Number of Children in Special Education - Parent Form - Exhibit 1 - V..... | 94 |
| Attitudes Toward the Role of School Personnel - Exhibit 2 - V..... | 95 |
| Views as to Helpfulness of School Personnel - Parent and School Form - Exhibit 3 - V..... | 96 |
| Parental Involvement - Exhibit 4 - V..... | 98 |

Appendices

| | |
|---|-----|
| Appendix 1. Parents' Survey Instrument..... | 100 |
| Appendix 2. Professionals' Survey Instrument..... | 104 |

"One of the worst problems is lack of communication . . . Leads to duplication . . . No feedback on cases. Teacher's low man on the totem pole when it comes to being informed about what the other groups do."

---Elementary school teacher in urban area

"The school said 'mind your own business,' and they said 'she was interfering.'"

---Answer from a mother of seven with three children in special ed programs when asked how school responded when she attempted to have them respond better to her children's needs.

"Another woman, who, although economically deprived, is aware of her rights and is not afraid to claim them. For that reason, she has had little difficulty in getting the help she needs. Her attitude toward the schools is very positive. There is a positive correlation between her awareness and her attitude."

---Interviewers' comments on divorced mother of one who said the schools were "glad to think I was interested" in trying to get them to respond better to her child's needs.

"If this is what it takes to establish contact with parents of disadvantaged children - person-to-person in the parents' own home - then that is what should be done. Her children won't speak up because neither did she when in school. In her case it's a cop-out to say she won't get involved. She isn't able."

---Interviewers' comments on divorced mother of three who said "I'm not one to speak out on anything. That was my problem in school too."

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to provide a basis for the planning of future Title I* programming in New Hampshire which takes into account the attributes of educational disadvantage which prevent New Hampshire children from satisfactory achievement in school. A sample of approximately 10 percent of the state's school districts was selected and more than 260 interviews were conducted with school and non-school professionals and parents who have disadvantaged children. The school districts were divided into three levels of economic well-being, three levels of achievement and into urban, suburban and rural categories. The purpose of these groupings was to go beyond the overall description of the phenomenon of educational disadvantage and indicate the specific patterns of need which occur in each type of district.

Local officials are faced with the task of conducting needs assessments upon which to base programming decisions and proposals. This report presents a general set of characteristics which is likely to be present in their particular district.

It is fully recognized that each district and supervisory union has unique characteristics and qualities within its population which are reflected in the attitudes, abilities and levels of attainment of its school population. Many factors which are observable and understood by local citizens are not quantifiable in a statistical sense either because they are difficult to describe in numbers, or because the necessary statistics are not available. In addition, there is a practical limit to the complexity of the survey instrument which if exceeded could result in ill considered answers and inaccurate reporting. For these reasons, no assertion is made that this study is complete or represents the last word in planning assistance for the development of programs to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children.

In fact, this study represents a beginning, and indicates that with further development and experimentation, better and more useful tools can be developed for the periodic analysis of the specific components of educational disadvantage at given times in given places. To the extent that this study is a sound beginning, programs can be developed which will help disadvantaged youngsters to make the most of their individual capacities and to lead more fulfilled lives.

Exhibit 1 contains lists of the school districts which were judged to be urban and suburban for the purpose of our analysis. All districts not listed were considered rural. We realize that these distinctions will appear in some instances to have been arbitrary. Some of the districts considered to be suburban have larger populations than those considered to be urban. Also, we did not use the term suburban only to describe the "bedroom community" which is close to a large city and thought to be dependent upon it economically. We included in the suburban categories several communities which might be said to have their own

*This and each succeeding reference to Title I means Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

economies and not to be dependent for their principal sources of livelihood on adjacent urban areas. In these instances, our use of the term "suburban" simply means a large town or small city which has many of the characteristics of an urban area, but is smaller in population. Some of the school districts considered to be rural also have rather sizable populations. Most were considered rural because they are cooperative school districts made up of several towns with small populations and, generally rural economies.

Exhibit 1 also contains two series of numbers which indicate differences in levels of economic well-being and achievement in the schools of each district. Reference may be made to Exhibits 1 and 2 in Section II in order to identify the standing of each school district in relation to these figures.

Another cautionary word is necessary at this point. Several of the economic indicators used to differentiate between the levels of economic well-being in each school district are based upon figures between two and five years old. Even in more "ordinary" times than these, the use of such a dated statistical base would be undesirable. In these times when the rate of economic activity in several types of business and industry is changing rapidly, school districts are more economically volatile than usual. The achievement comparisons used in this study were based on statewide testing done in the school year 1970-71. Not only were Stanford and Otis scores not available for all school districts, but the passage of time in a period of relatively rapid turnover of educational personnel and increasing mobility of population means that precise rankings of school districts based on these achievement scores are becoming obsolete.

If the types of information generated by the study's application prove to be useful for planning Title I programs as well as for other purposes, the study should be repeated at approximately three to five year intervals using updated economic and achievement information.

A further area for study and refinement is the categorization of school districts. It may be that more precise terms can be applied to New Hampshire districts to facilitate agreement among the public planning personnel, administrators and Title I program analysts.

These observations are intended to point up that we are still at the beginning stage of the research and survey work needed to bring about a constructive developmental relationship between the real needs of educationally disadvantaged youngsters and programs which will answer these needs.

There are, in this study, significant contributions to understanding this relationship and to expressing it in a sufficiently systematic manner to serve as a useful tool for educational planning purposes. Among these:

- . Several economic indicators have been gathered together on a school district basis;
- . A method has been developed to construct a sample of New Hampshire school districts representative of parents and professionals in more than 140 other districts;
- . It has been shown that there are significant differences of viewpoint in districts with different levels of economic well-being, school achievement, population and location;
- . A method has been developed to express these differences in terms of needs, characteristics, attitudes and viewpoints to which programs can be addressed;
- . A description and enumeration of the elements which make up educational disadvantage in New Hampshire has been created;
- . Avenues of inquiry have been opened which indicate directions for study and research;
- . The conclusions of this study are based solidly upon the views of New Hampshire parents and New Hampshire professional personnel, concerned about the specific needs and futures of specific children.

This project also represents a test of the assumption on the part of the authors of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that poverty is the central root of educational disadvantage. The Title I staff and many perceptive educators have been aware of a growing doubt throughout the educational system that this assumption alone accounted for the inability of students to reach levels of achievement consistent with their individual capacities. This doubt has grown into a strong sense of the need to know what professionals and parents concerned with New Hampshire children actually experienced as disadvantage. It is hoped that a broader basis of understanding of educational disadvantage will mean that programs aimed at its alleviation will work.

Exhibit 1

Categories of School Districts

Urban

Berlin
Claremont
Concord
Derry
Dover
Keene
Laconia
Lebanon
Manchester
Nashua
Portsmouth
Rochester
Salem
Somersworth

Suburban

Amherst
Bedford
Exeter
Franklin
Gilford
Goffstown
Hampton
Hanover
Hooksett
Hudson
Littleton
Londonderry
Merrimack
Milford
Newport
Pelham
Pembroke
Rye

Economic Well-Being

| | |
|---------|--------|
| Good | 0-56 |
| Average | 57-84 |
| Poor | 85-137 |

Achievement

| | |
|---------|---------|
| Good | 190-272 |
| Average | 95-189 |
| Poor | 0-94 |

SECTION I

Conclusions

In this section we attempt to set down some of the broad conclusions and patterns of thought which arise from comparison of the material contained in all of the exhibits.

The principal material outcome of this study has been the creation of a body of information of considerable richness and diversity. With the help of the Impress Computer System and Data Processing personnel at Dartmouth College, the answers recorded by interviewers to two long and rather complex survey instruments have been analyzed and compared. The result is the series of exhibits which accompany the text of this report. The exhibits reveal many insights into the thinking of professionals and parents as to the elements of disadvantage, the quality of the school-family relationship, the usefulness of current programming for children with special problems, and other subjects. While there are important areas of agreement and awareness, the survey also shows contradictions and inconsistencies.

Educational Disadvantage

There is educational disadvantage in New Hampshire, and it relates to the levels of economic well-being and achievement in school districts. This relationship is exceedingly complex and comprised of a great many factors, including the incidence of these various elements of disadvantage. Specific variations, described in detail in Section IV of the report, include the following clear observations:

- there is a strong tendency on the part of parents to blame teachers and other professionals if children do not perform well;
- there is an equally strong tendency for professionals to believe that the essential responsibility for lack of satisfactory performance rests in the home;
- there is also a strong disagreement between parents and professionals as to whether various school-home communications devices which are a necessary part of the relationship between school and home are in use.

Thus, the most compelling insights developed during the course of this study are the disagreement over whether the process of communication between school and home is working; and the strong tendency by each group to point the finger at the other - both for causes of problems and communications gaps.

This lack of credibility suggests that improvement in communications between school and home should be recognized as a first priority. Failure to do so presents a considerable potential for hostility, and to the extent hostility exists or develops, it endangers the ability of the child to achieve and sustain satisfactory performance.

There is also a difference in view between the parents and the professionals as to the importance of environmental and health conditions as related to satisfactory school performance. The professionals believe that environmental factors have more negative impact than health deficiencies, while parents believe just as strongly that the opposite is true.

In the area of environmental needs, the professionals strongly believe that not having enough good food plays an important part in preventing adequate performance. Combining this observation with the overall concern of the parents for the health of the child, suggests need for development of programs with an emphasis on improved nutrition.

The professionals are united in placing more emphasis on learning disabilities as a cause of educational disadvantage than do the parents.

The parents show particular concern - more so than the professionals with the use of drugs and alcohol and with the lack of preschool education, as indicators of disadvantage.

Parents and professionals are agreed that vision and hearing deficiencies and emotional and psychological problems very frequently diminish the effectiveness of school performance.

Awareness

Several of the survey questions tested the levels of awareness of the existence of programs designed to help disadvantaged children. The accumulated answers to these questions point to the following conclusions:

- there is significantly less awareness of such programs in areas that are rural, poor and have low levels of school achievement;
- there is a much stronger feeling that help which is needed is not available in school districts that are rural, poor and low in achievement;
- conversely, there is more confidence that there are sources of help available outside the school system in areas that are urban, poor and low in achievement;
- there is a much stronger awareness of specific programs to help disadvantaged children in suburban school districts that have high levels of economic well-being and achievement;
- there is much more use of available special programs in suburban school districts that rate good in economy and achievement, and much less use made of such programs in rural areas that rate poorly in economy and achievement.

The Roles of School Personnel

The analyses of roles of school personnel by the parents' sample indicates that the classroom teacher, the school principal and, to a much lesser extent, the guidance counselor, are the only types of school professionals who receive much recognition of the relevance of their activities to the needs of disadvantaged children.

Program Needs

When asked to indicate needed areas of improvement in school program, the parents showed a strong belief in the efficacy of special classes for disadvantaged youngsters. But they also indicated that the schools should place more emphasis on basic practical education in areas such as reading.

Participation and Support

Comparative levels of parental participation and involvement with the education of disadvantaged youngsters brought forth answers leading to these conclusions:

- the highest rate of parental participation is in suburban school districts which are well off economically and have a high level of achievement;
- parents place much more reliance than do professionals on the value of supportive activities in the home in improving school performance.

Attitudinal Differences

Several questions on each of the survey instruments attempted to gauge attitudinal differences in the various types of school districts. Three pronounced comparative patterns of attitude were revealed. These patterns can be described by reference to the locations of the districts in which they occur - suburban, urban and rural.

Suburban school districts which, compared to all other districts, are strong economically and show a good level of achievement in test results:

- place great importance on the learning of a trade or work skill;
- place less importance on making good grades in school than on studying;
- do not give high priority to preparation for college;
- demonstrate less knowledge on the part of their professional personnel as to how special programs for disadvantaged youngsters have been developed or funded and whether federal funds have been useful in this area.

A second pattern of attitudes is revealed in those urban school districts which rate poorly economically and in achievement. In these districts:

- there is strong support for the importance of preparation for college;
- there is less emphasis on the importance of learning a trade or work skill;
- there is more feeling that the attitude of disadvantaged children toward the schools is positive;
- there is more knowledge amongst professionals as to how special programs are developed and funded.

The third attitudinal pattern is revealed in rural school districts where the levels of economic well-being and achievement are poor. In these districts:

- there is a clear belief that learning to get along with others is one of the most important outcomes of a child's schooling;
- there is less emphasis on the importance of learning a trade or work skill than in suburban areas;
- there is more import placed on college preparation than in suburban areas;
- there is less feeling that families with disadvantaged youngsters are viewed as being "different" by the schools;
- there is stronger feeling that the attitudes of the schools toward a disadvantaged child is positive.

In both types of rural and urban school districts mentioned above - where economic and achievement levels are comparatively low - there is a greater belief that federal funds have been useful in support programs for disadvantaged youngsters than there is in suburban districts with high economic and achievement levels.

Participation in Special Education

Another interesting series of conclusions has to do with the question of the comparative incomes of families whose children are involved in special education programs. All the families queried were divided into two economic groups - those with family incomes of over \$5,500 a year and those whose incomes were less. A comparison of how these two groups broke down in each type of school district shows:

- in districts with good and average levels of economic well-being, more families with incomes over \$5,500 have children in special education programs;

- . in districts that are poor economically, more families with incomes of less than \$5,500 have children in special education;
- . in districts with good and average achievement, more families with incomes higher than \$5,500 have children in special education programs;
- . in school districts with a low level of achievement, there are more families with children in special education who have incomes less than \$5,500;
- . in urban and suburban school districts, families with incomes of over \$5,500 are more likely to have children in special education than low income families;
- . in rural areas, the lower income families are more likely to have children in special education programs.

SECTION II METHODOLOGY

Preparation of Instruments

In preparing the two instruments (Appendix 1 and 2), a number of issues had to be faced and several factors taken into account.

First, there was the charge given us by Title I, Department of Education, as described in the Introduction of this document. We must design questionnaires, which would elicit the desired information, but at the same time - recognizing the paucity of existing research in this area - leave enough flexibility to allow additional important issues to surface. We must determine what kinds of people would be questioned, what kinds of people should question the interviewees and what shape the questions should take.

Once having decided upon the construction of the instruments; we must determine what correlations, if any, should exist between the two questionnaires and conversely, what questions should be exclusive to each document.

One early decision was to construct two separate questionnaires. One would be aimed exclusively at parents and the other at a variety of professionals, including school administrators, teachers, guidance personnel, nurses, psychiatrists, psychologists, physicians and others having contact with children and/or the families of children having problems in school. (For purposes of this report, the instruments are designated "P" for parents and "S" for all others.)

Another early decision reached was that the information needed for the purposes set forth in the charge could not be gleaned from a brief, uni-purpose questionnaire. A series of direct and probing questions was needed, designed to bring forth the actual needs as seen by the interviewee, the degree to which the needs were seen as being met, or not met, the kinds of things identified as constituting "disadvantage", and situations and attitudes which may weigh upon the disadvantaged child.

The instruments are the result of several refinements following consultation with Title I personnel, educators and a brief field test. It was recognized in advance, and even more so in retrospect, that the responses would include information a) beyond the ability to deal with in one, limited-sized report, and b) beyond the scope of the charge. Still, it was decided to err on the side of obtaining more information than would be used, - again having in mind the lack of data in this field in New Hampshire.

A perusal of the questionnaires will demonstrate the various factors outlined above. For example, Question 1 in each instrument is designed to elicit a picture of the "disadvantaged" child, but to receive the picture separately through the eyes of parents and of professionals.

Also, Questions 10 through 15 on "P" are equivalent to Questions 11 through 16 on "S". These parallel questions serve at least two purposes - they provide quantitative answers to questions which either follow up on or expand upon earlier queries in each questionnaire, and also provide rich material for quantitatively comparing the perceptions of the two groups questioned. Questions 17 and 19 and, to a lesser degree, Question 18 on both "P" and "S" provide the same opportunities.

On the other hand, on the "P" questionnaire, Questions 9c through 9i provide exclusive information on characteristics of families of interviewees, while Question 16 provides the parental view of the importance of specific student achievements. An example of specificity on the "S" instrument is Question 8 which deals with development and funding of special programming.

We believe that only the results of the survey, as detailed later in this document, can determine the validity of the questionnaires and the way in which the interviews were conducted (see next section). It is not an apology to state that questions are not solutions. But at the same time, it is abundantly clear that questions, honestly constructed and sincerely asked of those most affected, can be the vehicles to carry on from the problem to the solution.

Deriving the Sample

The purpose of this section is to describe the process by which a representative sampling of 16 school districts was selected for the conduct of the field survey phase of this study. First, population groupings were developed which would represent all districts from the largest to the most rural. Secondly, it was necessary to ensure that comparisons of the responses of interviewees to the survey instruments could be compared to illustrate meaningful differences. This was accomplished by gathering statistics upon which to base an economic and social ranking of all districts, as well as developing a comparative school achievement ranking. The final selection of the sample was, as will be seen, based upon representative social and economic rankings within population groupings of districts.

Population

There are several alternative methods available for comparing the population of school districts in the State of New Hampshire. Three population indicators were compared in order to select the population figures used in preparing this study. These were the standard projection for 1972 made from the 1970 federal census figures for the United States Census Bureau; a projection derived by extrapolation from "Population Projections of New Hampshire" prepared by Anderson Nichols and Company, Inc.; and the estimates of resident population prepared annually by the Office of State Planning.

After comparison of these three projections for the years 1971, 1972 and 1973 it was decided for two reasons to use the estimate of the Office of State Planning for the year 1972. The percent of deviation between all three indicators was smallest in 1972, and several of the social and economic indicators were obtainable for 1972 but not for 1973.

Two other series of comparative population figures were used to derive school district population rankings; the estimate of the civilian labor force 16 years of age and over from the 1970 census, and the estimates of total population between the ages of 5 and 17 from the same source.

When rankings based on population, civilian labor force and school age population were derived it was possible to compile an overall ranking of all school districts. On this basis six population groups of districts were chosen which were representative of all districts from the most urban to the most rural.

It is notable here that Group I was made up of Manchester and Nashua which had more than 20 percent of the state's estimated population in 1972. In contrast, Group VI with 67 school districts contained only 7.3 percent of the state's 1972 population. It should be noted that because of the many cooperative school districts combining a number of small communities, the districts in the middle population groups do not necessarily represent the smaller urban or larger suburban districts.

Exhibit 3 shows the population range of each group of districts and the percentage of the total state population in the group. It also shows the number of school districts in each group. Some districts in Group VI have a higher population than districts in Group V because the civilian labor force and the population 5 to 17 were taken into account in grouping districts, in addition to the estimated number of residents.

The number of interviewees in each district was also selected on the basis of population. Thus; the number of people interviewed in each group was determined by the percentage of total state population residing in each group.

Social and Economic Indicators and Their Sources

Eight series of social and economic statistical* indicators were developed for the purpose of ranking the general level of individual and family well-being by school district.

The rankings derived from these series of statistical indicators are included in Exhibit 1. The sources of the rankings are as follows:

1. Percent of Work Force Unemployed - The figures upon which these ranks were based were prepared by the Reports and Analysis Section of the New Hampshire Department of Employment Security and were reported by Local Office Area. In

*hereinafter referred to as SES

the "New Hampshire Annual Manpower Planning Report, Fiscal Year 1975" the recorded unemployment percentages for a representative six month period were averaged to arrive at a percentage for each of the ten Local Office Areas. This percentage was used as an estimate of the percent of work force unemployed for each school district within the Local Office Area. The fact that there were only ten Local Office Areas accounts for the small number of different ranking levels. This factor, of course, makes these rankings too general to be used as accurate economic indicators by themselves. In instances where school district boundaries crossed, Local Office boundaries weighted averages based on population were computed. Generalized figures of this sort have been used in more than one of our social and economic indicators. We claim validity for such figures only when they are considered as adding to the overall validity of a series of specific and nonspecific indicators.

2. The Yearly Average Incomes of Weekly Wage Earners in Private Industry*- The figures upon which these rankings were based were also compiled for this study by the Reports and Analysis Section of the Department of Employment Security. They are based on the average weekly wages earned during the third quarter of 1972 and projected for the year to form the basis for ranks. We are indebted to the staff of the Reports and Analysis Section for the special effort involved in producing these figures.
3. Years of Education Completed by Adults - These figures are from the publication "Low Income Areas in New Hampshire - Research Report No. 25 New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station July 1972". The rankings are based on comparisons of the percentages of persons in each county who had a first to eighth grade education, an education that stopped at or below the third year in high school, a complete high school education or who had attended college. Since these figures were available on a county-by-county basis, the rankings in this series are also generalized. Each school district received the comparative rank ascribed to its own county unless its boundaries crossed those of another county.

The rankings between counties reflect favorably upon those in which a larger percentage of the adult population had completed high school or attended college.

4. Orshansky Percentages - These figures represent percentages of children age 5 to 17 residing in each school district who lived in families listed as poor in the 1970 census report.
5. Public Aid Per Capita - These rankings are based on comparative expenditures in each school district during the calendar year 1972 for Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Aid to Families with Dependent Children Foster Care, Direct Relief Administered by Local Governments and Foster Care Payments Made by Local Governments. Direct Relief to Single Persons as well as other non-child related public assistance such as Old Age Assistance are excluded. The total sums expended were divided by the population of each school district to

*Averages of wages reported - not all wages.

derive comparative rankings for this study.

We are indebted to the Reports and Analysis Section of the New Hampshire Division of Welfare for the extra study required to accumulate these figures.

6. Families With Income Under \$4,000 - "Low Income Areas in New Hampshire", referred to under Number 3, and 1970 census data were used for these rankings.
7. Housing Lacking Basic Facilities - These figures were also taken from "Low Income Areas in New Hampshire" and represent an estimate of the percentage of housing lacking toilets, plumbing or kitchen facilities.
8. Median Family Income - These figures are based on 1970 census information but were compiled on a school district basis for this survey by the Reports and Analysis Section of the Department of Employment Security.

In addition to the rankings determined from the eight series of figures described above, Exhibit 1 also contains an average rank for each school district and an average rank within each group of school districts.

Achievement*

Exhibit 2 contains rankings by school district based on differences in mean Stanford Achievement Scores and Otis Test Scores for grades 2, 4, 6 and 8 taken from the "School Testing Program Report" for the school year 1970-1971. The mean Stanford Achievement Scores result from a comparison of achievement by school districts in all areas measured by ability testing. These were combined with Otis Intelligence Test Scores for the same school districts to form an achievement ranking for each district. It was not possible to develop rankings for all school districts since some Achievement Scores were not available. Since mean scores were available for more than three quarters of the school districts in the state, however, this factor did not prevent interviewing in a fully representative sampling of districts.

The rankings based on Stanford and Otis Scores were added to develop an achievement point ranking for each district. The achievement point ranking for all districts within each population group was then averaged.

Final Sample District Selection

Exhibit 3, in addition to the information referred to previously, also contains the group average SES and Achievement ranks resulting from the application of Exhibits 1 and 2. It will be noted that in contrast to the SES rankings in which a low rank represents a more satisfactory social and economic community performance, in the case of Achievement a higher score represents a higher district performance.

*See explanation accompanying Exhibit 2.

The final selection of sixteen representative school districts was made to provide a district in each group of districts which had a favorable, an average and an unfavorable SES ranking as compared to the group average, and a high, average and low Achievement ranking as compared to the group average. (This was not done in Group I, which contained only two school districts.) This method avoided the selection of a group of districts so similar that differences in the level of social and economic performance within the total sample could not be tested in relation to contrasting Achievement Scores.

The Subject Group

It was planned to interview approximately 250 persons in the sixteen districts. Actually, 189 members of families containing disadvantaged youngsters, and 72 school and non-school professionals were interviewed.

The sample size was such to allow between 40 minutes and an hour for each interview.

Conducting the Survey

Once the instruments had been prepared and tested and the sample to be questioned had been selected, the way was clear to begin the field survey. However, prior preparation and planning had been done since the survey essentially broke down into two main parts:

1. Developing methodology
2. Field implementation

A high priority must be placed upon the quality of the field interviewers. This is particularly true when dealing with a complex subject, an extensive set of questions, and a group of interviewees - both parents and professionals - whose sensitivity and awareness must be recognized and respected. For these reasons, all of the field workers were personally interviewed at length by the contractors. Of those selected, five were experienced interviewers with media backgrounds and the sixth was thoroughly acquainted with the project from its inception.

All of the interviewers underwent a training session conducted by the contractors and their behavioral-educational consultant, under the direction of the Field Coordinator.

The charge of the project, the two questionnaires, the method of selecting the sample, the proposed use of the responses, the need to keep closely in touch with the Field Coordinator - all these things were carefully covered in the training session.

Next, the sixteen school districts to be covered were broken down into five geographical areas for ease of coverage and assignment. Individual interviewers were given daily assignments, including locations of key interviewees. The contractor also prepared and provided the interviewers with a brief document "Purpose and Use of Survey" (Exhibit 4), and instructed them to make certain each person to be questioned read it and understood the questionnaire and the general purpose of gathering the information.

During the course of the survey, the Field Supervisor kept in frequent communication with the interviewers. Additionally, the interviewers periodically dropped off bundles of completed questionnaires with the contractor. In this way, personal contact was maintained with the interviewers, and the Field Supervisor was able to check the results to make certain the purposes of the survey were kept in mind and that questions or problems were dealt with promptly.

The Nature of the Sample.

In this section we discuss briefly:

The categories in terms of SES ranking, Achievement and Urban, Suburban or Rural status of the selected districts;

The numbers of respondents to the survey who were interviewed in each type of district;

The occupations of professional respondents; and

An analysis of the characteristics of the parents selected

Where percentages are used in some of the following exhibits or tables, rounding errors have occurred and account for totals not equaling 100.

The School Districts

The following table shows the breakdown of districts described above.

| | SES Scores | | | Achievement Rank | | |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | Good SES | Average SES | Poor SES | Good Achievement | Average Achievement | Poor Achievement |
| <u>Urban</u> | | | | | | |
| Manchester | | X | | | X | |
| Dover | | X | | | X | |
| Concord | | X | | X | | |
| Salem | X | | | | X | |
| Berlin | | | X | | | X |
| Laconia | | X | | | X | |
| <u>Suburban</u> | | | | | | |
| Merrimack | X | | | | X | |
| Bedford | X | | | X | | |
| Bow | X | | | X | | |
| <u>Rural</u> | | | | | | |
| Mascoma Valley | | | X | | | X |
| Sanborn Regional | | X | | | X | |
| Gorham | | | X | | | X |
| Mascenic Regional | | X | | | | X |
| Unity | | | X | | | X |
| Stoddard | | | X | | | X |
| Brentwood | X | | | X | | |

Following is a breakdown of all the respondents to the survey in the same categories.

| <u>Type of District</u> | <u>Sample Status</u> | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | <u>Percentage</u> |
| Urban | 135 | 51.7 |
| Suburban | 47 | 18.0 |
| Rural | 79 | 30.3 |

| <u>SES Score - Socioeconomic Status of District</u> | | |
|---|-----|-------------------|
| | | <u>Percentage</u> |
| Good | 65 | 24.9 |
| Average | 133 | 51.0 |
| Poor | 63 | 24.1 |

| <u>Achievement Score of District</u> | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| | | <u>Percentage</u> |
| Good | 47 | 18.0 |
| Average | 137 | 52.5 |
| Poor | 77 | 29.5 |

The table below shows the breakdown of the occupations of professional respondents.

| | | <u>Percentage</u> |
|--------------------------|----|-------------------|
| Administrators | 18 | 25.0 |
| Teachers | 12 | 16.7 |
| Special Teachers | 11 | 15.3 |
| Guidance Counselors | 10 | 13.9 |
| Nurses | 8 | 11.1 |
| Non-School Professionals | 13 | 18.1 |

The Parent Sample

Questions 9c through 9i on the parent interview form were designed to reveal the characteristics of the families interviewed, as demonstrated by the next table.

Family Characteristics of Parent Sample

| 9c. Number of children at home? | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 0-3 | <u>Percentage</u> | 4 or More | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No Answer</u> | |
| 77 | 41.2 | 110 | 58.8 | 2 | |

| 9d. Number of school-age children? | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 0-3 | <u>Percentage</u> | 4 or More | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No Answer</u> | |
| 104 | 55.2 | 84 | 44.8 | 1 | |

| 9e. Number of children involved in special educational programs? | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| None | <u>Percentage</u> | Some | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No Answer</u> | |
| 85 | 45.5 | 102 | 54.5 | 2 | |

| 9f. How many parents live at home? | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------|------------------|--|
| One | <u>Percentage</u> | Two | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No Answer</u> | |
| 62 | 32.8 | 127 | 67.2 | 0 | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 9g1. | Mother's years of education? | | | | | |
| | <u>0-8</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>9-11</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>12 or Over</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
| | 50 | 26.6 | 63 | 33.5 | 75 | 39.9 |
| | <u>No Answer</u> | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 9g2. | Father's years of education? | | | | | |
| | <u>0-8</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>9-11</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>12 or Over</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
| | 47 | 32.4 | 51 | 35.2 | 47 | 32.4 |
| | <u>No Answer</u> | | | | | |
| | 44 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 9h1. | Mother employed? | | | | | |
| | <u>Employed</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Not Employed</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No Answer</u> | |
| | 68 | 36.9 | 119 | 63.1 | 2 | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 9h2. | Father employed? | | | | | |
| | <u>Employed</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Not Employed</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No Answer</u> | |
| | 135 | 82.5 | 11 | 7.5 | 43 | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 9i. | Yearly income range? | | | | Don't Know | |
| | <u>\$0-\$5500</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>\$5500 or Over</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No Answer</u> | |
| | 70 | 40.0 | 105 | 60.0 | 14 | |

Exhibit 5 breaks down the answers to the same questions by SES district, Achievement districts, and Urban, Suburban or Rural districts.

The last table in this section shows a further breakdown of family income ranges within the sample. In the yearly income range breakdown among types of districts, the family income rating of those families earning under \$5,500 and over \$5,500 has been used to prepare for a number of exhibits which will be used in Part II of the study to indicate differences in answers between very low income groups and low income groups.

| | |
|----------------------|-----------|
| <u>Income Range</u> | |
| \$0-\$2,500 | 4 2.3 |
| \$2,500-\$4,000 | 32 18.3 |
| \$4,000-\$5,500 | 34 19.4 |
| \$5,500-\$7,000 | 64 36.6 |
| \$7,000 and Over | 41 23.4 |
| Excluded - No Answer | 14 |
| Totals | 189 100.0 |

A further word is necessary with regard to the process of identifying interviewees. Title I personnel were asked to identify a key person in each school district who might be interviewed by a member of the field survey team. They included administrators, teachers, guidance counselors and in some instances persons directly involved in the administration of the Title I program. They were asked to assist the interviewer in a preliminary identification of knowledgeable school and non-school professionals. These professionals when interviewed were asked to identify a small number of low income families with disadvantaged children. Other non-school persons with knowledge

of the family and community life of the area were identified and also assisted in obtaining the names of additional families and professionals to be interviewed.

The field survey team was carefully instructed to avoid the kind of repetitive categorical selection of interviewees which might have introduced bias into the results of the survey. In this way an attempt was made to use multiple criteria for selecting interviewees. We are aware that this process possibly may have resulted in the identification of unrepresentative respondents in some instances. However, we believe that the sample is large enough so that these instances could not seriously affect the value of the study results.

Analysis of Field Survey Results

When the field survey was completed a team of coding personnel was selected and trained to breakdown the answers to the questions contained in the respective instruments in order to achieve compatibility with the Kiewit Impress Problem Solving Computer System at Dartmouth College. When a complete coding manual had been compiled by this process all of the results of the field survey were entered into the Impress Data Analysis System. Our programming and data analysis consultant then generated the information and tables used in this report.

EXHIBIT 1 - II

Comparative Social and Economic Statistical Indicators By School District

| Groups | Percent Of Work Force Unemployed* | Yearly Average Income | Years Of Education Completed By Adults* | Orshansky Percentage | Public Aid | | Income Under \$4,000 | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income | Average Rank Per School District | Average Group Rank |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | Per Capita | Per Family | | | | | |
| Group I | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Manchester | 88 | 31 | 80 | 27 | 152 | 77 | 30 | 70 | 69.3** | 59.7 | |
| Nashua | 88 | 15 | 80 | 19 | 125 | 34 | 16 | 24 | 50.1 | | |
| Group II | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concord | 66 | 35 | 64 | 28 | 141 | 59 | 24 | 45 | 57.7 | 59.6 | |
| Dover | 112 | 47 | 128 | 27 | 140 | 42 | 20 | 55 | 71.3 | | |
| Keene | 88 | 26 | 96 | 30 | 136 | 63 | 24 | 47 | 62.5 | | |
| Portsmouth | 78 | 60 | 32 | 4 | 163 | 89 | 22 | 111 | 69.9 | | |
| Salem | 88 | 39 | 32 | 9 | 90 | 14 | 7 | 15 | 36.7 | | |
| Group III | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Berlin | 152 | 22 | 160 | 29 | 143 | 131 | 32 | 129 | 99.7 | 64.0 | |
| Claremont | 90 | 53 | 144 | 22 | 123 | 93 | 28 | 101 | 81.7 | | |
| Contoocook Valley Regional | 82 | 43 | 80 | 14 | 92 | 59 | 81 | 48 | 62.3 | | |
| Derry | 88 | 68 | 32 | 32 | 133 | 80 | 36 | 34 | 62.9 | | |
| Goffstown | 88 | 75 | 80 | 11 | 51 | 49 | 14 | 38 | 50.7 | | |
| Hudson | 88 | 83 | 80 | 17 | 78 | 6 | 4 | 14 | 46.2 | | |
| Laconia | 90 | 54 | 96 | 16 | 148 | 73 | 28 | 53 | 69.7 | | |
| Lebanon | 90 | 52 | 48 | 23 | 114 | 86 | 20 | 88 | 65.1 | | |
| Merrimack | 88 | 13 | 80 | 14 | 66 | 4 | 10 | 11 | 35.7 | | |
| Monadnock Regional | 88 | 64 | 96 | 39 | 115 | 96 | 104 | 95 | 87.1 | | |
| Rochester | 112 | 92 | 128 | 30 | 142 | 90 | 41 | 103 | 92.2 | | |
| Somersworth | 112 | 51 | 128 | 29 | 127 | 80 | 13 | 51 | 73.9 | | |
| Timberlane Regional | 78 | 71 | 32 | 21 | 100 | 30 | 44 | 16 | 49.0 | | |
| Group IV | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Anthorst | 88 | 84 | 80 | 28 | 21 | 31 | 63 | 5 | 50.0 | 58.5 | |
| Bedford | 88 | 121 | 80 | 7 | 27 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 44.2 | | |
| Conway | 152 | 106 | 16 | 30 | 117 | 80 | 116 | 127 | 93.0 | | |
| Exeter | 78 | 30 | 32 | 4 | 124 | 67 | 32 | 71 | 54.7 | | |
| Fall Mountain Regional | 88 | 36 | 122 | 20 | 73 | 91 | 93 | 113 | 79.5 | | |
| Franklin | 66 | 72 | 64 | 31 | 158 | 99 | 67 | 80 | 79.5 | | |

* The small numbers of rank orders in these columns result from the figures being available on an employment office or county basis.

**Please note that districts with lower average ranks have a higher level of economic well-being.



| Groups | Percent Of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Income | Years Of Education Completed By Adults | Orshansky Percentage | Public Aid Per Capita | Families With Income Under \$4,000 | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income | Average Rank Per School District | Average Group Rank |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Gov. Wentworth Regional | 94 | 114 | 26 | 36 | 99 | 32 | 116 | 107 | 78.0 | |
| Hampton | 78 | 32 | 32 | 23 | 85 | 58 | 11 | 31 | 43.7 | |
| Hanover | 90 | 14 | 48 | 4 | 18 | 37 | 41 | 3 | 31.9 | |
| Hooksett | 88 | 12 | 64 | 34 | 47 | 63 | 36 | 39 | 47.9 | |
| Inter-lakes Coop. | 90 | 74 | 80 | 38 | 119 | 76 | 102 | 84 | 82.9 | |
| Jaffrey-Rindge Coop. | 88 | 81 | 96 | 31 | 77 | 71 | 57 | 60 | 70.1 | |
| Kearsarge Regional | 82 | 90 | 72 | 6 | 76 | 107 | 123 | 133 | 86.1 | |
| Littleton | 164 | 78 | 48 | 16 | 151 | 19 | 49 | 139 | 83.0 | |
| Londonderry | 88 | 18 | 32 | 32 | 83 | 15 | 36 | 42 | 43.2 | |
| Mascocoma Valley Regional | 90 | 139 | 48 | 28 | 146 | 99 | 139 | 118 | 100.9 | |
| Merrimack Valley | 66 | 37 | 64 | 35 | 26 | 71 | 99 | 91 | 61.1 | |
| Milford | 88 | 40 | 80 | 32 | 104 | 54 | 20 | 50 | 58.5 | |
| Newfound Area | 90 | 41 | 56 | 43 | 111 | 122 | 134 | 115 | 89.0 | |
| Newport | 90 | 62 | 144 | 48 | 110 | 66 | 84 | 93 | 87.1 | |
| Oyster River Coop. | 112 | 102 | 128 | 12 | 46 | 87 | 33 | 12 | 66.5 | |
| Pembroke | 66 | 50 | 64 | 27 | 123 | 39 | 30 | 54 | 56.6 | |
| Sanborn Regional | 78 | 88 | 32 | 18 | 33 | 82 | 60 | 92 | 60.3 | |
| White Mountain Regional | 164 | 97 | 160 | 32 | 126 | 112 | 75 | 141 | 100.8 | |
| Winnisquam Regional | 90 | 42 | 83 | 33 | 145 | 106 | 77 | 118 | 86.7 | |
| Group V | | | | | | | | | | 64.4 |
| Allenstown | 66 | 118 | 64 | 16 | 121 | 41 | 20 | 63 | 63.6 | |
| Alton | 90 | 144 | 96 | 1 | 45 | 137 | 140 | 146 | 99.9 | |
| Ashland | 90 | 20 | 48 | 37 | 147 | 100 | 54 | 98 | 74.2 | |
| Auburn | 88 | 24 | 32 | 18 | 75 | 38 | 84 | 68 | 53.3 | |
| Barrington | 112 | 94 | 128 | 26 | 42 | 68 | 101 | 56 | 78.4 | |
| Bow | 66 | 5 | 64 | 0 | 23 | 3 | 52 | 10 | 31.8 | |
| Candia | 88 | 82 | 32 | 23 | 30 | 11 | 91 | 67 | 53.0 | |
| Chester | 88 | 85 | 32 | 16 | 122 | 116 | 76 | 65 | 75.0 | |
| Chesterfield | 88 | 69 | 96 | 13 | 69 | 22 | 66 | 66 | 61.1 | |
| Colebrook | 152 | 104 | 160 | 122 | 154 | 125 | 93 | 138 | 131.0 | |
| Cornish | 90 | 122 | 144 | 26 | 28 | 54 | 46 | 108 | 77.2 | |

| Groups | Percent Of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Income | Years Of Education Completed By Adults | Orshansky Percentage | Public Aid Per Capita | Families | | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income | Average Rank Per School District | Average Group Rank |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | With Income Under \$4,000 | Under \$4,000 | | | | |
| Deerfield | 66 | 34 | 32 | 30 | 43 | 99 | 126 | 41 | 58.9 | | |
| Epping | 78 | 107 | 32 | 33 | 151 | 28 | 86 | 106 | 77.6 | | |
| Epsom | 66 | 33 | 64 | 7 | 130 | 34 | 113 | 81 | 66.0 | | |
| Famington | 112 | 38 | 128 | 43 | 137 | 82 | 79 | 98 | 89.6 | | |
| Gilford | 90 | 76 | 96 | 4 | 22 | 49 | 10 | 13 | 45.0 | | |
| Gorham | 152 | 136 | 160 | 31 | 156 | 101 | 157 | 119 | 126.5 | | |
| Hampstead | 78 | 108 | 32 | 0 | 74 | 29 | 44 | 59 | 60.6 | | |
| Haverhill Coop. | 164 | 111 | 48 | 36 | 153 | 103 | 80 | 132 | 103.4 | | |
| Henniker | 66 | 55 | 64 | 48 | 52 | 126 | 139 | 126 | 84.5 | | |
| Hillsboro-Deering | 66 | 70 | 80 | 11 | 105 | 76 | 101 | 105 | 76.7 | | |
| Hinsdale | 88 | 95 | 96 | 39 | 129 | 64 | 52 | 77 | 80.0 | | |
| Hollis | 88 | 128 | 80 | 52 | 20 | 141 | 38 | 33 | 72.5 | | |
| Hopkinton | 66 | 7 | 64 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 69 | 6 | 31.0 | | |
| Lincoln-Woodstock Coop. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lisbon Regional | 164 | 49 | 48 | 37 | 134 | 54 | 60 | 128 | 84.2 | | |
| Litchfield | 164 | 120 | 48 | 71 | 71 | 151 | 131 | 18 | 96.7 | | |
| Marlboro | 88 | 149 | 80 | 0 | 40 | 6 | 7 | 17 | 55.3 | | |
| Mascenic Regional | 88 | 135 | 96 | 13 | 131 | 24 | 99 | 87 | 84.1 | | |
| Milton | 88 | 23 | 80 | 25 | 116 | 56 | 89 | 49 | 65.7 | | |
| New Boston | 112 | 66 | 128 | 8 | 67 | 120 | 149 | 121 | 96.4 | | |
| Newmarket | 88 | 1 | 80 | 27 | 90 | 44 | 106 | 23 | 57.4 | | |
| North Hampton | 112 | 73 | 32 | 29 | 135 | 96 | 44 | 108 | 67.4 | | |
| Northumberland | 78 | 77 | 32 | 20 | 53 | 66 | 2 | 25 | 44.1 | | |
| Northwood | 152 | 19 | 160 | 24 | 118 | 89 | 75 | 122 | 94.9 | | |
| Pittsfield | 66 | 132 | 32 | 0 | 120 | 108 | 94 | 112 | 94.8 | | |
| Plainfield | 66 | 63 | 64 | 31 | 144 | 50 | 99 | 110 | 78.4 | | |
| Plymouth | 90 | 56 | 144 | 13 | 81 | 28 | 61 | 75 | 68.5 | | |
| Plymouth | 90 | 99 | 48 | 40 | 149 | 113 | 58 | 104 | 87.6 | | |
| Raymond | 88 | 119 | 32 | 27 | 157 | 114 | 73 | 117 | 90.9 | | |
| Rollinsford | 112 | 101 | 128 | 20 | 101 | 54 | 28 | 44 | 73.5 | | |
| Rye | 78 | 123 | 32 | 31 | 57 | 92 | 3 | 26 | 55.2 | | |
| Seabrook | 78 | 27 | 32 | 41 | 160 | 49 | 79 | 73 | 67.4 | | |
| Shaker Regional | 84 | 8 | 88 | 17 | 58 | 44 | 90 | 86 | 68.4 | | |
| Stratham | 78 | 17 | 32 | 41 | 87 | 132 | 28 | 62 | 59.6 | | |
| Sunapee | 90 | 113 | 144 | 44 | 31 | 133 | 71 | 130 | 94.5 | | |

| Groups | Percent Of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Income | Years Of Education Completed By Adults | Orshansky Percentage | Public Aid Per Capita | Families With Income Under \$4,000 | Facilities | Median Family Income | Average Rank Per School District | Average Group Rank |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Wakefield | 112 | 105 | 16 | 48 | 161 | 136 | 109 | 150 | 104.6 | |
| Weare | 88 | 79 | 80 | 0 | 96 | 1 | 127 | 43 | 73.4 | |
| Wilton | 88 | 48 | 80 | 40 | 128 | 117 | 48 | 123 | 84.0 | |
| Winchester | 88 | 28 | 96 | 12 | 159 | 21 | 105 | 96 | 75.6 | |
| Windham | 88 | 21 | 32 | 19 | 80 | 2 | 38 | 9 | 36.1 | |
| Group VI | | | | | | | | | | 83.1 |
| Albany | 152 | 150 | 16 | 85 | 17 | 161 | 160 | 162 | 112.9 | |
| Andover | 66 | 133 | 64 | 20 | 82 | 19 | 120 | 36 | 67.5 | |
| Barnstead | 66 | 87 | 96 | 59 | 98 | 118 | 108 | 79 | 88.9 | |
| Bartlett | 152 | 116 | 16 | 33 | 107 | 105 | 53 | 126 | 88.5 | |
| Bath | 164 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 39 | 150 | 103 | 159 | 110.5 | |
| Benton | 164 | 0 | 48 | 160 | 1 | 148 | 159 | 163 | 120.4 | |
| Bethlehem | 164 | 137 | 48 | 0 | 65 | 21 | 22 | 30 | 69.6 | |
| Brentwood | 78 | 44 | 32 | 21 | 13 | 18 | 86 | 83 | 46.9 | |
| Brookline | 88 | 100 | 80 | 21 | 85 | 63 | 66 | 58 | 70.1 | |
| Campton | 90 | 65 | 48 | 19 | 93 | 69 | 73 | 76 | 66.6 | |
| Chatham | 152 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 158 | 129 | 161 | 102.8 | |
| Chichester | 88 | 69 | 64 | 40 | 32 | 85 | 111 | 102 | 73.9 | |
| Clarksville | 152 | 0 | 160 | 31 | 1 | 159 | 120 | 144 | 97.1 | |
| Columbia | 152 | 0 | 160 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 146 | 140 | 88.7 | |
| Croydon | 90 | 146 | 144 | 0 | 1 | 110 | 154 | 152 | 113.8 | |
| Dummer | 152 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 35 | 153 | 163 | 157 | 136.7 | |
| Dunbarton | 66 | 141 | 64 | 40 | 37 | 73 | 71 | 69 | 70.1 | |
| East Kingston | 78 | 61 | 32 | 35 | 84 | 14 | 48 | 40 | 49.0 | |
| Eaton | 152 | 126 | 16 | 0 | 19 | 162 | 137 | 117 | 104.1 | |
| Errol | 152 | 29 | 160 | 0 | 162 | 155 | 153 | 82 | 127.6 | |
| Freedom | 90 | 152 | 16 | 50 | 106 | 139 | 133 | 158 | 104.2 | |
| Fremont | 78 | 127 | 32 | 4 | 155 | 104 | 108 | 78 | 85.7 | |
| Gilmanton | 90 | 117 | 96 | 59 | 55 | 154 | 144 | 100 | 101.9 | |
| Goshen-Lempster Coop. | 90 | 147 | 144 | 55 | 59 | 143 | 129 | 154 | 115.1 | |
| Grantham | 90 | 9 | 144 | 86 | 87 | 144 | 124 | 135 | 102.4 | |
| Hampton Falls | 78 | 57 | 32 | 32 | 38 | 12 | 24 | 28 | 37.6 | |
| Harrisville | 88 | 6 | 96 | 0 | 89 | 134 | 142 | 147 | 100.3 | |

| Groups | Percent Of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Income | Years Of Education Completed By Adults | Orshansky Percentage | Public Aid Per Capita | Families | | Average Rank Per School District | Average Group Rank |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | With Income Under \$4,000 | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | | |
| Hill | 66 | 130 | 64 | 0 | 139 | 129 | 113 | 103.7 | 85 |
| Holderness | 90 | 142 | 48 | 7 | 12 | 85 | 66 | 74.0 | 142 |
| Jackson | 152 | 89 | 16 | 76 | 36 | 136 | 56 | 79.4 | 74 |
| Kensington | 78 | 11 | 32 | 10 | 24 | 127 | 68 | 51.4 | 61 |
| Lafayette Regional | 164 | 11 | 48 | 113 | 94 | 160 | 99 | 98.5 | 99 |
| Landaff | 164 | 148 | 48 | 54 | 60 | 85 | 152 | 92.2 | 27 |
| Lyme | 90 | 109 | 48 | 7 | 62 | 25 | 126 | 69.5 | 89 |
| Lyndeborough | 88 | 86 | 80 | 0 | 49 | 41 | 136 | 69.6 | 7 |
| Madison | 152 | 46 | 16 | 50 | 29 | 142 | 89 | 77.2 | 94 |
| Marlow | 88 | 106 | 96 | 0 | 63 | 108 | 159 | 109.1 | 149 |
| Middleton | 112 | 0 | 128 | 46 | 15 | 147 | 155 | 106.7 | 144 |
| Milan | 152 | 91 | 160 | 19 | 112 | 9 | 141 | 101.9 | 131 |
| Monroe | 164 | 2 | 48 | 0 | 44 | 116 | 82 | 71.7 | 46 |
| Mont Vernon | 88 | 96 | 80 | 0 | 108 | 24 | 63 | 68.3 | 19 |
| Nelson | 88 | 153 | 96 | 0 | 148 | 125 | 151 | 116.6 | 155 |
| New Castle | 78 | 112 | 32 | 4 | 1 | 76 | 7 | 39.2 | 4 |
| Newfields | 112 | 59 | 32 | 11 | 97 | 16 | 52 | 51.0 | 29 |
| Newington | 78 | 10 | 32 | 7 | 138 | 59 | 56 | 52.1 | 37 |
| Northingham | 112 | 110 | 32 | 29 | 56 | 125 | 130 | 92.5 | 136 |
| Orford | 164 | 8 | 48 | 9 | 41 | 46 | 133 | 69.7 | 109 |
| Piermont | 164 | 145 | 48 | 94 | 25 | 96 | 123 | 103.7 | 135 |
| Pittsburg | 152 | 124 | 160 | 52 | 95 | 60 | 150 | 117.6 | 148 |
| Randolph | 152 | 151 | 160 | 0 | 79 | 152 | 48 | 123.7 | 124 |
| Rumney | 90 | 125 | 48 | 31 | 63 | 121 | 114 | 88.2 | 114 |
| Shelburne | 156 | 152 | 160 | 24 | 1 | 156 | 135 | 109.2 | 90 |
| South Hampton | 78 | 3 | 32 | 54 | 1 | 129 | 41 | 46.6 | 35 |
| Stark | 152 | 0 | 160 | 90 | 113 | 28 | 111 | 116.3 | 160 |
| Stewartstown | 152 | 98 | 160 | 89 | 102 | 138 | 121 | 124.6 | 137 |
| Stoddard | 88 | 134 | 96 | 0 | 54 | 37 | 143 | 86.8 | 56 |
| Stratford | 112 | 138 | 128 | 0 | 50 | 141 | 117 | 107.0 | 63 |
| Stratford | 152 | 25 | 160 | 116 | 164 | 146 | 161 | 135.0 | 156 |
| Tamworth | 152 | 131 | 16 | 52 | 34 | 146 | 116 | 101.4 | 164 |
| Thornton | 164 | 129 | 48 | 95 | 1 | 149 | 148 | 110.6 | 151 |
| Unity | 90 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 14 | 157 | 145 | 115.8 | 145 |
| Warren | 90 | 143 | 48 | 0 | 132 | 111 | 147 | 117.7 | 153 |

| Groups | Percent Of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Income | Years Of Education Completed By Adults | Orshansky Percentage | Public Aid Per Capita | Families With Income Under \$4,000 | | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income | Average Rank Per School District | Average Group Rank |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | | | 111 | 147 | | | | |
| Warren | 90 | 143 | 48 | 0 | 132 | 111 | 147 | 153 | 117.7 | | |
| Washington | 90 | 45 | 144 | 85 | 68 | 35 | 162 | 32 | 82.6 | | |
| Waterville Valley | 164 | 16 | 48 | 87 | 1 | 46 | 0 | 1 | 60.5 | | |
| Wentworth | 90 | 67 | 48 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 156 | 72 | 89.3 | | |
| Westmoreland | 88 | 93 | 96 | 30 | 72 | 110 | 99 | 52 | 80.0 | | |
| Windsor | 66 | 58 | 80 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 89 | 21 | 52.5 | | |

EXHIBIT 2 - II
Comparative School Achievement Ranks by School District*
Stanford

| Groups | Achievement Scores** | Otis Scores** | Achievement Points | Average Group Score |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| <u>Group I</u> | | | | 192.5 |
| Manchester | 91 | 86 | 177*** | |
| Nashua | 117 | 91 | 208 | 208 |
| <u>Group II</u> | | | | |
| Concord | 120 | 139 | 259 | |
| Dover | 91 | 85 | 176 | |
| Keene | 96 | 117 | 213 | |
| Portsmouth | 116 | 111 | 227 | |
| Salem | 88 | 77 | 165 | |
| <u>Group III</u> | | | | 167.7 |
| Berlin | 46 | 29 | 75 | |
| Claremont | 105 | 96 | 201 | |
| Contoocook-Valley Regional | 123 | 126 | 249 | |
| Derry | 98 | 92 | 190 | |
| Goffstown | 118 | 108 | 226 | |
| Hudson | 65 | 82 | 147 | |
| Laconia | 84 | 83 | 167 | |
| Lebanon | 68 | 94 | 162 | |
| Merrimack | 73 | 107 | 180 | |
| Monadnock Regional | 26 | 32 | 58 | |
| Rochester | 103 | 100 | 203 | |
| Somersworth | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Timberlane Regional | 61 | 93 | 154 | |
| <u>Group IV</u> | | | | 142.6 |
| Amherst | 127 | 131 | 258 | *These rankings were de- |
| Bedford | 112 | 125 | 237 | vised to select repre- |
| Conway | 124 | 109 | 233 | sentative districts and |
| Exeter | 114 | 121 | 235 | cannot be used for other |
| Fall Mountain Regional | 100 | 110 | 210 | purposes. Their only |
| Franklin | 55 | 50 | 105 | validity lies in typifying |
| Governor Wentworth Regional | 57 | 58 | 115 | districts to interpret the |
| Hampton | 133 | 127 | 260 | study results. |
| Hanover | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**School districts with zero are those for which test scores were not available.

***Please note that districts with higher Achievement scores have higher levels of achievement.

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>Stanford Achievement Scores</u> | <u>Otis Scores</u> | <u>Achievement Points</u> | <u>Average Group Score</u> |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Hooksett | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Inter-lakes Coop. | 99 | 89 | 188 | |
| Jaffrey-Rindge Coop. | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Kearsarge Regional | 108 | 119 | 227 | |
| Littleton | 33 | 51 | 84 | |
| Londonderry | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Mascoma Valley Regional | 25 | 33 | 58 | |
| Merrimack Valley Regional | 16 | 31 | 47 | |
| Milford | 86 | 97 | 183 | |
| Newfound Area | 52 | 24 | 76 | |
| Newport | 54 | 43 | 97 | |
| Oyster River Coop. | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Pembroke | 63 | 90 | 153 | |
| Sanborn Regional | 101 | 70 | 171 | |
| White Mountain Regional | 48 | 47 | 95 | |
| Winnisquam Regional | 38 | 37 | 75 | |
| <u>Group V</u> | | | | |
| Allenstown | 49 | 57 | 106 | 139 |
| Alton | 23 | 21 | 44 | |
| Ashland | 87 | 61 | 148 | |
| Auburn | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Barrington | 56 | 66 | 122 | |
| Bow | 129 | 138 | 267 | |
| Candia | 45 | 68 | 113 | |
| Chester | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Chesterfield | 58 | 78 | 136 | |
| Colebrook | 80 | 40 | 120 | |
| Cornish | 107 | 81 | 188 | |
| Deerfield | 18 | 30 | 48 | |
| Epping | 30 | 36 | 66 | |
| Epsom | 67 | 56 | 123 | |
| Farmington | 36 | 34 | 70 | |
| Gilford | 119 | 122 | 241 | |
| Gorham | 34 | 41 | 75 | |
| Hampstead | 136 | 136 | 272 | |
| Haverhill Coop. | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

These rankings were devised to select representative districts and cannot be used for other purposes. Their only validity lies in typifying districts to interpret the study results.

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>Stanford Achievement Scores</u> | <u>Otis Scores</u> | <u>Achievement Points</u> | <u>Average Group Score</u> |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Henniker | 106 | 128 | 234 | |
| Hillsboro-Deering | 81 | 102 | 183 | |
| Hinsdale | 35 | 49 | 84 | |
| Hellis | 131 | 135 | 148 | |
| Hopkinton | 111 | 115 | 226 | |
| Lincoln-Woodstock Coop. | 134 | 104 | 238 | |
| Lisbon Regional | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Litchfield | 0 | 28 | 28 | |
| Marlboro | 125 | 120 | 245 | |
| Mascenic Regional | 70 | 55 | 125 | |
| Milton | 77 | 73 | 150 | |
| New Boston | 22 | 27 | 49 | |
| Newmarket | 122 | 105 | 227 | |
| North Hampton | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Northumberland | 64 | 35 | 99 | |
| Northwood | 15 | 45 | 60 | |
| Pittsfield | 78 | 84 | 162 | |
| Plainfield | 71 | 64 | 135 | |
| Plymouth | 135 | 130 | 265 | |
| Raymond | 39 | 39 | 78 | |
| Rollinsford | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Rye | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Seabrook | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Shaker Regional | 47 | 37 | 84 | |
| Stratham | 62 | 98 | 160 | |
| Sunapee | 110 | 80 | 190 | |
| Wakefield | 41 | 25 | 66 | |
| Weare | 17 | 5 | 22 | |
| Wilton | 115 | 114 | 229 | |
| Winchester | 7 | 10 | 17 | |
| Windham | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| <u>Group VI</u> | | | | 117 |
| Albany | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Andover | 59 | 54 | 113 | |
| Barnstead | 0 | 20 | 20 | |
| Bartlett | 109 | 116 | 225 | |

These rankings were devised to select representative districts and cannot be used for other purposes. Their only validity lies in typifying districts to interpret the study results.

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>Stanford Achievement Scores</u> | <u>Otis Scores</u> | <u>Achievement Points</u> | <u>Average Group Score</u> |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Bath | 79 | 95 | 174 | |
| Benton | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Bethlehem | 74 | 65 | 139 | |
| Brentwood | 95 | 103 | 198 | |
| Brookline | 75 | 112 | 187 | |
| Campton | 21 | 11 | 32 | |
| Chatham | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Chichester | 50 | 59 | 109 | |
| Clarksville | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Columbia | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Croydon | 18 | 63 | 81 | |
| Dummer | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Dunbarton | 97 | 62 | 159 | |
| East Kingston | 138 | 124 | 262 | |
| Eaton | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Errol | 113 | 99 | 212 | |
| Freedom | 126 | 113 | 239 | |
| Fremont | 24 | 13 | 37 | |
| Gilmanton | 60 | 76 | 136 | |
| Goshen-Lempster Coop. | 43 | 42 | 85 | |
| Grantham | 3 | 8 | 11 | |
| Hampton Falls | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Harrisville | 19 | 26 | 45 | |
| Hill | 28 | 17 | 45 | |
| Holderness | 85 | 75 | 160 | |
| Jackson | 102 | 129 | 231 | |
| Kensington | 29 | 79 | 108 | |
| Lafayette Regional | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Landaff | 2 | 1 | 3 | |
| Lyme | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Lyndeborough | 66 | 71 | 137 | |
| Madison | 37 | 22 | 59 | |
| Marlow | 4 | 3 | 7 | |
| Middleton | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Milan | 6 | 9 | 15 | |
| Monroe | 137 | 134 | 271 | |
| Mont Vernon | 130 | 140 | 270 | |
| Nelson | 128 | 137 | 265 | |

These rankings were devised to select representative districts and cannot be used for other purposes. Their only validity lies in typifying districts to interpret the study results.

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>Stanford Achievement Scores</u> | <u>Otis Scores</u> | <u>Achievement Points</u> | <u>Average Group Score</u> |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| New Castle | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Newfields | 40 | 72 | 112 | |
| Newington | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Nottingham | 11 | 15 | 26 | |
| Orford | 42 | 44 | 86 | |
| Piermont | 94 | 88 | 182 | |
| Pittsburg | 72 | 23 | 95 | |
| Randolph | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Rumney | 44 | 48 | 92 | |
| Shelburne | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| South Hampton | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Stark | 76 | 38 | 114 | |
| Stewartstown | 14 | 6 | 20 | |
| Stoddard | 10 | 7 | 17 | |
| Strafford | 69 | 46 | 115 | |
| Stratford | 5 | 4 | 9 | |
| Tamworth | 32 | 18 | 50 | |
| Thornton | 51 | 19 | 70 | |
| Unity | 9 | 12 | 21 | |
| Warren | 47 | 53 | 100 | |
| Washington | 20 | 52 | 72 | |
| Waterville Valley | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Wentworth | 140 | 69 | 209 | |
| Westmoreland | 104 | 123 | 227 | |
| Windsor | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The wide differences in "scores", and "points" shown in this exhibit do not represent the degrees of difference between the achievement levels of students in the various school districts. The real differences are small. Even if these tables displayed test scores they could not be used to compare school districts without detailed analysis of SES and other community factors. These tables do not contain test scores, they merely display rank orders. The rankings are used in this study to assist in selecting a representative sample of districts and to compare the answers to questions in different categories of districts. Comparisons based on this exhibit should not be used for other purposes.

EXHIBIT 3 - II

Statistical Summary of School District Groupings and Rankings of Sample School Districts

| GROUPS | COUNTY | POPULATION | POPULATION RANGE OF GROUP | PERCENT OF POPULATION IN GROUP | - NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN GROUP | GROUP AVERAGE SES SCORE |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| I | Hillsborough | 96,657 | 60136-96657 | 20.1% | 2 | 59.7 |
| II | | | 20145-29670 | 15.2% | 5 | 59.6 |
| Dover | Stafford | 22,458 | | | | |
| Concord | Merrimack | 29,670 | | | | |
| Salem | Rockingham | 25,255 | | | | |
| III | | | 9660-18551 | 20.4% | 13 | 64. |
| Berlin | Coos | 15,144 | | | | |
| Laconia | Belknap | 14,947 | | | | |
| Merrimack | Hillsborough | 11,827 | | | | |
| IV | | | 4385-9580 | 20.8% | 25 | 58.5 |
| Mascona Valley Regional | Grafton | 5,049 | | | | |
| Sanborn Regional | Rockingham | 5,567 | | | | |
| Bedford | Hillsborough | 6,859 | | | | |
| V | | | 1270-4194 | 16.2% | 50 | 64.4 |
| Gorham | Coos | 3,038 | | | | |
| Mascenic Regional | Hillsborough | 4,049 | | | | |
| Bow | Merrimack | 2,778 | | | | |
| VI | | | 61-1508 | 7.3% | 67 | 83.1 |
| Unity | Sullivan | 729 | | | | |
| Stoddard | Cheshire | 276 | | | | |
| Brentwood | Rockingham | 1,508 | | | | |

| GROUPS | DISTRICT SES SCORE | GROUP AVERAGE ACHIEVEMENT RANK | DISTRICT ACHIEVEMENT RANK | NUMBER OF | |
|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| | | | | INTERVIEWS IN EACH DISTRICT PROFESSIONAL | DISTRICT FAMILY |
| I | | 192.5 | | | |
| Manchester | 69.3 | | 177 | 15 | 35 |
| II | | 208. | | | |
| Dover | 71.3 | | 176 | 3 | 9 |
| Concord | 57.7 | | 259 | 5 | 9 |
| Salem | 36.7 | | 165 | 3 | 9 |
| III | | 167.7 | | | |
| Berlin | 99.7 | | 75 | 5 | 13 |
| Laconia | 69.7 | | 167 | 5 | 13 |
| Merrimack | 35.7 | | 180 | 5 | 13 |
| IV | | 142.6 | | | |
| Mascoma Valley | | | | | |
| Regional | 100.9 | | 58 | 5 | 13 |
| Sanborn Regional | 60.3 | | 171 | 6 | 13 |
| Bedford | 44.2 | | 237 | 5 | 13 |
| V | | 139. | | | |
| Goffham | 126.5 | | 75 | 4 | 9 |
| Mascepic | | | | | |
| Regional | 65.7 | | 125 | 4 | 10 |
| BOW | 31.8 | | 267 | 4 | 9 |
| VI | | 117. | | | |
| Unity | 115.8 | | 21 | 1 | 4 |
| Stoddard | 86.8 | | 17 | 3 | 5 |
| Brentwood | 46.9 | | 198 | 1 | 4 |

EXHIBIT 4 - II

PURPOSE AND USE OF SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to find out more about the needs of New Hampshire school children with special problems. Secondly, it is also to find out more about the ways in which New Hampshire school districts respond to these needs.

In order for the survey to do any good your answers to the questions we would like to ask you should be as frank and as complete as possible.

The answers that you make to these questions will be added to those made by other persons in representative school districts throughout the state. In this way, a better understanding can be developed of the relationship between the achievement level of children with special problems, and conditions in the community, the family and the school.

When all the answers have been put together they will be made available to the public and to state and school officials who are attempting to develop school programs that respond to real needs.

Your name and address will not be made available to these persons or agencies nor will we use your name and address for any other purpose.

EXHIBIT 5 - II

Family Characteristics of Parent Sample By Type of School District

9c. Number of children at home?

| | SES* | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-----------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| 0-3 | 30.6 | 46.3 | 48.6 | 37.4 | 44.8 | 28.6 | 42.9 |
| 4 or More | 69.4 | 53.7 | 51.4 | 62.6 | 55.2 | 71.4 | 57.1 |
| Total | 49 | 95 | 35 | 99 | 96 | 35 | 56 |

9d. Number of school-age children?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-----------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| 0-3 | 46.9 | 59.4 | 62.9 | 52.0 | 58.3 | 48.6 | 54.4 |
| 4 or More | 53.1 | 40.6 | 37.1 | 48.0 | 41.7 | 51.4 | 45.6 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 96 | 35 | 57 |

9e. Number of children involved in "special" education programs?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| None | 32.7 | 47.4 | 37.1 | 41.4 | 42.1 | 25.7 | 63.2 |
| Some | 67.3 | 52.6 | 62.9 | 58.6 | 57.9 | 74.3 | 36.8 |
| Total | 49 | 95 | 35 | 99 | 95 | 35 | 57 |

9f. How many parents live at home?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| One | 16.3 | 45.8 | 22.9 | 41.0 | 43.3 | 14.3 | 26.3 |
| Two | 83.7 | 54.2 | 77.1 | 59.0 | 56.7 | 85.7 | 73.7 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

*SES means social and economic statistics

9g1. Mother's years of education?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| 8 or Under | 34.7 | 29.5 | 37.1 | 32.3 | 30.2 | 40.0 | 12.3 |
| 9-11 | 30.6 | 30.5 | 31.4 | 31.3 | 37.5 | 25.7 | 31.6 |
| 12 and Over | 34.7 | 40.0 | 31.4 | 36.4 | 32.3 | 34.3 | 56.1 |
| Total | 49 | 95 | 35 | 99 | 96 | 35 | 57 |

9g2. Father's years of education?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| 8 or Under | 30.4 | 34.4 | 35.7 | 32.0 | 31.7 | 28.1 | 36.0 |
| 9-11 | 32.6 | 39.1 | 35.7 | 36.0 | 34.9 | 34.4 | 36.0 |
| 12 and Over | 37.0 | 26.6 | 28.6 | 32.0 | 33.3 | 37.5 | 28.0 |
| Total | 46 | 64 | 28 | 75 | 63 | 32 | 50 |

9h1. Mother's occupation?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|--------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Employed | 30.6 | 40.6 | 34.3 | 37.0 | 38.1 | 28.6 | 36.8 |
| Not Employed | 69.4 | 57.3 | 65.7 | 61.0 | 59.8 | 71.4 | 63.2 |
| No Answer | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

9h2. Father's occupation?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|--------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Employed | 89.8 | 61.5 | 80.0 | 70.0 | 59.8 | 91.4 | 78.9 |
| Not Employed | 6.1 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 8.8 |
| No Answer | 4.1 | 33.3 | 17.1 | 25.0 | 35.1 | 5.7 | 12.3 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

9i. Yearly income range?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-----------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Under \$5500 | 19.1 | 51.7 | 24.2 | 49.5 | 54.5 | 14.7 | 32.1 |
| \$5500 and Over | 80.9 | 48.3 | 75.8 | 50.5 | 45.5 | 85.3 | 67.9 |
| Total | 47 | 87 | 33 | 91 | 88 | 34 | 53 |



SECTION III

EDUCATIONAL DISADVANTAGE

This section contains an analysis of the results both of the research and of the survey described in Section II. The overall purpose of the study was to develop, on the basis of both research and an empirical survey of the opinion of parents and school and non-school professionals, a new and more accurate perception of educational disadvantage at this time in the State of New Hampshire.

Since passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act initiated the Title I Program of grants intended to assist educationally disadvantaged children, the Title I staff had grown increasingly concerned that the central assumption underlying the distribution of these funds was an over-simplification, perhaps, to the point of inaccuracy. The assumption in question, was that the principal indication of educational disadvantage was poverty in the family. The determination to look more deeply into the nature of educational disadvantage was not based on a judgment that poverty was irrelevant to educational disadvantage. But experience in administering the program gave repeated indications that a more detailed, complete and sensitively accurate description was necessary in order to enable local educators, school boards and parents to design Title I programs which would actually answer the needs of educationally disadvantaged children. Such a description, it was felt, would also enable Title I staff to discern the relative merits of alternative proposals on a more knowledgeable basis and to assist school districts in developing appropriate proposals.

The Nature of Disadvantage

Our approach to the task of describing educational disadvantage has been twofold. First, we have inquired into the general nature of disadvantage in the school districts of New Hampshire without specific references to interrelation with the educational system. Second, we have inquired into educational disadvantage specifically.

We were aided in the first part of our task by reference to a study prepared for the Rockingham County Community Action Agency in 1972. The purpose of this earlier study was to determine both the causes of poverty and what could be done to break the cycle of poverty. A sample was chosen carefully to reflect the urban, suburban and rural communities in Rockingham County, which to a considerable extent are typical of our State.

The representatives of 199 low income families interviewed represented a very real cross section of low income families in Rockingham County. Of the interviewees, 71 percent lived in families with gross annual incomes of less than \$4,000 and 98 percent had incomes of \$5,500 or below. This compares with the sample interviewed in the current study which contained representatives of 189 families, 21 percent of whom lived in families of gross annual incomes of over \$4,000, 40 percent of \$5,500 and below, and 77 percent of \$7,000 and below. Considering the dramatic inflation which occurred between the Spring of 1972 and the Summer of 1974, when this survey was made, the groups are generally comparable in levels of economic well being.

The Rockingham County group, in response to a broadly constructed interview, made its views very clear:

- . To them, the principal element of disadvantage was insufficient employment and employment services.
- . The second most important element was the need for decent low cost housing.
- . The third priority area was the lack of programs involving family counseling, budgeting and planning. The greatest concern in this area was to learn how to get the most out of every dollar in an insufficient income.
- . Another priority was the need for communication about the availability of public assistance, general assistance and also non-money payment programs to help low income families.

The Rockingham County survey further indicated striking differences between people living in different sizes and types of communities in both the degree of awareness and the level of consensus as to the elements of disadvantage. The Rockingham results suggested that a group of indicators - compiled by school districts and including the principal elements of disadvantage identified by the Rockingham County group - could demonstrate both the presence of the elements of general economic disadvantage in New Hampshire school districts and compare the level of economic well being between the school districts.

The indicators described in Section II of the report were chosen a) for the purpose of using this comparison as a part of the mechanism for selecting a representative sample of districts, and b) for the purpose of forming a necessary part of the description of the incidence of the disadvantage of the school districts of our State. Exhibit 1 of this section is a district-by-district listing of seven of these indicators. The years of education completed by adults is not included in this exhibit for reasons referred to previously. The areas described by these statistical series are unemployment, housing, insufficient family income and comparative occurrence of relevant public and general assistance. These areas were identified as critical in the overall phenomenon of disadvantage by the Rockingham County group. The relationship of these general elements of disadvantage to educational disadvantage will be discussed later, in Section IV. At this point, it is enough to state that there is a relationship and that it is important to the fuller understanding of educational disadvantage.

The Nature of Educational Disadvantage

It was largely to find out what makes up educational disadvantage that the field survey of this study was conducted. Section II described the process of selecting a sample of approximately 10 percent of the state's school districts and commented upon the identification of individual interviewees residing or employed in the school systems or communities within these districts. We also discussed the preparation of the survey instruments used in interviewing the two basic groups in the sample. The first of these groups included 189 members of families which were identified as having one or more children with special problems which either

prevented or made more difficult the achievement of satisfactory performance in school. No attempt has been made to ascertain exactly why in each instance the students' performance was considered unsatisfactory, either by teachers and other school officials or by the family. Rather, the questions were aimed at giving both groups the opportunity to express their views as fully as possible both as to the causes and the observable symptoms of educational disadvantage.

The Parents' View

Exhibit 2 is a compilation of the results of several of the questions from the parents' sample. Two of these questions are particularly relevant. Question 1 was aimed at enabling the parents to discuss and enumerate the causes of poor performance in school, and Question 2b asked them to specify which of these causes applied in their own families. These answers were identified by percentages of the parent sample, the causes and symptoms of educational disadvantage cited - and are listed below in the order of priority.

The third column below combines the percentages and indicates the overall order of importance which each of these aspects of educational disadvantage assumes in the view of the entire parent sample.

Parents' View

| <u>Question 1</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes | 36.5 |
| Family disruption | 20.6 |
| Permissiveness - home and school | 19.6 |
| Unsatisfactory teacher ability | 19.6 |
| Learning disabilities | 16.4 |
| Low student motivation | 14.3 |
| Unsatisfactory parental attitudes | 12.2 |
| Student dislike of school | 11.6 |
| Physical handicaps | 11.1 |
| Emotional - psychiatric problems | 11.1 |
| No preschool education | 10.1 |
| <u>Question 2b</u> | |
| Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes | 28.4 |
| Learning disabilities | 18.9 |
| Physical handicaps | 15.4 |
| Family disruption | 14.2 |
| Low student motivation | 13.6 |
| Permissiveness - home or school | 12.4 |
| Unsatisfactory teacher ability | 10.7 |
| Emotional - psychiatric problems | 9.5 |
| Student dislike of school | 8.9 |
| No preschool education | 6.5 |

CombinedPercentage

| | |
|----------------------------------|------|
| Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes | 32.5 |
| Learning disabilities | 17.7 |
| Family disruption | 17.4 |
| Permissiveness - home and school | 16.0 |
| Unsatisfactory teacher ability | 15.2 |
| Low student motivation | 14.0 |
| Physical handicaps | 13.3 |
| Emotional - psychiatric problems | 10.3 |
| Student dislike of school | 10.3 |

There are nine elements listed which were cited by more than 10 percent of the sample as being important in determining educational disadvantage.

The answers to other questions helped to fill out the picture further. In answering Question 4b, half of the 27 percent stating their children need types of assistance which are not available, indicate their belief that special classes in subject areas such as reading and arithmetic are the answer. More than 60 percent of those responding to Question 8a favored a very strong emphasis on basic education in such areas as reading and writing, and indicated a preference for courses that would provide the student with a "trade to get a job" and other employment related skills. In answering Question 16, the parents indicated that graduating from elementary and secondary schools was extremely important, but again put a strong emphasis on the need to learn a trade or employment skill. To do this, they indicated that completing studies were somewhat more important than achieving good grades and that it was also important to learn "to get along with others".

The Professionals' View

Exhibit 3 contains the answers to a series of questions in the interview instrument used for the school and non-school professionals' sample. Below, we have listed the answers to the questions most frequently selected by this sample in the order of preference.

The last column in the exhibit is the order of preference by average percentages obtained by combining the answers to Questions 2 and 3.

Representative View

| <u>Question 1</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Question 2</u> | <u>%</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Learning disabilities | 38.9 | Family disruption | 40.3 |
| Emotional - psychiatric problems | 36.1 | Unsatisfactory economic background | 37.5 |
| Physical handicaps | 29.2 | Improper child care | 37.5 |
| Unsatisfactory economic background | 26.4 | Physical handicaps | 29.2 |
| Family disruption | 25.0 | Experiential deprivation | 25.0 |
| Improper child care | 20.8 | Cultural deprivation | 19.4 |
| Cultural deprivation | 18.1 | Permissiveness - home and school | 13.9 |
| Low student motivation | 18.1 | Emotional - psychiatric problems | 12.5 |
| Immaturity | 16.7 | | |

| <u>Question 1</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Question 2</u> | <u>%</u> |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
| Negative social behavior | 16.7 | Learning disabilities | 12.5 |
| Hyperactivity | 12.5 | | |
| Experiential deprivation | 12.5 | | |

| <u>Question 2c</u> | <u>%</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| Emotional - psychiatric problems | 56.3 |
| Low achievement | 26.8 |
| Negative social behavior | 26.8 |
| Learning disabilities | 22.5 |
| Physical handicaps | 18.3 |
| Low student motivation | 15.5 |
| Poor peer relations | 11.3 |
| Hyperactivity | 11.3 |
| Immaturity | 8.5 |

| <u>Question 3</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Questions 2 and 3</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|
| Poor economic background | 30.6 | Poor economic background | 34 |
| Improper child care | 26.4 | Improper child care | 32 |
| Physical handicaps | 25.0 | Family disruption | 31 |
| Experiential deprivation | 23.6 | Physical handicaps | 27 |
| Family problems | 20.8 | Experiential deprivation | 24 |
| Learning disabilities | 16.7 | Learning disabilities | 15 |
| Emotional psychiatric | 15.3 | Cultural deprivation | 15 |
| Negative self-image | 11.1 | Emotional psychiatric | 14 |
| Cultural deprivation | 9.7 | Negative self-image | 10 |
| Immaturity | 6.9 | Immaturity | 8 |
| Home environment | 6.9 | | |
| Teacher/administrator attitudes | 6.9 | | |

The twelve causes and symptoms of educational disadvantage identified by the responses of Question 1, and the nine fundamental sources of disadvantage identified by the combined answers to Questions 2 and 3 add a further dimension to the description of educational disadvantage.

The answers to Question 13d indicate that there are several "blocks" to the effective participation by parents in dealing with problems of their children. These "blocks" are also a key part of the whole picture of educational disadvantage.

Contrasting Views

Exhibit 4 contains the answers to a selection of the questions which were asked on both questionnaires. Below we have listed in order of preference the conditions selected by the two groups separately in answer to Questions 13b and 14b which deal with environmental situations.

While there is fairly strong agreement that some of these conditions make it more difficult for students to do their best in school, it is evident there is wide disagreement on the importance of others. The third list below shows the combined preferences of the two groups.

Contrasting Views

Questions 13b and 14b

| <u>Parents</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Professionals</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------|
| Drugs and alcohol | 69.9 | Not enough good food | 65.7 |
| No pre-school education | 52.4 | No pre-school education | 55.1 |
| Not enough good food | 49.2 | Parents-limited education | 52.1 |
| Lack of medical care | 37.2 | One parent in home | 50.0 |
| Shortage of clothes | 34.8 | Drugs and alcohol | 49.3 |
| Inadequate housing | 32.8 | Low family income | 47.1 |
| Low family income | 28.0 | Lack of medical care | 42.6 |
| Unemployment | 27.9 | Unemployment | 40.6 |
| One parent in home | 26.8 | Family mobility | 40.4 |
| Parents-limited education | 24.2 | Shortage of clothes | 26.1 |

| <u>Combined</u> | <u>%</u> |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Drugs and alcohol | 60.0 |
| Not enough good food | 57.5 |
| No pre-school education | 53.5 |
| Lack of medical care | 40.0 |
| One parent in home | 38.5 |
| Parents-limited education | 38.0 |
| Low family income | 37.5 |
| Unemployment | 34.5 |
| Shortage of clothes | 30.0 |
| Family mobility | 20.0 |

It is noteworthy that the professional sample responded much more strongly. Of the ten priority items selected by the professional group, an average of 46.8 percent judged them important. The average percentage of parents participating in the selection of the ten most important conditions was only 38.1 percent.

Next, we list below the preference responses to Questions 15b and 16b asking the two groups how limiting various physical and emotional handicaps are to school performance.

Contrasting Views

Questions 15b and 16b

| <u>Parents</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Professionals</u> | <u>%</u> |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
| Poor vision | 64.6 | Learning Disability | 58.3 |
| Poor hearing | 63.5 | Emotional nervousness | 52.8 |
| Inability to understand | 63.0 | Retardation | 51.4 |

| <u>Parents</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Professionals</u> | <u>%</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------|
| Retardation | 56.6 | Poor vision | 40.3 |
| Learning Disability | 55.0 | Poor hearing | 38.9 |
| Mental illness | 54.0 | Mental illness | 38.9 |
| Emotional nervousness | 51.9 | Physical defects | 22.2 |
| Physical handicaps | 44.4 | Physical handicaps | 18.1 |
| | <u>Combined</u> | | <u>%</u> |
| | Learning Disability | | 56.5 |
| | Retardation | | 54.0 |
| | Poor vision | | 52.5 |
| | Emotional nervousness | | 52.5 |
| | Poor hearing | | 51.5 |
| | Mental illness | | 46.5 |
| | Physical handicaps | | 31.5 |
| | Inability to understand | | 31.5 |

Once again, there is both agreement and disagreement. In contrast to the previous questions, however, the parents responded much more strongly to these questions, so an average of 57 percent of the parents identified the eight most frequently cited limiting conditions. Of the professionals indicating a preference, an average of only 41.5 percent agreed on the importance of the conditions.

The responses to questions listing a series of specific conditions, even though they do not represent the freely stated views of the interviewees in the same way as do the earlier questions discussed above, nevertheless serve to deepen and round out the perception of disadvantage. The professionals view environmental conditions as having a more frequently negative affect on school performance. Parents believe individual physical and emotional conditions are more important.

The divergence in views between the professional and parent group is further illustrated by the answers to Questions 17a and 17b. Of the professionals, 81 percent believe that the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems is positive. Only 45 percent of the parents agree. 44 percent of the professionals believe that in general, the attitudes of the child with educational problems toward the schools is positive. Only 15 percent of the parents agree.

The most important elements of educational disadvantage in the cumulative view of all 261 persons interviewed in the course of this survey are listed below. Also listed are the most important environmental conditions and physical or emotional conditions which, in the view of the entire sample are detrimental to satisfactory school performance.

Unsatisfactory teacher attitudes
 Learning disabilities
 Family disruption

Permissiveness - home and school
 Unsatisfactory teacher ability
 Low student motivation
 Physical handicaps
 Emotional - psychiatric problems
 Student dislike of school
 Learning disabilities
 Emotional - psychiatric problems
 Physical handicaps
 Unsatisfactory economic background
 Family disruption
 Improper child care
 Cultural deprivation
 Low student motivation
 Immaturity
 Negative social behavior
 Hyperactivity
 Experiential deprivation
 Unsatisfactory economic background
 Improper child care
 Family disruption
 Physical handicaps
 Experiential deprivation
 Cultural deprivation
 Learning disabilities
 Emotional - psychiatric problems
 Negative self-image
 Immaturity
 Drugs and alcohol.
 Not enough good food
 No pre-school education
 Lack of medical care
 One parent in home
 Parents with limited education
 Low family income,
 Unemployment
 Shortage of clothes
 Family mobility
 Learning disabilities
 Retardation
 Poor vision
 Emotional nervousness
 Poor hearing
 Mental illness
 Physical handicaps
 Inability to understand

These combined lists include all of the elements given priority identification by either of the groups. Similarly, they contain all of the environmental, physical or emotional conditions limiting school performance.

We have not attempted to "winnow out" the elements upon which there was not agreement between the two groups. To do so would negate the special value which the perception of each adds to our overall description.

One additional thought requires discussion at this point in description of educational disadvantage. It is clear from the answers to Questions 1 and 2 by the parents that unsatisfactory teacher attitudes and abilities are a strong source of parental concern. It is equally clear from their strong identification of family disruption and improper child care in answer to Questions 2 and 3, and lack of interest on the part of parents as a block to parental involvement in answer to Question 13d, that the professionals are deeply concerned about conditions in the home. It is not unnatural that these strongly conflicting concerns should exist between the professionals and members of families with children having school problems. The failure of satisfactory performance in school itself creates a great deal of this concern.

Question 19 appeared on both forms. It asked whether the schools had a special responsibility toward a child with problems. Approximately 94 percent of both groups answered in the affirmative.

The contrast between the nearly unanimous agreement on the responsibility of the schools for the problem child with the opposing views of parents and professionals as to where the cause for the problems lie, should be a matter of deep concern. These strongly opposed views may themselves constitute an element of disadvantage. The victims of these dissenting views, left unattended, will almost certainly be the very children whom all are concerned to help.

The full description of educational disadvantage, then, consists of:

- living in school districts which, compared to other districts, have relatively high unemployment, inadequate housing, insufficient family income and a high level of reliance on public and general assistance, and
- being members of school and family groups, or being individuals, with an incidence of environmental, health, teaching, learning, attitudinal and emotional deficiencies which make satisfactory school performance unlikely.

EXHIBIT 1 - III
Social and Economic Statistics By School District

| School Districts | Percentage of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Individual Wage Earner | Orshansky Percentage |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Albany | 7.6 | \$ 2,696 | 25.0 |
| Allenstown | 3.3 | 4,690 | 4.9 |
| Alton | 4.5 | 3,860 | .4 |
| Amherst | 4.4 | 5,631 | 8.3 |
| Andover | 3.3 | 4,369 | 5.9 |
| Ashland | 4.5 | 7,302 | 11.1 |
| Auburn | 4.4 | 7,119 | 5.5 |
| Barnstead | 3.3 | 5,492 | 17.8 |
| Barrington | 5.6 | 5,269 | 7.9 |
| Bartlett | 7.6 | 4,719 | 9.9 |
| Bath | 8.2 | | 0.0 |
| Bedford | 4.4 | 4,644 | 2.0 |
| Benton | 8.2 | | 47.4 |
| Berlin | 7.6 | 7,161 | 8.7 |
| Bethlehem | 8.2 | 4,163 | 0.0 |
| BOW | 3.3 | 9,563 | 0.0 |
| Brentwood | 3.9 | 6,520 | 6.3 |
| Brookline | 4.4 | 5,142 | 6.2 |
| Campton | 4.5 | 5,968 | 5.6 |
| Candia | 4.4 | 5,662 | 7.0 |
| Chatham | 7.6 | | 0.0 |
| Chester | 4.4 | 5,629 | 4.7 |
| Chesterfield | 4.4 | 5,856 | 3.9 |
| Chichester | 3.3 | 3,985 | 12.1 |
| Claremont | 4.5 | 6,331 | 6.7 |
| Clarksville | 7.6 | | 9.4 |
| Colebrook | 7.6 | 5,080 | 36.1 |
| Columbia | 7.6 | | 3.2 |
| Concord | 3.3 | 6,626 | 8.4 |
| Contoocook Valley | 4.1 | 6,540 | 4.2 |
| Conway | 7.6 | 4,995 | 9.1 |
| Cornish | 4.5 | 4,624 | 7.9 |
| Croydon | 4.5 | 3,618 | 0.0 |
| Deerfield | 3.3 | 6,627 | 8.9 |
| Derry | 4.4 | 5,870 | 9.5 |

| School Districts | Percentage of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Income Individual Wage Earner | Orshansky Percentage |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Dover | 5.6 | \$ 6,470 | 8.0 |
| Dummer | 7.6 | | 0.0 |
| Dunbarton | 3.3 | 3,922 | 12.1 |
| East Kingston | 3.9 | 6,123 | 10.6 |
| Eaton | 7.6 | 4,504 | 0.0 |
| Epping | 3.9 | 4,990 | 10.0 |
| Epsom | 3.3 | 6,738 | 2.1 |
| Errol | 7.6 | 6,896 | 0.0 |
| Exeter | 3.9 | 6,880 | 1.1 |
| Fall Mountain Regional | 4.4 | 6,618 | 6.1 |
| Farmington | 5.6 | 6,612 | 12.9 |
| Franklin | 3.3 | 5,829 | 9.3 |
| Freedom | 4.5 | 2,536 | 15.0 |
| Fremont | 3.9 | 4,501 | 1.1 |
| Gilford | 4.5 | 5,770 | 1.3 |
| Gilmanston | 4.5 | 4,703 | 17.6 |
| Goffstown | 4.4 | 5,770 | 3.3 |
| Gorham | 7.6 | 4,229 | 9.3 |
| Goshen-Lempster Coop. | 4.5 | 3,599 | 16.4 |
| Governor Wentworth Regional | 4.7 | 4,774 | 10.9 |
| Grantham | 4.5 | 8,590 | 25.2 |
| Greenland | 3.9 | 9,942 | 10.0 |
| Hampstead | 3.9 | 4,987 | 0.0 |
| Hampton | 3.9 | 6,758 | 6.9 |
| Hampton Falls | 3.9 | 6,285 | 9.6 |
| Hanover | 4.5 | 7,852 | 1.2 |
| Harrisville | 4.4 | 9,109 | 0.0 |
| Haverhill Coop. | 8.2 | 4,847 | 10.9 |
| Henniker | 3.3 | 6,319 | 14.4 |
| Hill | 3.3 | 4,434 | 0.0 |
| Hillsboro-Deering | 3.3 | 5,855 | 3.4 |
| Hinsdale | 4.4 | 5,244 | 11.6 |
| Holderness | 4.5 | 3,891 | 2.0 |
| Hollis | 4.4 | 4,477 | 15.7 |
| Hooksett | 4.4 | 8,241 | 10.3 |

| School Districts | Percentage of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Individual Wage Earner Income | Orshansky Percentage |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Hopkinton | 3.3 | \$ 8,929 | 0.6 |
| Hudson | 4.4 | 5,634 | 5.2 |
| Inter-lakes Coop. | 4.5 | 5,771 | 11.3 |
| Jackson | 7.6 | 5,425 | 22.7 |
| Jaffrey-Rindge Coop. | 4.4 | 5,663 | 9.3 |
| Kearsarge Regional | 4.1 | 5,405 | 1.9 |
| Keene | 4.4 | 7,043 | 5.9 |
| Kensington | 3.9 | 8,193 | 3.1 |
| Laconia | 4.5 | 6,326 | 4.9 |
| Lafayette Regional | 8.2 | 4,757 | 33.3 |
| Landaff | 8.2 | 3,486 | 16.2 |
| Lebanon | 4.5 | 6,345 | 6.8 |
| Lincoln-Woodstock Coop. | 8.2 | 6,425 | 11.1 |
| Lisbon Regional | 8.2 | 4,669 | 21.4 |
| Litchfield | 4.4 | 3,100 | 0.0 |
| Littleton | 8.2 | 5,718 | 4.9 |
| Londonderry | 4.4 | 7,381 | 9.6 |
| Lyme | 4.5 | 4,966 | 2.0 |
| Lyndeborough | 4.4 | 5,520 | 0.0 |
| Madison | 7.6 | 6,471 | 15.1 |
| Manchester | 4.4 | 6,767 | 8.2 |
| Marlboro | 4.4 | 4,320 | 3.9 |
| Marlow | 4.4 | 5,061 | 0.0 |
| Mascenic Regional | 4.4 | 7,125 | 7.5 |
| Mascoma Valley Regional | 4.5 | 4,153 | 8.3 |
| Merrimack | 4.4 | 7,999 | 4.1 |
| Merrimack Valley | 3.3 | 6,616 | 10.5 |
| Middletown | 5.6 | | 13.7 |
| Milan | 7.6 | 5,336 | 5.7 |
| Milford | 4.4 | 6,579 | 9.6 |
| Milton | 5.6 | 5,936 | 2.3 |
| Monadnock Regional | 4.4 | 6,066 | 11.6 |
| Monroe | 8.2 | 12,113 | 0.0 |
| Mont Vernon | 4.4 | 5,237 | 0.0 |
| Nashua | 4.4 | 7,798 | 5.6 |

| School Districts | Percentage of Work Force Unemployed | Yearly Average Income Individual Wage Earner | Orshansky Percentage |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Nelson | 4.4 | \$ 2,067 | 0.0 |
| New Boston | 4.4 | 12,121 | 8.1 |
| New Castle | 3.9 | 4,823 | 1.1 |
| Newfields | 5.6 | 6,237 | 3.3 |
| Newfound Area | 4.5 | 6,516 | 13.0 |
| Newington | 3.9 | 8,486 | 2.1 |
| Newmarket. | 5.6 | 5,786 | 8.6 |
| Newport | 4.5 | 6,115 | 14.3 |
| North Hampton | 3.9 | 5,726 | 6.0 |
| Northumberland | 7.6 | 7,355 | 7.3 |
| Northwood | 3.3 | 4,380 | 0.0 |
| Nottingham | 5.6 | 4,857 | 8.8 |
| Orford | 8.2 | 8,825 | 2.7 |
| Oyster River Coop. | 5.6 | 5,095 | 3.5 |
| Pelham | 4.4 | 5,083 | 7.3 |
| Pembroke | 3.3 | 6,392 | 8.2 |
| Piermont | 8.2 | 3,626 | 27.5 |
| Pittsburg | 7.6 | 4,537 | 15.5 |
| Pittsfield | 3.3 | 6,100 | 9.2 |
| Plainfield | 4.5 | 6,323 | 3.9 |
| Plymouth | 4.5 | 5,150 | 12.1 |
| Portsmouth | 3.9 | 6,188 | 1.2 |
| Randolph | 7.6 | 2,557 | 0.0 |
| Raymond | 4.4 | 4,676 | 8.0 |
| Rochester | 5.6 | 5,326 | 9.0 |
| Rollinsford | 5.6 | 5,133 | 5.9 |
| Rumney | 4.5 | 4,529 | 9.3 |
| Rye | 3.9 | 4,560 | 9.2 |
| Salem | 4.4 | 6,593 | 2.6 |
| Saborn Regional | 3.9 | 5,448 | 5.5 |
| Seabrook | 3.9 | 6,997 | 12.2 |
| Shaker Regional | 4.2 | 5,673 | 5.0 |
| Shelburne | 7.6 | 2,361 | 7.1 |
| Somersworth | 5.6 | 6,365 | 8.8 |
| South Hampton | 3.9 | 10,934 | 16.2 |

| School Districts | Percentage of Work Force | | Yearly Average Income | | Orshansky Percentage |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | Unemployed | Wage Earner | Individual | Wage Earner | |
| Stark | 7.6 | | \$ | | 26.4 |
| Stewartstown | 7.6 | | | 5,219 | 26.1 |
| Stoddard | 4.4 | | | 4,347 | 0.0 |
| Strafford | 5.6 | | | 4,050 | 0.0 |
| Stratford | 7.6 | | | 7,107 | 34.1 |
| Stratham | 3.9 | | | 7,562 | 12.4 |
| Sunapee | 4.5 | | | 4,784 | 13.2 |
| Tamworth | 7.6 | | | 4,423 | 15.5 |
| Thornton | 8.2 | | | 4,474 | 28.0 |
| Timberlane Regional | 3.9 | | | 5,832 | 6.4 |
| Unity | 4.5 | | | | 0.0 |
| Wakefield | 5.6 | | | 5,073 | 14.4 |
| Warren | 4.5 | | | 3,872 | 0.0 |
| Washington | 4.5 | | | 6,474 | 25.0 |
| Waterville Valley | 8.2 | | | 7,730 | 25.5 |
| Weare | 4.4 | | | 5,699 | 0.0 |
| Wentworth | 4.5 | | | 5,902 | 0.0 |
| Westmoreland | 4.4 | | | 5,276 | 9.0 |
| White Mountain Regional | 8.2 | | | 5,227 | 9.5 |
| Wilton | 4.4 | | | 6,461 | 12.1 |
| Winchester | 4.4 | | | 6,939 | 3.5 |
| Windham | 4.4 | | | 7,215 | 5.8 |
| Windsor | 3.3 | | | 6,264 | 0.0 |
| Winnisquam Regional | 4.5 | | | 6,553 | 9.9 |

| School Districts | Public Aid Per Capita | Families With Income Under \$4,000 | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Albany | \$.77 | 47.8% | 27.9% | \$ 6,090 |
| Allenstown | 21.50 | 9.0 | 1.9 | 9,621 |
| Alton | 6.71 | 18.1 | 15.9 | 7,707 |
| Amherst | 1.52 | 8.2 | 4.5 | 13,247 |
| Andover | 12.98 | 6.5 | 10.9 | 10,513 |
| Ashland | 32.03 | 13.4 | 3.7 | 8,844 |
| Auburn | 11.76 | 8.8 | 6.5 | 9,514 |
| Barnstead | 15.05 | 15.7 | 9.2 | 9,303 |
| Barrington | 6.24 | 11.0 | 7.6 | 9,821 |
| Bartlett | 17.86 | 14.0 | 3.6 | 8,291 |
| Bath | 4.89 | 23.4 | 8.3 | 6,434 |
| Bedford | 2.62 | 5.1 | 1.7 | 12,559 |
| Benton | 0 | 22.0 | 26.6 | 5,722 |
| Berlin | 29.77 | 17.3 | 2.6 | 8,179 |
| Bethlehem | 9.93 | 6.6 | 2.0 | 10,651 |
| Bow | 1.74 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 12,105 |
| Brentwood | .20 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 9,267 |
| Brookline | 13.29 | 10.4 | 4.8 | 9,781 |
| Campton | 14.30 | 11.1 | 5.7 | 9,318 |
| Candia | 3.35 | 5.6 | 7.0 | 9,520 |
| Chatham | 0 | 31.7 | 12.5 | 6,250 |
| Chester | 21.99 | 15.5 | 5.9 | 9,611 |
| Chesterfield | 10.88 | 6.8 | 4.8 | 9,526 |
| Chichester | 3.71 | 12.1 | 9.7 | 8,775 |
| Claremont | 22.31 | 12.9 | 2.2 | 8,778 |
| Clarksville | 0 | 32.3 | 10.9 | 7,833 |
| Colebrook | 35.67 | 16.3 | 7.2 | 8,057 |
| Columbia | 0 | 5.6 | 19.6 | 7,958 |
| Concord | 29.17 | 10.1 | 2.1 | 10,092 |
| Contoocook Valley | 14.02 | 10.1 | 6.3 | 9,975 |
| Conway | 20.08 | 11.8 | 3.2 | 8,272 |
| Cornish | 2.66 | 9.9 | 10.5 | 8,714 |
| Croydon | 0 | 14.6 | 22.9 | 7,409 |
| Deerfield | 6.37 | 13.2 | 11.6 | 10,196 |
| Derry | 27.26 | 11.8 | 2.8 | 10,542 |

| School Districts | Public Aid Per Capita | Families | | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | With Income Under \$4,000 | 1.9% | | |
| Dover | \$28.37 | 9.2% | 1.9% | | \$ 9,824 |
| Dummer | 4.25 | 24.1 | 42.5 | | 6,583 |
| Dunbarton | 4.49 | 11.4 | 5.6 | | 9,500 |
| East Kingston | 13.15 | 5.9 | 3.2 | | 10,388 |
| Eaton | .98 | 56.5 | 15.4 | | 8,600 |
| Epping | 33.46 | 7.4 | 6.6 | | 8,718 |
| Epsom | 26.50 | 8.4 | 10.0 | | 9,273 |
| Errol | 46.65 | 28.6 | 22.7 | | 9,269 |
| Exeter | 22.58 | 10.7 | 2.6 | | 9,460 |
| Fall Mountain Regional | 11.62 | 12.7 | 7.2 | | 8,683 |
| Farmington | 28.05 | 11.9 | 6.1 | | 8,844 |
| Franklin | 38.38 | 13.2 | 4.9 | | 9,276 |
| Freedom | 17.75 | 18.8 | 13.3 | | 6,483 |
| Fremont | 35.71 | 13.9 | 9.2 | | 9,315 |
| Gilford | 1.59 | 9.5 | 1.3 | | 11,590 |
| Gilmanton | 8.24 | 27.0 | 16.9 | | 8,782 |
| Goffstown | 7.39 | 9.5 | 1.6 | | 10,479 |
| Gorham | 36.54 | 13.5 | 24.5 | | 8,511 |
| Goshen-Lempster Coop. | 8.86 | 20.1 | 12.5 | | 7,362 |
| Governor Wentworth Regional | 15.22 | 17.3 | 10.2 | | 8,715 |
| Grantham | 13.62 | 20.2 | 11.4 | | 8,125 |
| Greenland | 11.32 | 5.3 | 1.5 | | 10,952 |
| Hampstead | 11.70 | 7.8 | 3.1 | | 9,775 |
| Hampton Falls | 13.29 | 10.0 | 1.4 | | 10,582 |
| Hampton Falls | 4.88 | 5.7 | 2.1 | | 10,711 |
| Hanover | .80 | 8.6 | 3.0 | | 13,953 |
| Harrisville | 13.65 | 17.6 | 16.2 | | 7,657 |
| Haverhill Coop. | 33.80 | 13.7 | 6.2 | | 8,150 |
| Henniker | 7.41 | 16.4 | 15.7 | | 8,291 |
| Hill | 28.20 | 16.8 | 10.0 | | 9,214 |
| Hillsboro-Deering | 17.45 | 11.5 | 7.6 | | 8,737 |
| Hinsdale | 26.30 | 10.5 | 3.5 | | 9,317 |
| Holderness | .17 | 12.1 | 4.8 | | 7,863 |
| Hollis | 1.44 | 19.1 | 2.9 | | 10,549 |
| Hooksett | 6.75 | 10.4 | 2.8 | | 10,456 |

| School Districts | Public Aid Per Capita | Families With Income Under \$4,000 | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Hopkinton | \$.70 | 6.48 | 5.38 | \$12,880 |
| Hudson | 12.52 | 5.0 | 1.1 | 11,406 |
| Inter-lakes Coop. | 20.26 | 11.5 | 7.7 | 9,263 |
| Jackson | 4.27 | 17.8 | 3.8 | 9,416 |
| Jaffrey-Rindge Coop. | 12.29 | 11.3 | 3.9 | 9,772 |
| Kearsarge Regional | 12.12 | 14.4 | 11.1 | 8,127 |
| Keene | 27.98 | 10.4 | 2.1 | 10,049 |
| Kensington | 1.93 | 16.7 | 5.1 | 9,735 |
| Laconia | 32.31 | 11.4 | 2.2 | 9,839 |
| Lafayette Regional | 14.63 | 37.3 | 7.5 | 8,800 |
| Landaff | 9.14 | 12.1 | 21.5 | 10,800 |
| Lebanon | 18.97 | 12.2 | 1.9 | 9,125 |
| Lincoln-Woodstock Coop. | 27.67 | 9.9 | 4.3 | 8,237 |
| Lisbon Regional | 11.53 | 23.7 | 13.2 | 11,043 |
| Litchfield | 5.59 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 11,151 |
| Littleton | 32.99 | 15.8 | 3.4 | 8,032 |
| Londonderry | 12.99 | 6.0 | 2.8 | 10,183 |
| Lyme | 9.77 | 7.1 | 11.6 | 9,111 |
| Lyndeborough | 6.80 | 9.0 | 14.3 | 12,778 |
| Madison | 3.28 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 8,916 |
| Manchester | 33.62 | 11.7 | 2.5 | 9,488 |
| Marlboro | 27.00 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 9,142 |
| Marlow | 9.81 | 13.7 | 26.6 | 7,543 |
| Mascenic Regional | 19.96 | 10.0 | 6.7 | 9,965 |
| Mascoma Valley Regional | 31.51 | 13.2 | 15.7 | 8,580 |
| Merrimack | 9.94 | 4.3 | 1.3 | 11,852 |
| Merrimack Valley | 2.61 | 11.3 | 7.5 | 9,009 |
| Middleton | .66 | 21.8 | 23.6 | 7,833 |
| Milan | 18.65 | 5.5 | 16.1 | 8,166 |
| Milford | 17.33 | 9.9 | 1.9 | 9,947 |
| Milton | 10.61 | 15.9 | 19.9 | 8,364 |
| Monadnock Regional | 19.04 | 13.0 | 8.4 | 8,887 |
| Monroe | 6.57 | 15.5 | 6.4 | 10,052 |
| Mont Vernon | 18.09 | 7.0 | 4.5 | 11,035 |
| Nashua | 22.84 | 8.4 | 1.7 | 10,866 |

| School Districts | Public Aid Per Capita | Families With Income Under \$4,000 | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Nelson | \$32.31 | 16.3% | 21.0% | \$ 7,208 |
| New Boston | 13.74 | 9.3 | 8.9 | 10,916 |
| New Castle | 0 | 11.5 | 1.2 | 13,860 |
| Newfields | 14.94 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 10,694 |
| Newfound Area | 18.64 | 16.1 | 13.6 | 8,604 |
| Newington | 28.11 | 10.1 | 3.8 | 10,486 |
| Newmarket | 29.71 | 13.0 | 3.1 | 8,714 |
| Newport | 18.40 | 10.6 | 6.5 | 8,963 |
| North Hampton | 7.47 | 10.6 | 0.9 | 10,860 |
| Northumberland | 20.15 | 12.5 | 5.8 | 8,350 |
| Northwood | 20.95 | 14.5 | 7.4 | 8,690 |
| Nottingham | 8.69 | 16.3 | 12.8 | 8,105 |
| Orford | 5.80 | 9.4 | 13.3 | 8,710 |
| Oyster River Coop. | 6.74 | 12.3 | 2.7 | 11,767 |
| Pelham | 9.71 | 8.4 | 1.3 | 11,010 |
| Pembroke | 18.09 | 8.9 | 2.5 | 9,825 |
| Piermont | 2.26 | 13.0 | 11.1 | 8,125 |
| Pittsburg | 14.67 | 10.2 | 20.5 | 7,625 |
| Pittsfield | 30.60 | 9.7 | 7.5 | 8,766 |
| Plainfield | 12.85 | 7.4 | 4.4 | 9,321 |
| Plymouth | 32.72 | 15.3 | 4.0 | 8,755 |
| Portsmouth | 55.05 | 12.5 | 2.0 | 8,704 |
| Randolph | 12.58 | 24.0 | 3.2 | 8,318 |
| Raymond | 36.63 | 15.4 | 5.7 | 8,600 |
| Rochester | 29.51 | 12.6 | 3.0 | 8,759 |
| Rollinsford | 15.38 | 9.9 | 2.2 | 10,102 |
| Rumney | 9.81 | 16.0 | 10.1 | 8,666 |
| Rye | 8.78 | 12.8 | 1.0 | 10,818 |
| Salem | 13.74 | 5.9 | 1.2 | 11,402 |
| Sanborn Regional | 4.00 | 11.9 | 4.3 | 9,008 |
| Seabrook | 41.70 | 9.5 | 6.1 | 9,438 |
| Shaker Regional | 8.83 | 9.3 | 6.8 | 9,154 |
| Shelburne | 0 | 30.9 | 13.7 | 9,083 |
| Somersworth | 24.46 | 11.8 | 1.5 | 9,933 |
| South Hampton | 0 | 16.8 | 3.0 | 10,535 |

| School Districts | Public Aid Per Capita | Families With Income Under \$4,000 | Housing Lacking Basic Facilities | Median Family Income |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Stark | \$18.82 | 7.4% | 9.7% | \$ 6,333 |
| Stewartstown | 16.33 | 18.4 | 11.0 | 8,088 |
| Stoddard | 8.18 | 8.6 | 16.3 | 9,818 |
| Stratford | 6.85 | 19.1 | 10.3 | 9,656 |
| Stratford | 61.10 | 21.7 | 30.0 | 7,136 |
| Stratham | 13.62 | 17.4 | 2.2 | 9,716 |
| Sunapee | 3.41 | 17.5 | 5.6 | 8,175 |
| Tamworth | 4.17 | 21.7 | 10.2 | 5,478 |
| Thornton | 0 | 22.6 | 19.8 | 7,468 |
| Timberlane Regional | 15.34 | 8.1 | 3.1 | 11,180 |
| Unity | .22 | 31.4 | 18.1 | 7,764 |
| Wakefield | 43.96 | 17.8 | 9.5 | 7,480 |
| Warren | 27.06 | 14.8 | 19.7 | 7,375 |
| Washington | 10.64 | 8.5 | 38.0 | 10,550 |
| Waterville Valley | 0 | 9.4 | | 16,111 |
| Weare | 14.82 | 2.3 | 12.3 | 10,135 |
| Wentworth | 16.52 | | 24.0 | 9,452 |
| Westmoreland | 11.55 | 14.6 | 7.5 | 9,875 |
| White Mountain Regional | 23.13 | 15.1 | 5.8 | 7,901 |
| Wilton | 24.57 | 15.6 | 3.2 | 8,346 |
| Winchester | 39.86 | 6.6 | 8.7 | 8,860 |
| Windham | 12.59 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 12,325 |
| Windsor | 0 | | 6.7 | 11,000 |
| Winnisquam Regional | 31.35 | 14.1 | 6.0 | 8,404 |



EXHIBIT 2 - III

Elements of Educational Disadvantage
Parents' View

1. What kinds of things do you believe cause some children not to do their best in school?*

| | Yes | Percentage | No | Percentage |
|--|-----|------------|-----|------------|
| Negative peer influence | 7 | 3.7 | 182 | 96.3 |
| Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school) | 37 | 19.6 | 152 | 80.4 |
| Parental attitudes | 23 | 12.2 | 166 | 87.8 |
| Teacher attitudes | 69 | 36.5 | 120 | 63.5 |
| Relations with peers | 10 | 5.3 | 179 | 94.7 |
| Parental behavior problems | 5 | 2.6 | 184 | 97.4 |
| Home environment (specific factors not identified) | 12 | 6.3 | 177 | 93.7 |
| Improper care in home | 13 | 6.9 | 176 | 93.1 |
| Family disruption or problems | 39 | 20.6 | 150 | 79.4 |
| Immaturity | 10 | 5.3 | 179 | 94.7 |
| Lack of preschool education | 19 | 10.1 | 170 | 89.9 |
| Poor study habits | 2 | 1.1 | 187 | 98.9 |
| Emotional or psychiatric problems | 21 | 11.1 | 168 | 88.9 |
| Hyperactivity | 6 | 3.2 | 183 | 96.8 |
| Negative social behavior | 4 | 2.1 | 185 | 97.9 |
| Truancy | 3 | 1.6 | 186 | 98.4 |
| Speech problems | 8 | 4.2 | 181 | 95.8 |
| Physically handicapping conditions | 21 | 11.1 | 168 | 88.9 |
| Inappropriate ability-grouping | 8 | 4.2 | 181 | 95.8 |
| Low interest in or motivation for school work | 27 | 14.3 | 162 | 85.7 |
| Crowded or noisy schools and classes | 18 | 9.5 | 171 | 90.5 |
| Learning or reading disabilities | 31 | 16.4 | 158 | 83.6 |
| Student dislike of teacher/school | 22 | 11.6 | 167 | 88.4 |
| Home/school teacher value conflict | 2 | 1.1 | 187 | 98.9 |
| Poor parent/school teacher communication/cooperation | 3 | 1.6 | 186 | 98.4 |
| Teacher ability or classroom performance | 37 | 19.6 | 152 | 80.4 |
| Curriculum too accelerated | 5 | 2.6 | 184 | 97.4 |

*In this and succeeding exhibits, miscellaneous, don't know, no answer and not codeable replies are excluded for purposes of brevity.

2b. Which ones (apply)?

| | Yes | Percentage | No | Percentage |
|--|-----|------------|-----|------------|
| Overly permissive; lack of discipline | 21 | 12.4 | 148 | 87.6 |
| Parental attitudes | 4 | 2.4 | 165 | 97.6 |
| Teacher attitudes | 48 | 28.4 | 121 | 71.6 |
| Relations with peers | 37 | 1.8 | 166 | 98.2 |
| Parental behavior problems | 4 | 2.4 | 165 | 97.6 |
| Home environment | 8 | 4.7 | 161 | 95.3 |
| Improper care in home | 10 | 5.9 | 159 | 94.1 |
| Family disruption or problems | 24 | 14.2 | 145 | 85.8 |
| Immaturity | 8 | 4.7 | 161 | 95.3 |
| Lack of preschool education | 11 | 6.5 | 158 | 93.5 |
| Poor study habits | 0 | 0.0 | 169 | 100.0 |
| Emotional or psychiatric problems | 16 | 9.5 | 153 | 90.5 |
| Hyperactivity | 9 | 5.3 | 160 | 94.7 |
| Negative social behavior | 10 | 5.9 | 159 | 94.1 |
| Truancy | 4 | 2.4 | 165 | 97.6 |
| Speech problems | 13 | 7.7 | 156 | 92.3 |
| Physical handicaps | 26 | 15.4 | 143 | 84.6 |
| Inappropriate ability-grouping | 4 | 2.4 | 165 | 97.6 |
| Low interest or motivation | 23 | 13.6 | 146 | 86.4 |
| Crowded or noisy classes | 6 | 3.6 | 163 | 96.4 |
| Learning or reading disabilities | 32 | 18.9 | 137 | 81.1 |
| Student dislike of teacher/school | 15 | 8.9 | 154 | 91.1 |
| Home/school teacher value conflict | 1 | 0.6 | 168 | 99.4 |
| Poor parent/school teacher communication/cooperation | 3 | 1.8 | 166 | 98.2 |
| Teacher ability or classroom performance | 18 | 10.7 | 151 | 89.3 |
| Curriculum too accelerated | 2 | 1.2 | 167 | 98.8 |

4a. Have any of your children needed help you felt was not available in the schools?

50 26.9 136 73.1

4b. If yes (Question #4a), what kind of help (was not available)?

| | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Communication - (1) | 2.1 |
| Tutoring - (6) | 12.5 |
| Teachers' aides - (1) | 2.1 |
| Preschool education - (1) | 2.1 |
| Special classes - (24) | 50.0 |
| Individualized instruction - (4) | 8.3 |
| Guidance/psychological help - (5) | 10.4 |
| Vocational/technical classes - (1) | 2.1 |

8a. What do you think schools should provide for your children as far as their futures are concerned?

| | <u>Percentage</u> |
|---|-------------------|
| Preparation for life - (18) | 11.5 |
| More discipline/responsibility - (8) | 5.1 |
| Basic education - (61) | 38.9 |
| Education in social relations - (5) | 3.2 |
| Practical/life-relevant courses - (37) | 23.6 |
| Special education for handicapped/or retarded - (3) | 1.9 |
| Better/earlier diagnosis of problems - (2) | 1.3 |
| Intellectual stimulation - (2) | 1.3 |
| Better teacher-student relations - (1) | 0.6 |
| Individual attention - (3) | 1.9 |
| Career and psychological counseling - (8) | 5.1 |

16. How important do you think the following student achievements are to school-age children of today?

| Graduation from elementary school | | Graduation from high school | | Learning a trade or work skill | | Achieving good grades | | Involvement in non-study school activities | | Working part time to help the family | | Completing study assignments | | Learning to get along with others | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Fairly Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
| 167 | 88.4 | 14 | 7.4 | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | 58 | 30.7 | 7 | 3.7 | 81 | 42.9 | 81 | 42.9 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 166 | 87.8 | 19 | 10.1 | 3 | 1.6 | 39 | 20.6 | 72 | 38.1 |
| | | | | 2 | 1.1 | 121 | 64.0 | | | | | | | | |

| Taking part in class discussions | | Fairly | | Not very | |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Very | Percentage | Important | Percentage | Important | Percentage |
| 111 | 58.7 | 63 | 33.3 | 12 | 6.3 |
| Preparing for college | | Fairly | | Not very | |
| Very | Percentage | Important | Percentage | Important | Percentage |
| 69 | 36.5 | 65 | 34.4 | 50 | 26.4 |

EXHIBIT 3 - III

Elements of Educational Disadvantage
Professionals' View

1. Can you provide a general background picture of the child who is not likely to do well in school?

| | Yes | Percentage | No | Percentage |
|---|-----|------------|----|------------|
| Economic background | 19 | 26.4 | 53 | 73.6 |
| Teacher ability | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Teacher/administrator attitudes | 2 | 2.8 | 70 | 97.2 |
| Lack of special programs | 2 | 2.8 | 70 | 97.2 |
| Permissiveness in home/school | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Negative parental attitudes toward school | 2 | 2.8 | 70 | 97.2 |
| Inappropriate ability grouping | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Experiential deprivation | 9 | 12.5 | 63 | 87.5 |
| Cultural deprivation | 13 | 18.1 | 59 | 81.9 |
| Family problems/disruption | 18 | 25.0 | 54 | 75.0 |
| Home environment | 4 | 5.6 | 68 | 94.4 |
| Improper child care | 15 | 20.8 | 57 | 79.2 |
| Physical handicaps | 21 | 29.2 | 51 | 70.8 |
| Learning disabilities | 28 | 38.9 | 44 | 61.1 |
| Emotional/psychological problems | 26 | 36.1 | 46 | 63.9 |
| Poor/negative self-image | 7 | 9.7 | 65 | 90.3 |
| Low interest or motivation | 13 | 18.1 | 59 | 81.9 |
| Speech problems | 7 | 9.7 | 65 | 90.3 |
| Low achievement | 2 | 2.8 | 70 | 97.2 |
| Negative peer influence | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 100.0 |
| Poor peer relations | 4 | 5.6 | 68 | 94.4 |
| Hyperactivity | 9 | 12.5 | 63 | 87.5 |
| Immaturity | 12 | 16.7 | 60 | 83.3 |
| Home/school value conflict | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Physical appearance | 5 | 6.9 | 67 | 93.1 |
| Lack of preschool education | 3 | 4.2 | 69 | 95.8 |
| Working parents | 3 | 4.2 | 69 | 95.8 |
| Negative social behavior | 12 | 16.7 | 60 | 83.3 |
| Truancy | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 100.0 |
| Legal problems | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |

2a and
2b.

Why do some of these problems (Question #1) occur in your view?
Are there common home or educational experiences which seem to
cause these problems?

| | Yes | Percentage | No | Percentage |
|--|-----|------------|----|------------|
| Economic background | 27 | 37.5 | 45 | 62.5 |
| Teacher ability | 4 | 5.6 | 68 | 94.4 |
| Teacher/administrator attitudes | 6 | 8.3 | 66 | 91.7 |
| Lack of special programs | 6 | 8.3 | 66 | 91.7 |
| Permissiveness in home/school | 10 | 13.9 | 62 | 86.1 |
| Negative parental attitudes toward school | 7 | 9.7 | 65 | 90.3 |
| Inappropriate ability grouping | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Experiential deprivation | 18 | 25.0 | 54 | 75.0 |
| Cultural deprivation | 14 | 19.4 | 58 | 80.6 |
| Family problems/disruption | 29 | 40.3 | 43 | 59.7 |

2c. What are some of the common signals that you feel identify
students who need special help?

| | Yes | Percentage | No | Percentage |
|--|-----|------------|----|------------|
| Economic background | 2 | 2.8 | 69 | 97.2 |
| Teacher ability | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Teacher/administrator attitudes | 1 | 1.4 | 70 | 98.6 |
| Lack of special programs | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Permissiveness in home/school | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Negative parental attitudes toward school | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Inappropriate ability grouping | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Experiential deprivation | 2 | 2.8 | 69 | 97.2 |
| Cultural deprivation | 1 | 1.4 | 70 | 98.6 |
| Family problems/disruption | 1 | 1.4 | 70 | 98.6 |
| Home environment | 1 | 1.4 | 70 | 98.6 |
| Improper child care | 5 | 7.0 | 66 | 93.0 |
| Physical handicaps | 13 | 18.3 | 58 | 81.7 |
| Learning disabilities | 16 | 22.5 | 55 | 77.5 |
| Emotional/psychological problems | 40 | 56.3 | 31 | 43.7 |
| Poor/negative self-image | 1 | 1.4 | 70 | 98.6 |
| Low interest or motivation | 11 | 15.5 | 60 | 84.5 |
| Speech problems | 4 | 5.6 | 67 | 94.4 |
| Low achievement | 19 | 26.8 | 52 | 73.2 |
| Negative peer influence | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Poor peer relations | 8 | 11.3 | 63 | 88.7 |
| Hyperactivity | 8 | 11.3 | 63 | 88.7 |
| Immaturity | 6 | 8.5 | 65 | 91.5 |
| Home/school value conflict | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |
| Physical appearance | 3 | 4.2 | 68 | 95.8 |
| Lack of preschool education | 1 | 1.4 | 70 | 98.6 |
| Working parents | 0 | 0.0 | 71 | 100.0 |

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Negative social behavior | 19 | 26.8 | 52 | 73.2 |
| Truancy | 2 | 2.8 | 69 | 97.2 |
| Legal problems | 1 | 1.4 | 70 | 98.6 |

3. Could you list in order of importance the areas of disadvantage which lead to educational problems?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Economic background | 22 | 30.6 | 50 | 69.4 |
| Teacher ability | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 100.0 |
| Teacher/administrator attitudes | 5 | 6.9 | 67 | 93.1 |
| Lack of special programs | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 100.0 |
| Permissiveness in home/school | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Negative parental attitudes toward school | 4 | 5.6 | 68 | 94.4 |
| Inappropriate ability grouping | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Experiential deprivation | 17 | 23.6 | 55 | 76.4 |
| Cultural deprivation | 7 | 9.7 | 65 | 90.3 |
| Family problems/disruption | 15 | 20.8 | 57 | 79.2 |
| Home environment | 5 | 6.9 | 67 | 93.1 |
| Improper child care | 19 | 26.4 | 53 | 73.6 |
| Physical handicaps | 18 | 25.0 | 54 | 75.0 |
| Learning disabilities | 12 | 16.7 | 60 | 83.3 |
| Emotional/psychological problems | 11 | 15.3 | 61 | 84.7 |
| Poor/negative self-image | 8 | 11.1 | 64 | 88.9 |
| Low interest or motivation | 4 | 5.6 | 68 | 94.4 |
| Speech problems | 3 | 4.2 | 69 | 95.8 |
| Low achievement | 3 | 4.2 | 69 | 95.8 |
| Negative peer influence | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Poor peer relations | 4 | 5.6 | 68 | 94.4 |
| Hyperactivity | 2 | 2.8 | 70 | 97.2 |
| Immaturity | 5 | 6.9 | 67 | 93.1 |
| Home/school value conflict | 3 | 4.2 | 69 | 95.8 |
| Physical appearance | 1 | 1.4 | 71 | 98.6 |
| Lack of preschool education | 2 | 2.8 | 70 | 97.2 |
| Working parents | 2 | 2.8 | 70 | 97.2 |
| Negative social behavior | 3 | 4.2 | 69 | 95.8 |
| Truancy | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 100.0 |
| Legal problems | 0 | 0.0 | 72 | 100.0 |

13d. Within the disadvantaged parents group, what do you see as blocks to effective involvement with the problems of their children?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Working parent/lack of time | 11 | 15.3 | 61 | 84.7 |
| Parental emotional/psychological problems | 4 | 5.6 | 68 | 94.4 |
| Parental self-image | 14 | 19.4 | 58 | 80.6 |
| Communication problems | 9 | 12.5 | 63 | 87.5 |

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Percentage</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Percentage</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Lack of education/knowledge | 9 | 12.5 | 63 | 87.5 |
| Negative attitude toward schools | 12 | 16.7 | 60 | 83.3 |
| Defensiveness concerning children's problems | 6 | 8.3 | 66 | 91.7 |
| Lack of information concerning: Their rights; who to see; their children's problems | 6 | 8.3 | 66 | 91.7 |

EXHIBIT 4 - III

Elements of Educational Disadvantage
Comparison of Parental and Professional Views

13b (Parent Form) and 14b (School Form).

Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school. (Rate the extent to which they disrupt good performance).

| | Percentages Across | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | <u>Very Responsible</u> | <u>Responsible</u> | <u>Not Responsible</u> | <u>Total Responding</u> |
| <u>Good Medical Care Not Available</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 42.6 | 41.2 | 16.2 | 68 |
| Parents | 37.2 | 38.8 | 24.0 | 183 |
| Total | | | | 251 |
| <u>House Without Modern Plumbing, Electricity or Heat</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 19.7 | 54.5 | 25.8 | 66 |
| Parents | 32.8 | 35.5 | 31.7 | 183 |
| Total | | | | 249 |
| <u>Shortage of Clothes</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 26.1 | 52.2 | 21.7 | 69 |
| Parents | 34.8 | 44.4 | 20.9 | 187 |
| Total | | | | 251 |
| <u>Not Enough Good Food</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 65.7 | 30.0 | 4.3 | 70 |
| Parents | 49.2 | 39.2 | 11.6 | 181 |
| Total | | | | 251 |
| <u>No Preschool Education</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 55.1 | 24.6 | 20.3 | 69 |
| Parents | 52.4 | 28.1 | 19.5 | 185 |
| Total | | | | 254 |
| <u>Not Enough Family Income</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 47.1 | 42.6 | 10.3 | 68 |
| Parents | 28.0 | 45.5 | 26.5 | 189 |
| Total | | | | 257 |
| <u>Use of Drugs or Alcohol</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 49.3 | 44.8 | 6.0 | 67 |
| Parents | 69.9 | 19.1 | 10.9 | 183 |
| Total | | | | 250 |
| <u>Only One Parent in Home</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 50.0 | 41.4 | 8.6 | 70 |
| Parents | 26.8 | 45.8 | 27.4 | 179 |
| Total | | | | 249 |

Percentages Across

Unemployment

| | <u>Very Responsible</u> | <u>Responsible</u> | <u>Not Responsible</u> | <u>Total Responding</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Professionals | 40.6 | 52.2 | 7.2 | 69 |
| Parents | 27.9 | 41.5 | 30.6 | 183 |
| Total | | | | 252 |
| <u>Parents With Limited Education</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 52.1 | 39.4 | 8.5 | 71 |
| Parents | 24.2 | 33.3 | 42.5 | 186 |
| Total | | | | 257 |
| <u>Parents' Health</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 25.4 | 67.2 | 7.5 | 67 |
| Parents | 21.6 | 48.1 | 30.3 | 185 |
| Total | | | | 252 |
| <u>Family Mobility</u> | | | | |
| Professionals | 40.4 | 47.1 | 12.9 | 70 |
| Parents | 9.7 | 25.8 | 64.5 | 186 |
| Total | | | | 256 |

15b (Parent Form) and 16b (School Form).

Which of the following conditions most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

Percentages Across

Overweight

| | <u>Most Limit</u> | <u>Less Limit</u> | <u>Total Responding</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Professionals | 11.1 | 88.9 | 72 |
| Parents | 16.4 | 83.6 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Contagious Diseases</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 12.5 | 87.5 | 72 |
| Parents | 27.0 | 73.0 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Mental Illness</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 38.9 | 61.1 | 72 |
| Parents | 54.0 | 46.0 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Learning Disabilities</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 58.3 | 41.7 | 72 |
| Parents | 55.0 | 45.0 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Retardation</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 51.4 | 48.6 | 72 |
| Parents | 56.6 | 43.4 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Crippling Physical Handicaps</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 18.1 | 81.9 | 72 |
| Parents | 44.4 | 55.6 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |

Percentages Across

Poor Vision

| | <u>Most Limit</u> | <u>Less Limit</u> | <u>Total Responding</u> |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Professionals | 40.3 | 59.7 | 72 |
| Parents | 64.6 | 35.4 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Poor Hearing</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 38.9 | 61.1 | 72 |
| Parents | 63.5 | 36.5 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Not Able to Understand What is Being Taught</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 0.0 | 100.0 | 72 |
| Parents | 63.0 | 37.0 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Physical Defects</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 22.2 | 77.8 | 72 |
| Parents | 34.9 | 65.1 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Underweight</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 15.3 | 84.7 | 72 |
| Parents | 16.9 | 83.1 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Emotional Nervousness</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 52.8 | 47.2 | 72 |
| Parents | 51.9 | 48.1 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |

17a (Parent Form) and 17a (School Form).

17b (Parent Form) and 17b (School Form).

What is the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems?

What do you think is the attitude of a child with educational problems toward the schools?

Percentages Across

| | <u>Positive</u> | <u>Neutral</u> | <u>Negative</u> | <u>Total Responding</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Professionals | 80.9 | 8.8 | 10.3 | 68 |
| Parents | 45.1 | 38.6 | 16.3 | 184 |
| Total | | | | 252 |

Percentages Across

| | <u>Positive</u> | <u>Neutral</u> | <u>Negative</u> | <u>Total Responding</u> |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Professionals | 43.7 | 21.9 | 34.4 | 64 |
| Parents | 15.1 | 39.7 | 45.3 | 179 |
| Total | | | | 243 |

SECTION IV

The Perception of Needs By Type of District

In Section II we described the process of selecting the sample of school districts within which the interviews which made up our field survey were to be conducted. This process included an analysis of population differences in districts which enabled a distinction to be made between urban, suburban and rural districts. It also included an analysis in order that the districts could be separated into those with favorable, average and unfavorable economic conditions. Lastly, it included a comparative analysis of the recorded level of achievement by students in each school district as measured by Stanford and Otis test scores so that the districts could be separated as to good, average and poor levels of achievement.

In Section III, we have analyzed the responses to questions designed to reveal the elements which, in the opinion of both of our sample groups, make up educational disadvantage in our state. The question to be answered in this part of Section IV is whether, if we look at the differing ways in which key questions are answered in the nine categories of districts alluded to above, we can begin to discern patterns in the occurrence of educational disadvantage.

The purpose here is to go beyond the description of educational disadvantage in order to identify the deficiencies the sample identified as likely to occur in each type of district. The final goal of this study is to enable both school districts and Title I planning personnel (a) to design programs which are accurately aimed at real educational disadvantages as identified by their parents and school personnel; and (b) to develop a sufficient level of awareness so that the programs they design will truly answer needs of their particular districts.

Needs Identified By the Interviewees

Exhibit 1 shows some of the key elements of educational disadvantage identified by both the parent and professional groups. It is apparent that in the opinion of both groups there are broad differences in the degree of occurrence of these indicators in different kinds of districts. These elements are further identified below in order of priority in each of the nine district breakdowns.

Elements of Educational Disadvantage

Views of Parents by Type of District

Yes - Good

Teacher attitudes
Overly permissive;
lack of discipline
(home/school)
Lack of preschool
education
Family disruption or
problems
Learning or reading
disabilities

SES
Yes - Average

Teacher attitudes
Family disruption or
problems
Teacher ability or
classroom per-
formance
Overly permissive;
lack of discipline
(home/school)
Parental attitudes
Emotional or psychiatric
problems

Yes - Poor

Teacher attitudes
Low interest in or
motivation for
school work
Learning or reading
disabilities
Student dislike of
teacher/school
Family disruption
or problems
Teacher ability or
classroom per-
formance

Yes - Good

Overly permissive;
lack of discipline
(home/school)
Teacher attitudes
Teacher ability or
classroom per-
formance
Lack of preschool
education
Family disruption or
problems
Crowded or noisy schools
and classes

Achievement Score
Yes - Average

Teacher attitudes
Family disruption or
problems
Teacher ability or
classroom per-
formance
Parental attitudes
Learning or reading
disabilities

Yes - Poor

Teacher attitudes
Low interest in or
motivation for
school work
Student dislike of
teacher/school
Learning or reading
disabilities
Family disruption or
problems

Yes - Urban

Teacher attitudes
Teacher ability or
classroom per-
formance
Family disruption or
problems
Low interest in or
motivation for
school work
Overly permissive;
lack of discipline
(home/school)
Parental attitudes

Type of District
Yes - Suburban

Teacher attitudes
Overly permissive;
lack of discipline
(home/school)
Lack of preschool
education
Learning or reading
disabilities
Teacher ability or
classroom per-
formance

Yes - Rural

Teacher attitudes
Family disruption
or problems
Learning or reading
disabilities
Overly permissive;
lack of discipline
(home/school)
Student dislike of
teacher/school

Elements of Educational Disadvantage

Views of Professionals by Type of District

SES

Yes - Good

Emotional/psychological problems
 Cultural deprivation
 Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Immaturity: emotional, mental and physical
 Family problems/disruption
 Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
 Negative social behaviors

Yes - Average

Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
 Emotional/psychological problems
 Economic background
 Family problems/disruption
 Improper child care

Yes - Poor

Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Economic background
 Family problems/disruption
 Improper child care
 Emotional/psychological problems
 Poor/negative self-image

Achievement Score

Yes - Good

Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
 Emotional/psychological problems
 Family problems/disruption
 Cultural deprivation
 Low interest in or motivation for school work
 Immaturity: emotional, mental and physical

Yes - Average

Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Emotional/psychological problems
 Economic background
 Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
 Family problems/disruption
 Improper child care

Yes - Poor

Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Economic background
 Low interest in or motivation for school work
 Experiential deprivation
 Family problems/disruption
 Improper child care

Type of District

Yes - Urban

Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Physically handicapping conditions: Health problems, heredity, etc.
 Emotional/psychological problems
 Improper child care
 Economic background

Yes - Suburban

Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Emotional/psychological problems
 Family problems/disruption
 Cultural deprivation
 Physically handicapping conditions: health problems, heredity, etc.
 Immaturity: emotional, mental and physical

Yes - Rural

Economic background
 Emotional/psychological problems
 Cultural deprivation
 Family problems/disruption
 Learning disabilities: mental retardation, short attention, etc.
 Low interest in or motivation for school work

Environmental and Health Needs

Exhibit 2 shows the different patterns of answers to Questions 13b and 14b and 15b and 16b in which both groups of interviewees were asked to prioritize the importance of specific environmental and health deficiencies in terms of their effect in making it more difficult for children to maintain satisfactory performance in school. Below we list the priorities ascribed to these factors in each of the types of districts. In the case of Questions 13b and 14b, the total sample has been divided to obtain separate preference lists.

Environmental Sources of Disadvantage

Views of Parents by Type of District

| <u>SES</u> | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Good</u> No preschool education Use of drugs or alcohol Not enough good food House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat Good medical care not available</p> | <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Average</u> Use of drugs or alcohol No preschool education Not enough good food Good medical care not available Only one parent in the home Shortage of clothes</p> | <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Poor</u> Use of drugs or alcohol Not enough good food No preschool education Good medical care not available Shortage of clothes Parents with limited education</p> |
| <u>Achievement Score</u> | | |
| <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Good</u> Use of drugs or alcohol No preschool education House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat Not enough good food Good medical care not available</p> | <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Average</u> Use of drugs or alcohol No preschool education Not enough good food Good medical care not available Shortage of clothes</p> | <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Poor</u> Use of drugs or alcohol Not enough good food No preschool education Good medical care not available Shortage of clothes</p> |
| <u>Type of District</u> | | |
| <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Urban</u> Use of drugs or alcohol No preschool education Not enough good food Only one parent in the home Shortage of clothes</p> | <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Suburban</u> Use of drugs or alcohol No preschool education House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat Not enough good food Shortage of clothes Good medical care not available</p> | <p><u>Very Responsible</u> <u>Rural</u> Use of drugs or alcohol Not enough good food No preschool education Good medical care not available House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat</p> |

Environmental Sources of Disadvantage

Views of Professionals by Type of District

SES

Very Responsible
Good

Not enough good food
Good medical care not available
No preschool education
Only one parent in the home
Unemployment

Very Responsible
Average

Not enough good food
No preschool education
Only one parent in the home
Use of drugs or alcohol
Not enough family income

Very Responsible
Poor

Parents with limited education
Not enough good food
No preschool education
Inadequate family transportation
Good medical care not available

Achievement Score

Very Responsible
Good

Not enough good food
Only one parent in the home
Good medical care not available
House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat
Not enough family income
Unemployment
Use of drugs or alcohol

Very Responsible
Average

Not enough good food
No preschool education
Use of drugs or alcohol
Only one parent in the home
Parents with limited education
Unemployment

Very Responsible
Poor

Parents with limited education
Not enough good food
No preschool education
Use of drugs or alcohol
Inadequate family transportation

Type of District

Very Responsible
Urban

Not enough good food
Use of drugs or alcohol
Only one parent in the home
No preschool education
Parents with limited education

Very Responsible
Suburban

Not enough good food
Only one parent in the home
Not enough family income
Good medical care not available
No preschool education
Unemployment

Very Responsible
Rural

Not enough good food
No preschool education
Parents with limited education
Good medical care not available
Inadequate family transportation
Not enough family income

Sources of Educational Disadvantage Related to Health

Combined Views by Parents and Professionals by Type of District

| Most Limiting <u>Good</u> | SES Most Limiting <u>Average</u> | Most Limiting <u>Poor</u> |
|--|--|--|
| Retardation Poor vision Poor hearing Learning disabilities Mental illness | Poor vision Poor hearing Learning disabilities Emotional nervousness Retardation Not able to understand what is being taught | Retardation Learning disabilities Poor vision Mental illness Poor hearing Emotional nervousness Not able to understand what is being taught |
| Most Limiting <u>Good</u> | <u>Achievement Score</u> Most Limiting <u>Average</u> | Most Limiting <u>Poor</u> |
| Poor vision Poor hearing Learning disabilities Retardation Emotional nervousness Mental illness Not able to understand what is being taught | Poor vision Poor hearing Learning disabilities Retardation Emotional nervousness | Retardation Learning disabilities Poor vision Poor hearing Mental illness Emotional nervousness Not able to understand what is being taught |
| Most Limiting <u>Urban</u> | <u>Type of District</u> Most Limiting <u>Suburban</u> | Most Limiting <u>Rural</u> |
| Learning disabilities Poor hearing Poor vision Emotional nervousness Retardation | Retardation Poor vision Poor hearing Learning disabilities Emotional nervousness Mental illness | Poor vision Poor hearing Learning disabilities Retardation Mental illness Not able to understand what is being taught Emotional nervousness |

Awareness of Programs

Exhibit 3 shows the answers to a number of questions which occurred on one or the other or both instruments which were designed to demonstrate the level of awareness of the availability of programs both inside and outside the school system which could be used to assist students who were unable to maintain a satisfactory level of performance. The following percentages are an average of responses in the nine types of districts and indicate different cumulative levels of awareness in each type of district. All of the questions were averaged except for Question 7 on the school form.

Cumulative Awareness by Type of District

| <u>SES</u> | | | <u>Achievement Score</u> | | | <u>Type of District</u> | | |
|------------|---------|------|--------------------------|---------|------|-------------------------|----------|-------|
| Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| 52.8 | 61.2 | 62.8 | 50.6 | 61.7 | 60.7 | 62.0 | 56.3 | 59.8 |

The Roles of School Personnel

Exhibit 4 shows how the roles of school personnel were perceived in each type of district by both the parent and professional interviewees.

Program Needs

Exhibit 5 shows the preferences of the sample for different ameliorative emphases in school programming by type of district.

Participation and Support

The questions in this section are those which were designed to measure relative degrees of participation and support by the parents of educationally disadvantaged children. The lists which follow show the differences in the thinking of the total sample in response to Questions 12a and 13a and 14 and 15 by type of district. (See Exhibit 6)

Participation and Involvement by Parents

Combined Views of Parents and Professionals by Type of District

| | <u>SES</u> | |
|--|--|--|
| <u>Yes - Good</u> | <u>Yes - Average</u> | <u>Yes - Poor</u> |
| Individual conferences with teachers | Individual conferences with teachers | Individual conferences with teachers |
| Parents' nights | Parents' nights | Parents' nights |
| Meetings with principals | Meetings with principals | Meetings with principals |
| Specifically requesting more information | Specifically requesting more information | Specifically requesting more information |
| Parent-Teacher organizations | Parent-Teacher organizations | Parent-Teacher organizations |
| <u>Yes - Good</u> | <u>Achievement Score</u> | |
| <u>Yes - Good</u> | <u>Yes - Average</u> | <u>Yes - Poor</u> |
| Individual conferences with teachers | Individual conferences with teachers | Individual conferences with teachers |
| Parents' nights | Parents' nights | Parents' nights |
| Meetings with principals | Meetings with principals | Meetings with principals |
| Specifically requesting more information | Specifically requesting more information | Specifically requesting more information |
| Parent-Teacher organizations | Parent-Teacher organizations | Parent-Teacher organizations |
| <u>Yes - Urban</u> | <u>Type of District</u> | |
| <u>Yes - Urban</u> | <u>Yes - Suburban</u> | <u>Yes - Rural</u> |
| Individual conferences with teachers | Individual conferences with teachers | Individual conferences with teachers |
| Parents' nights | Parents' nights | Parents' nights |
| Meetings with principals | Meetings with principals | Meetings with principals |
| Specifically requesting more information | Specifically requesting more information | Specifically requesting more information |
| Parent-Teacher organizations | Parent-Teacher organizations | Parent-Teacher organizations |

Methods of Student Support Compared

Combined Views of Parents and Professionals by Type of District

| <u>Most Helpful Good</u> | <u>SES Most Helpful Average</u> | <u>Most Helpful Poor</u> |
|--|--|--|
| Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child A happy home Encouragement to do well by parents Frequent good family discussions Having reference books and other study aids available | Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child Encouragement to do well by parents A happy home Having reference books and other study aids available Frequent good family discussions | Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child A happy home Encouragement to do well by parents Frequent good family discussions Having reference books and other study aids available |

| <u>Most Helpful Good</u> | <u>Achievement Score Most Helpful Average</u> | <u>Most Helpful Poor</u> |
|--|--|--|
| Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child Encouragement to do well by parents A happy home Frequent good family discussions Having reference books and other study aids available | Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child A happy home Encouragement to do well by parents Frequent good family discussions Having reference books and other study aids available | Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child A happy home Encouragement to do well by parents Having reference books and other study aids available Frequent good family discussions |

| <u>Most Helpful Urban</u> | <u>Type of District Most Helpful Suburban</u> | <u>Most Helpful Rural</u> |
|--|--|--|
| Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child A happy home Encouragement to do well by parents Having reference books and other study aids available Frequent good family discussions | Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child Frequent good family discussions A happy home Encouragement to do well by parents Having reference books and other study aids available | Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child Encouragement to do well by parents A happy home Having reference books and other study aids available Frequent good family discussions |

Attitudinal Questions

Exhibit 7 brings together questions which measure the attitudes of the respondents towards various prospective student achievements as well as other attitudinal questions. The lists which follow illustrate the differences in answers to Question 16 by type of district.

Comparative Importance of Student Achievements

Views of the Parents by Type of District

SES

Very Important
Good

Graduation from elementary school
Graduation from high school
Learning a trade or work skill
Completing study assignments
Learning to get along with others

Very Important
Average

Graduation from high school
Graduation from elementary school
Learning a trade or work skill
Learning to get along with others
Completing study assignments

Very Important
Poor

Learning to get along with others
Graduation from high school
Learning a trade or work skill
Completing study assignments
Graduation from elementary school

Achievement Score

Very Important
Good

Graduation from elementary school
Graduation from high school
Completing study assignments
Learning a trade or work skill
Learning to get along with others

Very Important
Average

Graduation from high school
Graduation from elementary school
Learning a trade or work skill
Learning to get along with others
Completing study assignments

Very Important
Poor

Learning to get along with others
Graduation from high school
Learning a trade or work skill
Graduation from elementary school
Completing study assignments

Type of District

Very Important
Urban

Graduation from high school
Graduation from elementary school
Learning a trade or work skill
Learning to get along with others
Completing study assignments

Very Important
Suburban

Graduation from elementary school
Graduation from high school
Learning a trade or work skill
Completing study assignments
Achieving good grades

Very Important
Rural

Graduation from high school
Learning a trade or work skill
Graduation from elementary school
Learning to get along with others
Completing study assignments

Special Program Funding

Two questions with regard to the perception by professionals as to funding of special programs were asked. (See Exhibit 8)

Children in Special Education

Exhibit 9 contains the income distribution of families with children receiving special education by type of district. It is included in order to indicate the degree to which parents in the different types of economic, achievement and population districts differ as to the likelihood that their disadvantaged children will receive special education.

EXHIBIT 1 - IV

Educational Disadvantage By Type of School District
Parent Form

1. What kinds of things do you believe cause some children not to do their best in school?

(Overly permissive; lack of discipline (home/school))

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 32.7 | 18.7 | 42.9 | 13.0 | 13.4 | 40.0 | 17.5 |
| No | 67.3 | 81.2 | 57.1 | 87.0 | 86.6 | 60.0 | 82.5 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Teacher attitudes)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 8.2 | 13.5 | 2.9 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 8.6 | 12.3 |
| No | 91.8 | 86.5 | 97.1 | 84.0 | 86.6 | 91.4 | 87.7 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Family disruption or problems)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 40.8 | 35.4 | 31.4 | 41.0 | 34.0 | 45.7 | 35.1 |
| No | 59.2 | 64.6 | 68.6 | 59.0 | 66.0 | 54.3 | 64.9 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Lack of preschool education)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 22.4 | 19.8 | 11.4 | 25.0 | 21.6 | 14.3 | 22.8 |
| No | 77.6 | 80.2 | 88.6 | 75.0 | 78.4 | 85.7 | 77.2 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Emotional or psychiatric problems)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 28.6 | 5.2 | 22.9 | 11.0 | 7.2 | 31.4 | 1.8 |
| No | 71.4 | 94.8 | 77.1 | 89.0 | 92.8 | 68.6 | 98.2 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Emotional or psychiatric problems)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 6.1 | 13.5 | 8.6 | 12.0 | 12.4 | 8.6 | 10.5 |
| No | 93.9 | 86.5 | 91.4 | 88.0 | 87.6 | 91.4 | 89.5 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Physically handicapping conditions)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 8.2 | 9.4 | 2.9 | 12.0 | 11.3 | 8.6 | 12.3 |
| No | 91.8 | 90.6 | 97.1 | 88.0 | 88.7 | 91.4 | 87.7 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Low interest in or motivation for school work)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 6.1 | 12.5 | 5.7 | 13.0 | 19.6 | 8.6 | 8.8 |
| No | 93.9 | 87.5 | 94.3 | 87.0 | 80.4 | 91.4 | 91.2 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Crowded or noisy schools and classes)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 8.2 | 11.5 | 11.4 | 10.0 | 12.4 | 8.6 | 5.3 |
| No | 91.8 | 88.5 | 88.6 | 90.0 | 87.6 | 91.4 | 94.7 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Student dislike of teacher/school)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 8.2 | 8.3 | 2.9 | 9.0 | 10.3 | 8.6 | 15.8 |
| No | 91.8 | 91.7 | 97.1 | 91.0 | 89.7 | 91.4 | 84.2 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Learning or reading disabilities)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 20.4 | 10.4 | 8.6 | 16.0 | 10.3 | 28.6 | 19.3 |
| No | 79.6 | 89.6 | 91.4 | 84.0 | 89.7 | 71.4 | 80.7 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Teacher ability or classroom performance)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 18.4 | 19.8 | 25.7 | 19.0 | 23.7 | 17.1 | 14.0 |
| No | 81.6 | 80.2 | 74.3 | 81.0 | 76.3 | 82.9 | 86.0 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

School Form

1. Can you provide a general background picture of the child who is not likely to do well in school?

(Economic background)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 18.7 | 29.7 | 8.3 | 32.4 | 28.9 | 0.0 |
| No | 81.2 | 70.3 | 91.7 | 67.6 | 71.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 38 | 12 |

(Experiential deprivation)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 6.2 | 13.5 | 16.7 | 5.4 | 13.2 | 0.0 |
| No | 93.7 | 86.5 | 83.3 | 94.6 | 86.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 38 | 12 |

(Cultural deprivation)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 31.2 | 13.5 | 33.3 | 13.5 | 13.2 | 25.0 |
| No | 68.7 | 86.5 | 66.7 | 86.5 | 86.8 | 75.0 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 38 | 12 |

(Family problems/disruption)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 25.0 | 24.3 | 41.7 | 21.6 | 23.7 | 33.3 |
| No | 75.0 | 75.7 | 58.3 | 78.4 | 76.3 | 66.7 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 38 | 12 |

(Improper child care)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 6.2 | 24.3 | 16.7 | 21.6 | 34.2 | 0.0 |
| No | 93.7 | 75.7 | 83.3 | 78.4 | 65.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 38 | 12 |

(Physically handicapping conditions: Health problems, heredity, etc.)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 25.0 | 35.1 | 50.0 | 29.7 | 39.5 | 25.0 |
| No | 75.0 | 64.9 | 50.0 | 70.3 | 60.5 | 75.0 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 38 | 12 |

(Learning disabilities: mental, retardation, short attention, etc.)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 31.2 | 45.9 | 16.7 | 51.4 | 47.4 | 41.7 |
| No | 68.7 | 54.1 | 83.3 | 48.6 | 52.6 | 58.3 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 37 | 38 | 12 |

(Emotional/Psychological problems)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 50.0 | 26.3 | 50.0 | 21.7 | 36.8 | 31.8 |
| No | 50.0 | 73.7 | 50.0 | 78.3 | 63.2 | 68.2 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 22 |

(Poor/Negative self-image)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 6.2 | 15.8 | 8.3 | 17.4 | 5.3 | 18.2 |
| No | 93.7 | 84.2 | 91.7 | 82.6 | 94.7 | 81.8 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 22 |

(Low interest in or motivation for school work)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 12.5 | 26.3 | 25.0 | 26.1 | 18.4 | 22.7 |
| No | 87.5 | 73.7 | 73.0 | 73.9 | 81.6 | 77.3 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 22 |

(Speech or language problems)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|-------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 0.0 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 13.2 | 9.1 |
| No | 100.0 | 84.2 | 100.0 | 82.6 | 86.8 | 90.9 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 22 |

(Hyperactivity)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|-------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 0.0 | 10.5 | 8.3 | 13.0 | 18.4 | 9.1 |
| No | 100.0 | 89.5 | 91.7 | 87.0 | 81.6 | 90.9 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 22 |

(Immaturity: Emotional, mental and physical)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 31.2 | 10.5 | 25.0 | 8.7 | 21.1 | 4.5 |
| No | 68.7 | 89.5 | 75.0 | 91.3 | 78.9 | 95.5 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 22 |

(Negative social behavior)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 25.0 | 21.1 | 16.7 | 17.4 | 21.1 | 9.1 |
| No | 75.0 | 78.9 | 83.3 | 82.6 | 78.9 | 90.9 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 22 |

EXHIBIT 2 - IV

Environmental and Health Needs By Type of District
Parent and School Form

13b (Parent Form) and
14b (School Form)

Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school. (Rate the extent to which they disrupt good performance.)

| | (Good medical care not available) (School) | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|--|------|------|-------------------|------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | SES | Good | Poor | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 40.0 | 41.2 | 47.4 | 44.1 | 36.4 | 43.5 | 40.5 | 36.4 | 50.0 |
| Responsible | 46.7 | 38.2 | 42.1 | 41.2 | 36.4 | 43.5 | 37.8 | 45.5 | 45.0 |
| Not Responsible | 13.3 | 20.6 | 10.5 | 14.7 | 27.3 | 13.0 | 21.6 | 18.2 | 5.0 |
| Total | 15 | 34 | 19 | 34 | 11 | 23 | 37 | 11 | 20 |
| | ((Good medical care not available) (Parent)) | | | | | | | | |

| | (House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat) (School) | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|---|------|------|-------------------|------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | SES | Good | Poor | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 50.0 | 29.0 | 40.5 | 35.1 | 41.2 | 38.5 | 31.9 | 58.8 | 32.7 |
| Responsible | 37.5 | 37.6 | 42.9 | 37.1 | 38.2 | 42.3 | 37.2 | 29.4 | 47.3 |
| Not Responsible | 12.5 | 33.3 | 16.7 | 27.8 | 20.6 | 19.2 | 30.9 | 11.8 | 20.0 |
| Total | 48 | 93 | 42 | 97 | 34 | 52 | 94 | 34 | 55 |

| | (House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat) (Parent) | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|---|------|------|-------------------|------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | SES | Good | Poor | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 6.7 | 33.3 | 5.6 | 24.2 | 27.3 | 9.1 | 23.5 | 9.0 | 19.0 |
| Responsible | 60.0 | 42.4 | 72.2 | 51.5 | 45.5 | 63.6 | 55.9 | 45.5 | 57.1 |
| Not Responsible | 33.3 | 24.2 | 22.2 | 24.2 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 20.6 | 45.5 | 23.8 |
| Total | 15 | 33 | 18 | 33 | 11 | 22 | 34 | 11 | 21 |

| | (House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat) (Parent) | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|---|------|------|-------------------|------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | SES | Good | Poor | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 52.1 | 26.9 | 23.8 | 30.6 | 47.1 | 27.5 | 25.3 | 62.9 | 26.4 |
| Responsible | 33.3 | 31.2 | 47.6 | 32.7 | 29.4 | 45.1 | 34.7 | 31.4 | 39.6 |
| Not Responsible | 14.6 | 41.9 | 28.6 | 36.7 | 23.5 | 27.5 | 40.0 | 5.7 | 34.0 |
| Total | 48 | 93 | 42 | 98 | 34 | 51 | 95 | 35 | 53 |

(Shortage of clothes) (School)

| | SES | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 12.5 | 15.8 | 36.1 | 19.0 |
| Responsible | 50.0 | 63.2 | 47.2 | 61.9 |
| Not Responsible | 37.5 | 21.1 | 16.7 | 19.0 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 36 | 21 |

(Shortage of clothes) (Parents)

| | SES | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 49.0 | 32.6 | 32.3 | 23.2 |
| Responsible | 30.6 | 51.2 | 44.8 | 53.6 |
| Not Responsible | 20.4 | 16.3 | 22.9 | 23.2 |
| Total | 49 | 43 | 96 | 56 |

(Not enough good food) (School)

| | SES | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 56.2 | 68.4 | 70.3 | 66.7 |
| Responsible | 37.5 | 31.6 | 27.0 | 28.6 |
| Not Responsible | 6.2 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 4.8 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 37 | 21 |

(Not enough good food) (Parent)

| | SES | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 55.1 | 63.4 | 41.8 | 52.7 |
| Responsible | 40.8 | 31.7 | 38.5 | 43.6 |
| Not Responsible | 4.1 | 4.9 | 19.8 | 3.6 |
| Total | 49 | 41 | 91 | 55 |

(No preschool education) (School)

| | SES | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 37.5 | 52.6 | 55.6 | 66.7 |
| Responsible | 37.5 | 31.6 | 19.4 | 28.6 |
| Not Responsible | 25.0 | 15.8 | 25.0 | 4.8 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 36 | 21 |

(No preschool education) (Parent)

| | SES | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Urban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 77.1 | 46.5 | 44.2 | 50.0 |
| Responsible | 18.7 | 34.9 | 28.4 | 33.9 |
| Not Responsible | 4.2 | 18.6 | 27.4 | 16.1 |
| Total | 48 | 43 | 95 | 56 |

(Not enough family income) (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 31.2 | 44.4 | 27.3 | 40.9 | 47.1 | 41.7 | 50.0 |
| Responsible | 50.0 | 50.0 | 63.6 | 45.5 | 47.1 | 33.3 | 40.9 |
| Not Responsible | 18.7 | 5.6 | 9.1 | 13.6 | 5.9 | 25.0 | 9.1 |
| Total | 16 | 18 | 11 | 22 | 34 | 12 | 22 |

(Not enough family income) (Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 28.6 | 27.3 | 28.6 | 27.8 | 25.8 | 37.1 | 26.3 |
| Responsible | 46.9 | 50.0 | 42.9 | 46.8 | 44.3 | 51.4 | 43.9 |
| Not Responsible | 24.5 | 22.7 | 28.6 | 25.9 | 29.9 | 11.4 | 29.8 |
| Total | 49 | 44 | 35 | 54 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Use of drugs or alcohol) (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 33.3 | 44.4 | 27.3 | 50.0 | 60.0 | 27.3 | 42.9 |
| Responsible | 60.0 | 50.0 | 63.6 | 40.9 | 37.1 | 63.6 | 47.6 |
| Not Responsible | 6.7 | 5.6 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 2.9 | 9.1 | 9.5 |
| Total | 15 | 18 | 11 | 22 | 35 | 11 | 21 |

(Use of drugs or alcohol) (Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 75.0 | 75.6 | 73.5 | 78.4 | 60.0 | 82.9 | 79.2 |
| Responsible | 20.8 | 17.1 | 11.8 | 15.7 | 24.2 | 14.3 | 13.2 |
| Not Responsible | 4.2 | 7.3 | 14.7 | 5.9 | 15.8 | 2.9 | 7.5 |
| Total | 48 | 41 | 34 | 51 | 95 | 35 | 53 |

(Only one parent in the home) (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 37.5 | 38.9 | 50.0 | 40.9 | 58.3 | 50.0 | 36.4 |
| Responsible | 56.2 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 45.5 | 33.3 | 41.7 | 54.5 |
| Not Responsible | 6.2 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 9.1 |
| Total | 16 | 18 | 12 | 22 | 36 | 12 | 22 |

(Only one parent in the home) (Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 28.6 | 21.4 | 23.5 | 17.6 | 35.6 | 25.7 | 13.0 |
| Responsible | 55.1 | 61.9 | 50.0 | 60.8 | 35.6 | 60.0 | 53.7 |
| Not Responsible | 16.3 | 16.7 | 26.5 | 21.6 | 28.9 | 14.3 | 33.3 |
| Total | 49 | 42 | 34 | 51 | 90 | 35 | 54 |



(Unemployment) (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 37.5 | 44.1 | 27.3 | 48.6 | 45.7 | 33.3 | 36.4 |
| Responsible | 50.0 | 47.1 | 72.7 | 40.0 | 51.4 | 50.0 | 54.5 |
| Not Responsible | 12.5 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 2.9 | 16.7 | 9.1 |
| Total | 16 | 34 | 11 | 35 | 35 | 12 | 22 |

(Unemployment) (Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 34.7 | 23.4 | 29.4 | 28.3 | 28.4 | 37.1 | 20.8 |
| Responsible | 42.9 | 36.2 | 41.2 | 37.4 | 34.7 | 48.6 | 49.1 |
| Not Responsible | 22.4 | 40.4 | 29.4 | 34.3 | 36.8 | 14.3 | 30.2 |
| Total | 49 | 94 | 34 | 99 | 95 | 35 | 53 |

(Parents with limited education) (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 31.2 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 52.8 | 54.1 | 25.0 | 63.6 |
| Responsible | 62.5 | 36.1 | 75.0 | 33.3 | 32.4 | 66.7 | 36.4 |
| Not Responsible | 6.2 | 13.9 | 8.3 | 13.9 | 13.5 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| Total | 16 | 36 | 12 | 36 | 37 | 12 | 22 |

(Parents with limited education) (Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 16.3 | 24.5 | 20.0 | 23.5 | 27.4 | 17.1 | 23.2 |
| Responsible | 40.8 | 28.7 | 40.0 | 30.6 | 32.6 | 45.7 | 26.8 |
| Not Responsible | 42.9 | 46.8 | 40.0 | 45.9 | 40.0 | 37.1 | 50.0 |
| Total | 49 | 94 | 35 | 98 | 95 | 35 | 56 |

(Parents' health) (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 0.0 | 36.4 | 9.1 | 30.3 | 31.4 | 0.0 | 28.6 |
| Responsible | 93.3 | 51.5 | 72.7 | 60.6 | 60.0 | 90.9 | 66.7 |
| Not Responsible | 6.7 | 12.1 | 18.2 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 9.1 | 4.8 |
| Total | 15 | 33 | 11 | 33 | 35 | 11 | 21 |

(Parents' health) (Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 14.3 | 28.0 | 17.1 | 26.5 | 31.6 | 14.3 | 9.1 |
| Responsible | 40.8 | 44.1 | 42.9 | 39.8 | 42.1 | 42.9 | 61.8 |
| Not Responsible | 44.9 | 28.0 | 40.0 | 33.7 | 26.3 | 42.9 | 29.1 |
| Total | 49 | 93 | 35 | 98 | 95 | 35 | 55 |

(Inadequate family transportation) (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 18.7 | 52.6 | 25.0 | 40.0 | 38.9 | 16.7 | 54.5 |
| Responsible | 75.0 | 42.1 | 66.7 | 42.9 | 41.7 | 83.3 | 36.4 |
| Not Responsible | 6.2 | 5.3 | 8.3 | 17.1 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 35 | 36 | 12 | 22 |

(Inadequate family transportation) (Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Responsible | 12.5 | 9.3 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 10.4 | 8.8 | 8.9 |
| Responsible | 29.2 | 30.2 | 29.4 | 24.2 | 21.9 | 35.3 | 26.8 |
| Not Responsible | 58.3 | 60.5 | 58.8 | 65.7 | 67.7 | 55.9 | 64.3 |
| Total | 48 | 43 | 34 | 99 | 96 | 34 | 56 |

15b (Parent Form and
16b (School Form):

Following is a list of conditions. Which ones most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

(Overweight)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 32.3 | 4.8 | 21.3 | 16.8 | 7.4 | 44.7 | 10.1 |
| Less Limiting | 67.7 | 95.2 | 78.7 | 83.2 | 92.6 | 55.3 | 89.9 |
| Total | 65 | 63 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Contagious diseases)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 41.5 | 14.3 | 29.8 | 23.4 | 14.1 | 51.1 | 21.5 |
| Less Limiting | 58.5 | 85.7 | 70.2 | 76.6 | 85.9 | 48.9 | 78.5 |
| Total | 65 | 63 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Mental illness)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 72.3 | 44.4 | 59.6 | 46.7 | 40.0 | 74.5 | 51.9 |
| Less Limiting | 27.7 | 55.6 | 40.4 | 53.3 | 60.0 | 24.5 | 48.1 |
| Total | 65 | 63 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Learning disabilities)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 75.4 | 50.4 | 68.1 | 53.3 | 47.4 | 78.7 | 57.0 |
| Less Limiting | 24.6 | 49.6 | 31.9 | 46.7 | 52.6 | 2;3 | 43.0 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Retardation)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 83.1 | 45.1 | 63.8 | 52.6 | 43.7 | 85.1 | 57.0 |
| Less Limiting | 16.9 | 54.9 | 36.2 | 47.4 | 56.3 | 14.9 | 43.0 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Crippling physical handicaps)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 61.5 | 28.6 | 40.4 | 37.2 | 25.9 | 61.7 | 41.8 |
| Less Limiting | 38.5 | 71.4 | 59.6 | 62.8 | 74.1 | 38.3 | 58.2 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Poor vision)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 81.5 | 51.1 | 70.2 | 56.2 | 45.9 | 83.0 | 63.3 |
| Less Limiting | 18.5 | 48.9 | 29.8 | 43.8 | 54.1 | 17.0 | 36.7 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Poor Hearing)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 80.0 | 51.1 | 70.2 | 55.5 | 46.7 | 83.0 | 58.2 |
| Less Limiting | 20.0 | 48.9 | 29.8 | 44.5 | 53.3 | 17.0 | 41.8 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Not able to understand what is being taught)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 64.6 | 42.1 | 57.4 | 44.5 | 35.6 | 68.1 | 49.4 |
| Less Limiting | 35.4 | 57.9 | 42.6 | 55.5 | 64.4 | 31.9 | 50.6 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Physical defects)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 43.1 | 32.3 | 34.0 | 34.3 | 23.0 | 57.4 |
| Less Limiting | 56.9 | 67.7 | 66.0 | 65.7 | 77.0 | 42.6 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 |

(Underweight)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 26.2 | 15.8 | 17.0 | 19.7 | 13.3 | 31.9 |
| Less Limiting | 73.8 | 84.2 | 83.0 | 80.3 | 86.7 | 68.1 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 |

(Emotional nervousness)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|---------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Most Limiting | 66.2 | 49.6 | 63.8 | 49.6 | 45.2 | 76.6 |
| Less Limiting | 33.8 | 50.4 | 36.2 | 50.4 | 54.8 | 23.4 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 |

EXHIBIT 3 - IV

Comparative Awareness of Program Availability
Parent Form

3a. Are you aware of any kinds of help available in the schools to help with these kinds of problems?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 83.7 | 88.4 | 77.1 | 91.0 | 89.5 | 94.3 |
| No | 16.3 | 11.6 | 22.9 | 9.0 | 10.5 | 5.7 |
| Total | 49 | 95 | 35 | 100 | 95 | 35 |

3c. How did it work out?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|---------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Good | 67.6 | 80.4 | 65.0 | 78.7 | 78.6 | 70.4 |
| Neutral | 2.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 3.7 |
| Bad | 29.4 | 15.7 | 35.0 | 16.4 | 16.1 | 25.9 |
| Total | 34 | 51 | 20 | 61 | 56 | 27 |

4a. Have any of your children needed help you felt was not available in the schools?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 28.6 | 32.4 | 22.9 | 32.1 | 24.5 | 28.6 | 29.8 |
| No | 71.4 | 67.6 | 77.1 | 67.9 | 75.5 | 71.4 | 70.2 |
| Total | 49 | 43 | 35 | 53 | 94 | 35 | 57 |

6b. Do you know of specific programs you could turn to for this help?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 23.3 | 46.7 | 29.4 | 47.1 | 48.8 | 28.1 | 37.5 |
| No | 74.4 | 53.3 | 67.6 | 51.0 | 51.2 | 68.7 | 60.7 |
| Total | 43 | 41 | 34 | 51 | 86 | 32 | 56 |

7a. Do you know of (other) people or places outside the school system where you could go for help?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 59.2 | 67.4 | 60.0 | 66.0 | 77.1 | 57.1 | 64.9 |
| No | 38.8 | 30.2 | 37.1 | 30.2 | 22.9 | 40.0 | 31.6 |
| Total | 49 | 43 | 35 | 53 | 96 | 35 | 57 |

7c. Did they help the children?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 76.0 | 87.0 | 66.7 | 84.6 | 81.5 | 73.7 | 90.0 |
| No | 12.0 | 8.7 | 11.1 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 15.8 | 3.3 |
| Don't know | 12.0 | 4.3 | 22.2 | 7.7 | 11.1 | 10.5 | 6.7 |
| Total | 25 | 23 | 18 | 26 | 54 | 19 | 30 |

School Form

10d. Have you referred children to any of them? (Persons in the community who are knowledgeable about or involved with the needs of educationally disadvantaged children)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-----------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 31.2 | 42.1 | 33.3 | 34.8 | 34.2 | 41.7 | 27.3 |
| No | 31.2 | 21.1 | 16.7 | 17.4 | 21.1 | 33.3 | 18.2 |
| No Answer | 37.5 | 36.8 | 50.0 | 47.8 | 44.7 | 25.0 | 54.5 |
| Total | 16 | 19 | 12 | 23 | 38 | 12 | 22 |

7. What programs are you aware of or involved in that deal specifically with the educationally disadvantaged child? (Coded for number of programs cited.)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|-----------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| | 0-3 | 31.2 | 51.4 | 57.9 | 16.7 | 56.8 | 52.2 | 52.6 | 33.3 |
| 4 or More | 68.7 | 48.6 | 42.1 | 83.3 | 43.2 | 47.8 | 47.4 | 66.7 | 50.0 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 19 | 12 | 37 | 23 | 38 | 12 | 22 |

EXHIBIT 4 - IV

Roles of School Personnel by District Parent Form

6a. Who is the first person or what is the first place you would go to seek help for a child having problems with studies or behavior related to school?

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|---------------------|---------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| | Teacher | 32.7 | 49.4 | 45.2 | 41.2 | 40.9 | 50.0 | 51.8 | 17.1 |
| Guidance Counselor | 8.2 | 14.5 | 2.4 | 8.8 | 12.5 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 11.4 | 14.8 |
| Principal/Assistant | | | | | | | | | |
| Principal | 55.1 | 26.5 | 40.5 | 44.1 | 38.6 | 32.7 | 31.8 | 68.6 | 27.8 |
| Other | 4.1 | 9.6 | 11.9 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 11.5 | 10.6 | 2.9 | 9.3 |
| Total | 49 | 83 | 42 | 34 | 88 | 52 | 85 | 35 | 54 |

Parent and School Form

12a (Parent Form and
13a (School Form). Have you been involved in (do parents get involved in) any of the following?
(Parent-Teacher Organizations)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 35.9 | 42.6 | 36.2 | 49.3 | 43.2 | 34.8 | 52.6 |
| No | 64.1 | 57.4 | 63.8 | 50.7 | 56.8 | 65.2 | 47.4 |
| Total | 64 | 61 | 47 | 75 | 132 | 46 | 76 |

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 78.5 | 72.1 | 76.6 | 70.3 | 68.7 | 78.7 | 67.6 |
| No | 21.5 | 27.9 | 23.4 | 29.7 | 31.3 | 21.3 | 32.4 |
| Total | 65 | 61 | 47 | 74 | 131 | 47 | 74 |

(Individual conferences with teachers)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 79.7 | 80.0 | 87.0 | 81.1 | 80.9 | 80.4 | 84.0 |
| No | 20.3 | 20.0 | 13.0 | 18.9 | 19.1 | 19.6 | 16.0 |
| Total | 64 | 60 | 46 | 74 | 131 | 46 | 75 |

(School board meetings)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 27.4 | 35.0 | 20.5 | 40.5 | 21.8 | 25.0 | 43.2 |
| No | 72.6 | 65.0 | 79.5 | 59.5 | 78.2 | 75.0 | 56.8 |
| Total | 62 | 60 | 44 | 74 | 124 | 44 | 74 |

(Attendance in classes)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 24.2 | 34.5 | 20.0 | 33.8 | 37.2 | 27.3 | 29.6 |
| No | 75.8 | 65.5 | 80.0 | 66.2 | 62.8 | 72.7 | 70.4 |
| Total | 62 | 58 | 45 | 71 | 129 | 44 | 71 |

(Meetings with principals)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Poor | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 68.7 | 63.8 | 66.0 | 63.4 | 61.1 | 78.3 | 60.3 |
| No | 31.2 | 36.2 | 34.0 | 36.6 | 38.9 | 21.7 | 39.7 |
| Total | 64 | 58 | 47 | 71 | 131 | 46 | 73 |

Organizing parent groups)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 25.4 | 27.1 | 26.8 | 20.0 | 26.6 | 30.9 | 24.6 | 28.9 | 28.6 |
| No | 74.6 | 72.9 | 73.2 | 80.0 | 73.4 | 69.1 | 75.4 | 71.1 | 71.4 |
| Total | 63 | 118 | 56 | 45 | 124 | 68 | 122 | 45 | 70 |

(Specifically requesting more information)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 41.9 | 43.0 | 37.7 | 47.7 | 39.4 | 41.5 | 44.0 | 38.6 | 38.8 |
| No | 58.1 | 57.0 | 62.3 | 52.3 | 60.6 | 58.5 | 56.0 | 61.4 | 61.2 |
| Total | 62 | 121 | 53 | 44 | 127 | 65 | 125 | 44 | 67 |

Parent and School Form

14 (Parent Form) and
 15 (School Form) .. Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school?
 (A study schedule for completing homework)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|--------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 66.2 | 60.2 | 54.0 | 70.2 | 59.9 | 54.5 | 59.3 | 70.2 | 55.7 |
| Less Helpful | 33.8 | 39.8 | 46.0 | 29.8 | 40.1 | 45.5 | 40.7 | 29.8 | 44.3 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 63 | 47 | 137 | 77 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Help with homework by other family members)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|--------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 61.5 | 52.6 | 46.0 | 63.8 | 53.3 | 46.8 | 54.1 | 66.0 | 44.3 |
| Less Helpful | 38.5 | 47.4 | 54.0 | 36.2 | 46.7 | 53.2 | 45.9 | 34.0 | 55.7 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 63 | 47 | 137 | 77 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Encouragement to do well by parents)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|--------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 89.2 | 88.7 | 88.9 | 95.7 | 86.1 | 89.6 | 86.7 | 89.4 | 92.4 |
| Less Helpful | 10.8 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 4.3 | 13.9 | 10.4 | 13.3 | 10.6 | 7.6 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 63 | 47 | 137 | 77 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Having reference books and other study aids available)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|--------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 78.5 | 75.2 | 73.0 | 83.0 | 71.5 | 77.9 | 73.3 | 78.7 | 77.2 |
| Less Helpful | 21.5 | 24.8 | 27.0 | 17.0 | 28.5 | 22.1 | 26.7 | 21.3 | 22.8 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 63 | 47 | 137 | 77 | 135 | 47 | 79 |

(Frequent good family discussions)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|--------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 83.1 | 75.2 | 93.6 | 72.3 | 72.6 | 91.5 |
| Less Helpful | 16.9 | 24.8 | 6.4 | 27.7 | 27.4 | 8.5 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 |

(Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|--------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 98.5 | 91.0 | 100.0 | 90.5 | 91.1 | 97.9 |
| Less Helpful | 1.5 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 8.9 | 2.1 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 |

(Good rates of achievement in work or school by other family members)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|--------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 58.5 | 42.9 | 57.4 | 46.7 | 40.7 | 61.7 |
| Less Helpful | 41.5 | 57.1 | 42.6 | 53.3 | 59.3 | 38.3 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 |

(A happy home)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|--------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Most Helpful | 93.8 | 88.0 | 95.7 | 86.9 | 90.4 | 91.5 |
| Less Helpful | 6.2 | 12.0 | 4.3 | 13.1 | 9.6 | 8.5 |
| Total | 65 | 133 | 47 | 137 | 135 | 47 |

EXHIBIT 7 - IV

Comparative Attitudes by District
Parent Form

16. How important do you think the following student achievements are to school-age children of today?

(Graduation from elementary school)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|------------------|-------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Very Important | 100.0 | 87.5 | 97.1 | 91.0 | 85.6 | 100.0 |
| Fairly Important | 0.0 | 8.3 | 2.9 | 6.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 |
| Not Important | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 35 |

(Graduation from high school)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|-------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Important | 100.0 | 89.6 | 86.4 | 97.1 | 93.0 | 85.2 | 88.7 | 100.0 | 91.2 |
| Fairly Important | 0.0 | 7.3 | 13.6 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 14.8 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 8.8 |
| Not Important | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 44 | 35 | 100 | 54 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Learning a trade or work skill)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Important | 98.0 | 84.4 | 84.1 | 94.3 | 88.0 | 83.3 | 83.5 | 97.1 | 89.5 |
| Fairly Important | 2.0 | 12.5 | 13.6 | 5.7 | 10.0 | 13.0 | 14.4 | 2.9 | 7.0 |
| Not Important | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 44 | 35 | 100 | 54 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Achieving good grades)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Important | 57.1 | 65.6 | 68.2 | 68.6 | 61.0 | 66.7 | 66.0 | 68.6 | 57.9 |
| Fairly Important | 40.8 | 26.0 | 29.5 | 28.6 | 31.0 | 31.5 | 28.9 | 31.4 | 33.3 |
| Not Important | 2.0 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 7.0 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 44 | 35 | 100 | 54 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Involvement in non-study school activities)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Important | 44.9 | 41.7 | 43.2 | 48.6 | 41.0 | 42.6 | 43.3 | 51.4 | 36.8 |
| Fairly Important | 46.9 | 40.6 | 43.2 | 37.1 | 45.0 | 42.6 | 40.2 | 40.0 | 49.1 |
| Not Important | 6.1 | 13.5 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 12.0 | 9.3 | 13.4 | 5.7 | 8.8 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 44 | 35 | 100 | 54 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Working part time to help the family)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Important | 14.3 | 24.0 | 20.5 | 17.1 | 24.0 | 16.7 | 27.8 | 8.6 | 15.8 |
| Fairly Important | 51.0 | 27.1 | 47.7 | 48.6 | 32.0 | 42.6 | 32.0 | 54.3 | 38.6 |
| Not Important | 32.7 | 45.8 | 27.3 | 28.6 | 42.0 | 37.0 | 37.1 | 34.3 | 42.1 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 44 | 35 | 100 | 54 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Completing study assignments)

| | SES | | | Achievement Score | | | Type of District | | |
|------------------|------|---------|------|-------------------|---------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Poor | Good | Average | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Very Important | 83.7 | 72.9 | 79.5 | 97.1 | 70.0 | 77.8 | 72.2 | 97.1 | 73.7 |
| Fairly Important | 16.3 | 22.9 | 18.2 | 2.9 | 27.0 | 18.5 | 24.7 | 2.9 | 22.8 |
| Not Important | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 44 | 35 | 100 | 54 | 97 | 35 | 57 |

(Learning to get along with others)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Very Important | 59.2 | 82.3 | 71.4 | 74.0 | 79.4 | 82.5 |
| Fairly Important | 40.8 | 17.7 | 18.6 | 26.0 | 20.6 | 17.5 |
| Not Important | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 57 |

(Taking part in class discussions)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Very Important | 53.1 | 60.4 | 68.6 | 53.0 | 54.6 | 63.2 |
| Fairly Important | 44.9 | 27.1 | 31.4 | 34.0 | 37.1 | 24.6 |
| Not Important | 2.0 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 6.2 | 10.5 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 57 |

(Preparing for college)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|------------------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Very Important | 20.4 | 42.7 | 25.7 | 37.0 | 40.2 | 35.1 |
| Fairly Important | 42.9 | 28.1 | 48.6 | 28.0 | 32.0 | 31.6 |
| Not Important | 36.7 | 26.0 | 22.9 | 33.0 | 23.7 | 31.6 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 57 |

18. Do you think the schools feel the families of children with problems are "different" in any way?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Yes | 59.2 | 49.0 | 48.6 | 58.0 | 52.6 | 35.1 |
| No | 38.8 | 43.7 | 51.4 | 35.0 | 39.2 | 59.6 |
| Total | 49 | 96 | 35 | 100 | 97 | 57 |

Parent and School Form

17a. What is the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | |
|----------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Average | Urban | Rural |
| Positive | 46.2 | 54.0 | 54.3 | 48.9 | 54.7 | 58.4 |
| Neutral | 30.8 | 34.9 | 30.4 | 34.4 | 32.0 | 28.6 |
| Negative | 23.1 | 11.1 | 15.2 | 16.8 | 13.3 | 13.0 |
| Total | 65 | 126 | 46 | 131 | 128 | 77 |

17b. What do you think is the attitude of a child with educational problems toward the schools?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|----------|------|---------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Positive | 15.9 | 22.0 | 20.0 | 31.6 | 24.0 | 20.0 | 21.9 |
| Neutral | 41.3 | 29.3 | 33.3 | 40.4 | 34.4 | 40.0 | 32.9 |
| Negative | 42.9 | 48.8 | 46.7 | 28.1 | 41.6 | 40.0 | 45.2 |
| Total | 63 | 123 | 45 | 57 | 125 | 45 | 73 |

19. Do you believe the schools have a special responsibility toward a child with problems? (School)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|-------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 87.5 | 94.6 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 94.7 | 83.3 | 100.0 |
| No | 12.5 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 19 | 38 | 12 | 22 |

(Parent)

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|-------|------|---------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 95.8 | 91.5 | 94.1 | 95.3 | 91.6 | 94.1 | 96.4 |
| No | 4.2 | 8.5 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 8.4 | 5.9 | 3.6 |
| Total | 48 | 94 | 34 | 43 | 95 | 34 | 56 |

EXHIBIT 8 - IV

The Professionals' Knowledge of Special Programs School Form

8a. How have special programs been developed or funded?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------|------|---------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Know | 81.2 | 83.8 | 75.0 | 94.7 | 98.5 | 75.0 | 86.4 |
| Don't Know | 18.7 | 10.8 | 16.7 | 5.3 | 7.9 | 25.0 | 9.1 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 19 | 38 | 12 | 22 |

8b. Have federal funds been useful in this area?

| | SES | | Achievement Score | | Type of District | | |
|------------|------|---------|-------------------|------|------------------|----------|-------|
| | Good | Average | Good | Poor | Urban | Suburban | Rural |
| Yes | 50.0 | 81.1 | 58.3 | 94.7 | 81.6 | 50.0 | 86.4 |
| No | 18.7 | 2.7 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 16.7 | 4.5 |
| Don't Know | 25.0 | 2.7 | 25.0 | 5.3 | 2.6 | 33.3 | 4.5 |
| Total | 16 | 37 | 12 | 19 | 38 | 12 | 22 |

Income Distribution of Families With Children in Special Education by Type of District

| | Good | | Average | | SES | |
|-------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over |
| None* | 44.4 | 28.9 | 55.6 | 39.0 | 50.0 | 62.5 |
| Some* | 55.6 | 71.1 | 44.4 | 61.0 | 50.0 | 37.5 |
| Total | 9 | 38 | 45 | 41 | 16 | 24 |

| | Good | | Achievement Score | | Poor | |
|-------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over |
| None* | 62.5 | 28.0 | 51.1 | 31.1 | 52.9 | 63.6 |
| Some* | 37.5 | 72.0 | 48.9 | 68.9 | 47.1 | 36.4 |
| Total | 8 | 25 | 45 | 45 | 17 | 33 |

| | Urban | | Suburban | | Rural | |
|-------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over |
| None | 54.2 | 26.3 | 40.0 | 24.1 | 52.9 | 69.4 |
| Some | 45.8 | 73.7 | 60.0 | 75.9 | 47.1 | 30.6 |
| Total | 48 | 38 | 5 | 29 | 17 | 36 |

*None means families which have no children in special education. Some means families which have one or more children in special education.

SECTION V

Areas for Further Study

In the course of analyzing the large body of data generated during this study, several provocative questions arose which appear to warrant further study and investigation.

Communications

Another anomaly presented itself in the area of communications between the schools and the parents. Asked whether a number of communications devices were of value, - whether or not they were currently in use - there was nearly unanimous agreement between the two groups that they were (Questions 11b and 12b).

However, when the professionals were asked whether these communications tools were being currently employed, their answers varied greatly with those of parents who were asked whether they are receiving them (Questions 11a and 12a). With the exception of report cards, which nearly all respondents agreed were in existence, answers varied from more than 20 percent to more than 40 percent regarding other communications tools, as shown in the table below.

| | | | |
|--|------|--|------|
| <u>Report Cards</u> | | <u>Periodic Information About School Affairs</u> | |
| Professionals | 92.9 | Professionals | 87.3 |
| Parents | 92.0 | Parents | 68.5 |
| <u>School Newsletters</u> | | <u>Individual Reports From Teachers</u> | |
| Professionals | 51.7 | Professionals | 90.6 |
| Parents | 28.8 | Parents | 69.9 |
| <u>Individual Reports From Counselors</u> | | <u>Information on Available Special Help</u> | |
| Professionals | 72.3 | Professionals | 68.9 |
| Parents | 29.3 | Parents | 36.3 |
| <u>Requests Teacher/Parent Conferences</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 97.1 | | |
| Parents | 71.7 | | |

It seems fair to conclude from these divergent figures, that no matter how accurate the views of the professionals on the current use of these communication methods, parents either do not receive them or do not recognize what they are.

This would lead to a conclusion that these tools for communicating between the schools and the parents of educationally disadvantaged students must be made more understandable and distributed in ways to bring them more forcefully to the attention of parents.

The Availability and Utilization of Special Education

Exhibit 9 in Section IV illustrates the participation of children in special education courses who are members of families which

make up our sample by income range within each type of school district. It is apparent that there are other ways in which this question can be approached. One of the ways which appears useful is to find out whether there are differences in participation in special education by income group in different types of families. The following, Exhibit 1, is an opening approach to some of these questions. Over the whole sample, it makes several things apparent:

- there is a much larger participation in special education by children in families with incomes of more than \$5,500 than there is in lower income families;
- there is a larger participation in special education when the family has two parents living at home than when it has only one;
- there is a higher rate of participation in special education if the mother has attended high school than if she has attended eight grades or less;
- conversely, there is a lower rate of participation if the mother has attended more than twelve grades. These last two observations may indicate a greater perception of need by the mother if she has attended high school and a smaller incidence of need if she has a higher education;
- the figures for participation when linked to the fathers' years of education follow closely the results with the mothers', except for a higher rate of participation when the father has a high school diploma or above;
- there is a significantly larger percentage of participation in special education in families with four or more children at home and four or more school-age children.

Attitudes Toward the Role of School Personnel

Exhibit 4 in Section IV shows differences in attitudes toward school personnel in different types of districts. Questions 10a and 11a asked which types of school personnel should be most helpful to youngsters having problems. Questions 10b and 11b asked for a judgment as to which types of personnel have, in fact, been helpful.

The answers to these questions as shown in Exhibit 2 are revealing. It is obvious that some types of school personnel are not thought to be very relevant to the problems of disadvantaged children. Even more striking, are the wide differences between the answers of the professionals and the parents.

Another insight as to how the roles of school personnel are seen, is contained in the different answers from school districts with different achievement levels. Exhibit 3 shows these differences. Administrators, other than superintendents and principals, are

not seen as playing a very strong rôle in poor achievement districts. Similarly, guidance counselors are not thought to be highly relevant to the needs of youngsters in poor achievement areas. The same is true, although to a lesser extent, of special teachers and student teachers.

On the other hand, superintendents, school nurses and school board members are thought to be more relevant in low achievement areas. It may be that low achievement school districts do not have as many of the first types of personnel on their staffs as school districts with better achievement levels.

— Participation and Support

Section IV also discusses the answers to Questions 12a and 13b concerning the involvement of parents and Questions 14 and 15 asking which forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement.

Exhibit 4 illustrates briefly both the areas of agreement and differences in opinion in response to these questions. In general, there is agreement between parents and professionals that the opportunities for participation listed in 12a and 13a are effective, but there is a strong disagreement between the two groups as to whether the parents actually have been involved in the specified activities. The parents and professionals are strongly disagreed as to the usefulness of the forms of support listed in Questions 14 and 15. Parents display much more faith than professionals in study skills, help with homework, encouragement by the parents, availability of reference books and other study aids, and in the power of example set by other members of the family who are achievers and in the influence of a happy home.

Parent Form
 Consideration of a Number of Variables
 in Relation to the Number of Children in Special Education

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| (Yearly income range) | Under \$5500 | \$5500 and Over |
| None* | 52.9 | 40.8 |
| Some* | 47.1 | 59.2 |
| Total | 70 | 103 |
| (How many parents live at home?) | | |
| One | 53.2 | 41.6 |
| Some | 46.8 | 58.4 |
| Total | 100 | 125 |
| (Mother's years of education) | | |
| 8 or Below | 46.9 | 36.5 |
| None | 53.1 | 63.5 |
| Some | 49 | 63 |
| Total | 100 | 125 |
| (Mother's years of education) | | |
| High School | 41.1 | 51.4 |
| None | 58.9 | 48.6 |
| Some | 112 | 74 |
| Total | 100 | 125 |
| (Father's years of education) | | |
| 8 or Below | 44.7 | 34.0 |
| None | 55.3 | 66.0 |
| Some | 47 | 50 |
| Total | 100 | 125 |
| (Father's years of education) | | |
| High School | 39.2 | 45.7 |
| None | 60.8 | 54.3 |
| Some | 97 | 46 |
| Total | 100 | 125 |
| (Number of children at home) | | |
| 0-3 | 55.3 | 38.5 |
| None | 44.7 | 61.5 |
| Some | 76 | 109 |
| Total | 100 | 125 |
| (Number of school age children) | | |
| 0-3 | 53.4 | 35.7 |
| None | 46.6 | 64.3 |
| Some | 103 | 84 |
| Total | 100 | 125 |

*None means families which have no children in special education.
 Some means families which have one or more children in special education.

EXHIBIT 2 - V

Attitudes Toward the Role of School Personnel

| | <u>Should be Helpful</u> | <u>Are Helpful</u> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <u>Superintendents</u> | | |
| Professionals | 58.3 | 82.9 |
| Parents | 42.3 | 60.4 |
| <u>Principals</u> | | |
| Professionals | 91.7 | 96.8 |
| Parents | 82.0 | 86.8 |
| <u>Other Administrators</u> | | |
| Professionals | 45.8 | 86.0 |
| Parents | 38.1 | 81.3 |
| <u>Classroom Teachers</u> | | |
| Professionals | 87.5 | 100.0 |
| Parents | 90.5 | 92.7 |
| <u>Guidance Counselors</u> | | |
| Professionals | 84.7 | 93.6 |
| Parents | 74.7 | 89.6 |
| <u>Reading or Other Special Teachers</u> | | |
| Professionals | 83.3 | 98.3 |
| Parents | 72.5 | 95.0 |
| <u>School Nurses</u> | | |
| Professionals | 87.5 | 98.4 |
| Parents | 59.3 | 90.8 |
| <u>School Board Members</u> | | |
| Professionals | 44.4 | 65.7 |
| Parents | 24.3 | 56.3 |
| <u>Librarians</u> | | |
| Professionals | 27.8 | 78.6 |
| Parents | 30.7 | 86.8 |
| <u>Aides</u> | | |
| Professionals | 50.0 | 87.8 |
| Parents | 38.1 | 83.6 |
| <u>Student Teachers</u> | | |
| Professionals | 30.6 | 81.5 |
| Parents | 30.7 | 82.6 |
| <u>Gym Teachers or Coaches</u> | | |
| Professionals | 45.8 | 86.8 |
| Parents | 46.6 | 84.6 |

Views as to Helpfulness of School Personnel
Parent and School Form

10a (Parent Form) and
11a (School Form).
(Superintendent)

Which of these types of people do you believe should be most helpful to youngsters who are having problems?

| | Good | Achievement Score Average | Poor |
|-------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Yes | 46.8 | 44.5 | 50.6 |
| No | 53.2 | 55.5 | 49.4 |
| Total | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Principal)

| | Good | Achievement Score Average | Poor |
|-------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Yes | 89.4 | 83.9 | 83.1 |
| No | 10.6 | 16.1 | 16.9 |
| Total | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Other administrators)

| | Good | Achievement Score Average | Poor |
|-------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Yes | 44.7 | 43.1 | 32.5 |
| No | 55.3 | 56.9 | 67.5 |
| Total | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Classroom teachers)

| | Good | Achievement Score Average | Poor |
|-------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Yes | 95.7 | 88.3 | 88.3 |
| No | 4.3 | 11.7 | 11.7 |
| Total | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Guidance counselors)

| | Good | Achievement Score Average | Poor |
|-------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Yes | 85.1 | 82.5 | 66.2 |
| No | 14.9 | 17.5 | 33.8 |
| Total | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Reading or other "special" teachers)

| | Good | Achievement Score Average | Poor |
|-------|------|------------------------------|------|
| Yes | 83.0 | 76.6 | 68.8 |
| No | 17.0 | 23.4 | 31.2 |
| Total | 47 | 137 | 77 |

W

(School nurses)

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------------------|------|
| Yes | Good | Achievement Score | Poor |
| No | 66.0 | Average | 75.3 |
| Total | 34.0 | 37.2 | 24.7 |
| | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(School board members)

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------------------|------|
| Yes | Good | Achievement Score | Poor |
| No | 36.2 | Average | 41.6 |
| Total | 63.8 | 78.8 | 58.4 |
| | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Librarians)

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------------------|------|
| Yes | Good | Achievement Score | Poor |
| No | 31.9 | Average | 33.8 |
| Total | 68.1 | 73.0 | 66.2 |
| | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Aides)

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------------------|------|
| Yes | Good | Achievement Score | Poor |
| No | 51.1 | Average | 49.4 |
| Total | 48.9 | 66.4 | 50.6 |
| | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Student teachers)

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------------------|------|
| Yes | Good | Achievement Score | Poor |
| No | 40.4 | Average | 20.8 |
| Total | 59.6 | 67.2 | 79.2 |
| | 47 | 137 | 77 |

(Gym teachers or coaches)

| | | | |
|-------|------|-------------------|------|
| Yes | Good | Achievement Score | Poor |
| No | 51.1 | Average | 44.2 |
| Total | 48.9 | 54.0 | 55.8 |
| | 47 | 137 | 77 |

EXHIBIT 4 - V

Parental Involvement

12a (Parent Form) and 13a (School Form).

12b (Parent Form) and 13b (School Form).

Have you been involved in (do parents get involved in) any of the following?

How do you rate their effectiveness (the effectiveness of such involvement)?

Percentages Across Parent-Teacher Organizations

Percentages Across

| | Yes | No | Total Responding | Effective | Not Effective | Total Responding |
|---|------|------|------------------|-----------|---------------|------------------|
| Professionals | 70.6 | 29.4 | 68 | 68.5 | 31.5 | 54 |
| Parents | 34.9 | 65.1 | 186 | 76.6 | 23.4 | 124 |
| Total | | | 254 | | | 178 |
| Parents' Nights | | | | | | |
| Professionals | 85.1 | 14.9 | 67 | 73.4 | 26.7 | 60 |
| Parents | 64.9 | 35.1 | 185 | 84.0 | 16.0 | 150 |
| Total | | | 252 | | | 210 |
| Individual Conferences With Teachers | | | | | | |
| Professionals | 97.1 | 2.9 | 68 | 98.4 | 1.5 | 65 |
| Parents | 76.1 | 23.9 | 184 | 93.1 | 6.9 | 159 |
| Total | | | 252 | | | 224 |
| School Board Meetings | | | | | | |
| Professionals | 54.0 | 46.0 | 63 | 79.1 | 20.9 | 43 |
| Parents | 20.1 | 79.9 | 179 | 84.5 | 15.5 | 97 |
| Total | | | 242 | | | 140 |
| Attendance in Classes | | | | | | |
| Professionals | 31.2 | 68.7 | 64 | 72.2 | 27.8 | 36 |
| Parents | 33.9 | 66.1 | 180 | 88.0 | 11.9 | 109 |
| Total | | | 244 | | | 145 |
| Meetings With Principals | | | | | | |
| Professionals | 85.3 | 14.7 | 68 | 98.2 | 1.8 | 55 |
| Parents | 56.0 | 44.0 | 182 | 89.4 | 10.6 | 132 |
| Total | | | 250 | | | 187 |
| Organizing Parent Meetings | | | | | | |
| Professionals | 50.0 | 50.0 | 62 | 89.2 | 10.8 | 37 |
| Parents | 18.3 | 81.7 | 175 | 88.5 | 11.5 | 96 |
| Total | | | 237 | | | 133 |
| Specifically Requesting More Information | | | | | | |
| Professionals | 63.3 | 36.7 | 60 | 88.1 | 11.9 | 42 |
| Parents | 34.1 | 65.9 | 176 | 84.9 | 15.1 | 106 |
| Total | | | 236 | | | 148 |

14 (Parent Form) and 15 (School Form).

Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school?

Percentages Across

A Study Schedule For Completing Homework

| | Most Helpful | Less Helpful | Total Responding |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|
| Professionals | 19.4 | 80.6 | 72 |
| Parents | 75.7 | 24.3 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |

| <u>Help With Homework by Other Family Members</u> | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| | <u>Most Helpful</u> | <u>Less Helpful</u> | <u>Total Responding</u> |
| Professionals | 27.8 | 72.2 | 72 |
| Parents | 63.0 | 37.0 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Encouragement to Do Well by Parents</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 79.2 | 20.8 | 72 |
| Parents | 92.6 | 7.4 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Having Reference Books and Other Study Aids Available</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 47.2 | 52.8 | 72 |
| Parents | 86.2 | 13.8 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Frequent Good Family Discussions</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 72.2 | 27.8 | 72 |
| Parents | 78.8 | 21.2 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Relationships of Trust and Confidence Between Parent and Child</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 93.1 | 6.9 | 72 |
| Parents | 94.2 | 5.8 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>Good Rates of Achievement in Work or School by Other Family Members</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 27.8 | 72.2 | 72 |
| Parents | 52.4 | 47.6 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |
| <u>A Happy Home</u> | | | |
| Professionals | 80.6 | 19.4 | 72 |
| Parents | 95.2 | 4.8 | 189 |
| Total | | | 261 |

| | <u>Very</u> <u>Helpful</u> | <u>Helpful</u> | <u>Not</u> <u>Helpful</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| School nurses | | | |
| School board members | | | |
| Librarians | | | |
| Aides | | | |
| Student teachers | | | |
| Gym teachers or coaches | | | |
| Other | | | |

11. (a) Do you receive any of the following? (b) How do you rate their usefulness, whether or not you receive them?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Very</u> <u>Useful</u> | <u>Useful</u> | <u>Not</u> <u>Useful</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Report cards | ... | .. | | | |
| Periodic printed information about school affairs | ... | .. | | | |
| School newsletters | ... | .. | | | |
| Individual reports from teachers | ... | .. | | | |
| Individual reports from counselors | ... | .. | | | |
| Information on special help available | ... | .. | | | |
| Requests for teacher-parent conferences | ... | .. | | | |

12. (a) Have you ever been involved in any of the following? (b) How do you rate their effectiveness?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Very</u> <u>Effective</u> | <u>Effective</u> | <u>Not</u> <u>Effective</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Parent-Teacher Organizations | ... | .. | | | |
| Parents nights | ... | .. | | | |
| Individual conferences with teachers | ... | .. | | | |
| School board meetings | ... | .. | | | |
| Attendance in classes | ... | .. | | | |
| Meetings with principals | ... | .. | | | |
| Organizing parent groups | ... | .. | | | |
| Specifically requesting more information | ... | .. | | | |

13. Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school. (a) Can you add other things to the list? (b) Which of the things on the list do you believe to be:

| | <u>Very</u> <u>Responsible</u> | <u>Responsible</u> | <u>Not</u> <u>Responsible</u> |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| Good medical care not available | | | |
| House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat | | | |
| Shortage of clothes | | | |
| Not enough good food | | | |
| No pre-school education (like kindergarten or Headstart) | | | |
| Not enough family income | | | |
| Use of drugs or alcohol | | | |



| | <u>Very Responsible</u> | <u>Responsible</u> | <u>Not Responsible</u> |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Only one parent in the home | | | |
| Unemployment | | | |
| Parents with limited education | | | |
| Parents' health | | | |
| Inadequate family transportation | | | |

14. Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school?

- A study schedule for completing homework
- Help with homework by other family members
- Encouragement to do well by parents
- Having reference books and other study aids available.....
- Frequent good family discussions
- Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child
- Good rates of achievement in work or school by other family members
- A happy home

15. Following is a list of conditions. (a) How frequently do they occur in school-age children you know? (b) Which ones most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

| | <u>Very Frequently</u> | <u>Frequently</u> | <u>Not Frequently</u> | <u>Limiting</u> |
|---|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Overweight | | | | |
| Contagious diseases | | | | |
| Mental illness | | | | |
| Learning disabilities | | | | |
| Retardation | | | | |
| Crippling physical handicaps | | | | |
| Poor vision | | | | |
| Poor hearing | | | | |
| Not able to understand what is being taught | | | | |
| Physical defects | | | | |
| Underweight | | | | |
| Emotional nervousness | | | | |

16. How important do you think the following student achievements are to school-age children of today?

| | <u>Very Important</u> | <u>Fairly Important</u> | <u>Not Very Important</u> |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Graduation from elementary school | | | |
| Graduation from high school | | | |
| Learning a trade or work skill | | | |
| Achieving good grades | | | |
| Involvement in non-study school activities | | | |
| Working part time to help the family | | | |
| Completing study assignments | | | |
| Learning to get along with others | | | |
| Taking part in class discussions | | | |
| Preparing for college | | | |

17. (a) What is the attitude of the schools toward a child who needs help with special problems?

Positive..... Neutral..... Negative.....

(b) What do you think is the attitude of a child with educational problems toward the schools?

Positive..... Neutral..... Negative.....

18. Do you think the schools feel the families of children with problems are "different" in any way?

Yes..... No.....

19. Do you believe the schools have a special responsibility toward a child with problems?

Yes..... No.....

APPENDIX 2
PROFESSIONALS' SURVEY INSTRUMENT

FORM S

Name _____ Position _____
School or District _____ City or Town _____

1. Can you provide a general background picture of the child who is not likely to do well in school?
2. (a) Why do some of these problems occur in your view? (b) Are there common home or educational experiences which seem to cause these problems? (c) What are some of the common signals that you feel identify students who need special help? (d) Do you have procedures for seeking out those children whose educational needs are less obvious, the so-called "quiet well-behaved" problem children?
3. Could you list in order of importance the areas of disadvantage-ment which lead to educational problems?
4. (a) How do you find out about children who are having problems? (b) Are there other ways in which you should find out but don't and, if so, why?
5. What actions do you take once such children come to your attention?
6. Once you have discovered a child or a group of children whose educational needs are not being met how do you work in concert with classroom teachers, specialists, counselors and others to handle the situation?
7. What programs are you aware of or involved in that deal specifically with the educationally disadvantaged child?
8. (a) How have special programs been developed and funded? (b) Have federal funds been useful in this area? (c) Are you free to apply for federal funding when available or needed? (d) How are you informed of various federal programs in this area?
9. (a) What other persons within the school system are most knowledgeable and involved in meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged children? (b) Why do you feel that they are knowledgeable? (c) Have they influenced the development of special programs for these children?
10. (a) Are there persons in the community who are knowledgeable about or involved with the needs of educationally disadvantaged children? (b) Who are they? (c) What specific things to your knowledge have they done? (d) Have you referred children to any of them and, if so, which ones?
11. (a) Which of these types of personnel are responsible in your school system for helping children who are having problems? (b) Which types are, in fact, most helpful to children with problems?

| | Responsible People | Very Helpful | Helpful | Not Helpful |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| Superintendent | | | | |
| Principal | | | | |
| Other administrators | | | | |
| Classroom teachers | | | | |
| Guidance counselors | | | | |
| Reading or other "special" teachers | | | | |
| School nurses | | | | |
| School board members | | | | |
| Librarians | | | | |

| | <u>Responsible People</u> | <u>Very Helpful</u> | <u>Helpful</u> | <u>Not Helpful</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Aides | | | | |
| Student teachers | | | | |
| Gym teachers or coaches | | | | |

12. (a) Are the following methods of communication with families used in your school system? (b) How do you rate their usefulness, whether or not they are used in your school system?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Very Useful</u> | <u>Useful</u> | <u>Not Useful</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Report cards | ... | .. | | | |
| Periodic printed information about school affairs | ... | .. | | | |
| School newsletters | ... | .. | | | |
| Individual reports from teachers | ... | .. | | | |
| Individual reports from counselors | ... | .. | | | |
| Information on special help available | ... | .. | | | |
| Requests for teacher-parent conferences | ... | .. | | | |

13. (a) In your school district, do parents become involved in the following activities? (b) How do you rate the effectiveness of such involvement?

| | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Very Effective</u> | <u>Effective</u> | <u>Not Effective</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Parent-Teacher Organizations | ... | .. | | | |
| Parents nights | ... | .. | | | |
| Individual conferences with teachers | ... | .. | | | |
| School board meetings | ... | .. | | | |
| Attendance in classes | ... | .. | | | |
| Meetings with principals | ... | .. | | | |
| Organizing parent groups | ... | .. | | | |
| Specifically requesting more information | ... | .. | | | |

13. (c) To what extent do parents of disadvantaged children become involved in these things?

13. (d) Within the disadvantaged parents' group, what do you see as blocks to effective involvement with the problems of their children?

14. Following is a list of conditions believed to be responsible for making it harder for students to do their best in school.

(a) Can you add other things to the list? (b) Which of the things on the list do you believe to be:

| | <u>Very Responsible</u> | <u>Responsible</u> | <u>Not Responsible</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Good medical care not available | | | |
| House without modern plumbing, electricity or heat | | | |
| Shortage of clothes | | | |
| Not enough good food | | | |

| | <u>Very Responsible</u> | <u>Responsible</u> | <u>Not Responsible</u> |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| No pre-school education (like kindergarten or Headstart) | | | |
| Not enough family income | | | |
| Use of drugs or alcohol | | | |
| Only one parent in the home | | | |
| Unemployment | | | |
| Parents with limited education | | | |
| Parents' health | | | |
| Family mobility | | | |

15. Which of these forms of support are most helpful in bringing about good achievement in school by disadvantaged children?
- A study schedule for completing homework
 - Help with homework by other family members
 - Encouragement to do well by parents
 - Having reference books and other study aids available,
 - Frequent good family discussions
 - Relationships of trust and confidence between parent and child
 - Good rates of achievement in work or school by other family members
 - A happy home

16. Following is a list of conditions. (a) How frequently are they a factor in educationally disadvantaged school-age children? (b) Which ones most limit a child's ability to do his or her best in school?

| | <u>Very Frequently</u> | <u>Frequently</u> | <u>Not Frequently</u> | <u>Limiting</u> |
|------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Overweight | | | | |
| Contagious diseases | | | | |
| Mental illness | | | | |
| Learning disabilities | | | | |
| Retardation | | | | |
| Crippling physical handicaps | | | | |
| Poor vision | | | | |
| Poor hearing | | | | |
| Physical defects | | | | |
| Underweight | | | | |
| Emotional nervousness | | | | |

17. (a) What is the attitude of the schools toward the disadvantaged child?

Positive..... Neutral..... Negative.....

(b) What is the disadvantaged child's attitude toward the schools?

Positive..... Neutral..... Negative.....

18. Can you comment generally on the characteristics of the family of a disadvantaged child?

19. Do you believe the schools have a special responsibility toward a disadvantaged child?

Yes..... No.....