ED 371 149   CE 066 593

AUTHOR   McCabe, Patrick P.; And Others
TITLE   The Attitude toward School of Secondary Special
                Education Students with High, Moderate, and Low
                Attendance Rates.
PUB DATE   [92]
NOTE   28p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Attendance Patterns; Career Education; Dropout
                Characteristics; Educational Research; High Risk
                Students; *Mild Disabilities; *Potential Dropouts;
                School Attitudes; Secondary Education; *Special
                Education; Special Needs Students; *Student
                Attitudes

ABSTRACT
        A study assessed the underlying dynamics of
attendance rates of secondary school special education students at
risk for dropping out. Seventy-eight mildly disabled special
education students enrolled in an urban work readiness program were
interviewed to assess the effects of job and affective skill training
on their attitudes toward school. Only feelings of belonging to the
school culture differentiated among students with low, moderate, and
high attendance rates. The data supported the proposition that
students with low attendance rates were more strongly affected by
outside influences (friends, home responsibilities) than by
school-related activities and job training. Five characteristics were
identified as indicative of alienation from the school culture and
early dropping out: being a loner, absences condoned by the home,
unique dress characteristics, full-time employment, and drugs and/or
erratic, hostile behavior. (Appendixes include interview response
form and percentage of responses by attendance rate, and follow-up
interview script. Contains 21 references.) (Author/YLB)

The Attitude Toward School of Secondary Special
Education Students with High, Moderate, and Low Attendance Rates

Patrick P. McCabe
Department of Education
Valdosta State University
Valdosta, GA 31698
(912) 333-5623

Peter C. Smergut
Principal
Manhattan School for Career Development
New York, NY
(212) 477-2090

Howard Margolis
Department cf Educational
and Community Programs
Queens College of CUNY
Flushing, NY 11367
(718) 997-5242

Running Head: Attendance

2

Abstract

Educators face the problem of low attendance and high drop out rates, an especially acute problem among urban special education students. This study assessed the underlying dynamics of attendance rates of secondary school special education students at risk for dropping out. Seventy-eight mildly disabled special education students enrolled in an urban work readiness program were interviewed to assess the effects of job and affective skill training on their attitudes toward school. Only feelings of belonging to the school culture differentiated among students with low, moderate, and high attendance rates. The data supports the proposition that students with low attendance rates are more strongly affected by "outside" influences (e.g., friends, home responsibilities) than by school related activities and job training. Early warning signs of dropping out are enumerated to help schools target intervention efforts.

Educators face the problem of low attendance and high drop
out rates. This problem is especially acute among urban special
education students. The high dropout rate has serious,
destructive ramifications for society.

Dropout rates are even more pronounced for mildly disabled
students capable of being mainstreaming than they are for
nondisabled students (e.g., Lichtenstein & Zantal-Wiener, 1988).
Blackorby, Edgar, and Kortering (1991) reported that 85% of
mildly disabled students surveyed dropped out of school. In New
York City over half of special education students failed to
graduate (New York City Board of Education, 1991). Understanding
the dynamics of dropping out can help educators make decisions
likely to enhance these retention rates. In reviewing the
literature on dropping out of school, Hendrick, Macmillan, and
Balow (1989) concluded that "the regrettable failing of research
efforts to date has been in not focusing more attention on those
dropouts most at risk, i.e., those with learning disabilities"
(p. 22). This study assessed the underlying dynamics of
attendance rates of special education students at risk for
dropping out.

Affective Factors

Overall, the literature suggests that students who feel good
about themselves (i.e., affect) in school and perceive that the
program in which they are enrolled provides important preparation
for the world of work (i.e., relevance) are more likely remain in
school than those who lack that belief. Martinez (1986) found
that negative teacher attitude and infrequent positive interac-
tions with teachers helped distinguish school attenders from non-

attenders. Similarly, Seidel and Vaughn (1991) found that
learning disabled school dropouts felt more alienation toward
classmates learning disabled persisters.

It is important to note that the positive relationship
between dropping out and negative affect exists across cultures.
For example, Alaskan female teenagers reported that low self-
esteem, isolation and alienation significantly influenced their
leaving school (Bruce, 1990); Native American high school leavers
reported teacher indifference as a significant factor (Colardar-
ci, 1983); and Chinese youth identified "genuine care and
concern" as significant factors keeping them in school (Guolin,
1988). The information on the social aspects of schooling and
dropout rates generally supports Tidwell's (1988) conclusion that
"the attitudes students have toward school and the degree of
students' social integration into the school environment are
related to early school departures" (p. 940). McPartland and
Slavin (1990) argued that to lessen the attrition of special
education students, school must provide both success and positive
student/adult relationships.

Relevance

Motivation theory and research suggests that students are
more likely to be motivated about program participation and
remain in school if they believe their program satisfies their
critical needs or will ultimately benefit them (Wood, 1991). The
more school programs evoke memories of past failures or
unpleasantness, and the less students believe school will
contribute to post-graduation success, the less the likelihood of
their remaining in school. This may explain why alternative

educational settings that impose curricula and assessment
procedures similar to those of traditional school settings have
greater dropout problems (Driscoll, Berle, Mandell, & Schneider,
1985; Glasser, Kley & Raymond, 1982; and
Silvestri, 1986).

Naylor (1987) found perceptions of "disconnectness" a major
factor influencing attrition. Students failed to see the connec-
tion between what was taught and their working future. To
overcome disconnectedness and reverse the dropout rate, she
recommended (a) extensive career exploration and related career
education experiences, (b) vocational programs that direct
dropout prone students to job specific training courses, and (c)
enhanced linkages between vocational experiences and other school
activities. Similarly, Okolo and Sitlington (1986) recommended
that career education programs for learning disabled students
stress (a) job related interpersonal and academic skill instruc-
tion; (b) in-depth career vocational assessment; (c) occupational
awareness, exploration, and basic work experiences; (d) post
school placement and follow-up. Miller (1987) found that in
addition to individualizing instruction and stressing outcomes,
successful programs for at-risk students focused on real life
problems and incorporated community service experiences. Clearly,
the emphasis on real life problems and community service is
designed to increase student perceptions of relevance.
Analogously, McPartland and Slavin (1990) posited that to reduce
attrition for special education students, programs must address
school relevance and outside interferences.

One interpretation of the literature suggests that solutions
to the dropout problem must emanate from an examination of the
school's structure and curriculum and not from a deficit
perspective in terms of the dropout. As Blackorby, Edgar and
Kortering (1991) stated, "A more productive approach may be to
study the contextual issues rather than individual dropouts"
(p. 111). If solutions emphasize diagnosing real or presumed
deficits of students "at-risk" for dropping out and trying to
change them rather than creating environments students find
attractive and meaningful, the problem will remain unsolved.
Developing programs that meet student needs, and which students
believe will meet their needs, in an accepting, growth-oriented
school culture, appears critical for reversing what has been an
intractably high secondary school dropout rate.

Lichtenstein and Zantal-Weiner (1988) have indicated a
dearth of research related specifically to special education
school dropouts. This lack of research is especially acute for
programs which have as their goal entry level participation by
special education students in the world of work. Therefore, this
investigation was conducted to examine the degree to which both
school structure and curriculum affect the perceptions of mildly
disabled students "at-risk" for dropping out of school.

New York City Board of Education Program:

The New York City Board of Education Citywide Secondary
School Program is an alternative high school program designed to
provide relevant social and work preparation experience for
mildly handicapped special education students "at-risk" for
dropping out. The curriculum and the nature of everyday experien-

ces differs greatly from traditional high school curricula, procedures, and organization.

From June 1987 to June 1989 school attendance in "Alternative Program A," one of eight New York City Board of Education alternative secondary programs increased from 51% to 74%, where it remained throughout the duration of this study. "Alternative Program A" was selected for this reason. Importantly, this attendance change occurred concurrently with the implementation of a new program of study which incorporated some of the suggestions in the literature cited above to improve the quality of secondary programs.

The hypothesis that students positively perceived the new program emerged from this concurrence of factors. To examine the relationship between (a) student attitudes toward the acquisition of job-related skills and toward affective factors and (b) their attendance, students in "Alternative Program A" were interviewed.

The transition-to-work curriculum of "Alternative Program A" is a five year course of study which gradually introduces students to the world of work in preparation for entry level positions. Unlike traditional high school programs where courses are departmentalized and students have several teachers a day, this program provided students with a teacher and paraprofessional five periods a day in a class with a low student-to-teacher ratio.

In year one the teacher spends five 45-minute teaching periods with the same youngsters with a 12:1:1 staff to student ratio (student: teacher: paraprofessional). Shop experiences in building maintenance, food, clerical skills, and automotive

skills are combined with visitations to related job sites.
Students are exposed to numerous career possibilities.

In year two, students select an area of concentration from
their first year experiences. Concordant with Frazier and Stone
(1983), who assert that student curricular preference is one way
to help prevent students from dropping out, the decision is not
imposed upon students. Students participate in four shop periods
in a preferred area of concentration. Workforce literacy and
mathematics skills are integrated with the demands of the
selected career area.

In year three students participate in a cooperative learning
model where they alternatively attend school and community
sponsored worksites in two week cycles. Worksite experiences are
determined by students' areas of interest and the type of
training received during their first two years in the program.
The Workforce literacy and mathematics skills taught in the
school enable students to successfully complete tasks assigned to
them at the Worksite.

In year four a full immersion work experience in the
students chosen career field occurs. Students have opportunities
to refine both their vocational and affective work experience
skills. Job related literacy skills, mathematics skills, and
values clarification sessions are provided several periods daily
for a total of ninety minutes. Students graduate after successful
completion of year four. However, they remain eligible for
transitional services in the fifth year of the program. In year
five employed graduates receive needed additional support to help
overcome any transitional difficulties they face.

Within this framework, this study examined student percep-
tions of the degree to which affective factors and the acquisi-
tion of job-related skills contributed to the attitudes of "at-
risk" secondary school learning disabled students with high
medium, and low attendance rates.

Method

The special education school in which "Alternative Program
A" was housed served 131 special education students ages 14-9 to
21-0. Program acceptance required prior identification of "at
risk" for dropping out of school, and voluntary selection of
"Alternative Program A's" entry work oriented program. Most
students traveled to school by public transportation, some
traveling more than an hour daily.

"Alternative Program A" meet New York City criteria as a SIE
(Special Instructional Environment) IV program. Students served
in SIE IV programs have the following characteristics (New York
City Board of Education, 1990).

1. Physical Development: The student's vision, hearing,
health, or motor development is normal or can be addressed
within the school, such as a resource room for hearing
impaired students.

2. Academic Development: The student is unable to meet the
requirements for a high school diploma and demonstrates
severe academic difficulties. His or her reading level is
below grade 3. These instructional deficits cannot be
attributable only to erratic school attendance, prolonged
absence from instruction, or recent arrival to formal public

schooling. These educational needs require specialized
instruction on a full-time basis.

3. Learning Characteristics: The student's intellectual
functioning falls within the 70 to 100 IQ range as deter-
mined by WISC-R scores, but the student demonstrates the
ability to achieve functional literacy. The student requires
intensive additional strategies and techniques in order to
acquire skills and information.

4. Handicapping Condition: The student has been identified
as learning disabled with or without another handicapping
condition (pp. 154-158)

Seventy-eight students who were new entrants into the
program were identified as subjects in this study. Of the 78
students selected, 72 had WISC-R Full Scale IQs that fell in the
"below average" category (IQs between 70 and 89); six had scores
that fell in the "average" range (IQs between 90 and 110).
Student ages ranged from 15 years, 2 months to 20 years, 2 months
(mean = 17 years, 3 months; standard deviation = 1 year, 3
months). Thirty-three students were African-American, 40 Latino,
and 5 Asian-American. Sixty-nine students were male. At the time
of the study, 37% of the students (n = 29) were high attenders
(above 84% attendance); 24% (n = 19) were moderate attenders (70
to 84% attendance); and 38% (n = 30) were low attenders (below
70% attendance). Categorization of student attendance followed
New York City Board of Education guidelines. All subjects came
from families which were at the federally defined poverty level.

Material

An interview response form to assess students' attitudes
toward the program (see Figure 1) was jointly created by the
principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, four teache-
rs, and a professor of education from a local college. The form
was designed to be comprehensible to the program's unique student
body and to reflect the emphasis of the program. Thus, it focused
on (a) job-related skills and (b) affect. As previously dis-
cussed, these two domains appear to critically influence student
decisions to continue in school

Items were carefully worded to ensure student understanding
of what they were asked. To assess understanding, a pilot
investigation was undertaken. A final 9 item response form
evolved from the pilot investigation. Six items focused on
"affect" and three on "job-related skills."

Procedure

During March, 1990 individual interviews of approximately
ten minutes in length were conducted in an empty classroom by a
bilingual English/Spanish speaking paraprofessional trained in
the testing procedure. The interview response form was tape
recorded and then presented to the subjects simultaneously in
oral and written form. (Tape recording was used to reduce the
possibility that students would primarily respond to please the
interviewer, often a problem in interview studies.) After intro-
ducing himself to the youngster and explaining the purpose of the
interview, the paraprofessional completed the sample item with
the student to ensure that the task was understood. Once satis-
fied that this was the case, the tape recorder was turned on and

the interview response form was heard. A Spanish version of the
interview response form was individually administered to three
youngsters for whom Spanish was their primary language. A follow-
up session was also conducted with students to ascertain the
reasons for their answers.

In effect the interviewer was removed from the process since
a different person -- hence a different voice and speech pattern
-- was heard on the tape. The interviewer merely stated the
purpose of and monitored the session to eliminate glitches. The
interviewer instructed students to follow along on their written
copy by placing a check in the appropriate space. If students
indicated they did not understand an item, the interviewer
provided a brief explanation, devoid of indications as to what
might be a preferred answer. If students lost their place or
needed other assistance, the interviewer intervened. Presentation
of the interview form on audio tape also eliminated the influence
of inadequate reading skills.

Data Analysis

Chi square analyses were used to test examine the variance
of the responses of high, moderate, and low attenders' attitude
toward school for each item in the questionnaire.

In order not to lose potentially valuable information which
may warrant further study with larger and/or different samples or
more refined instrumentation, differences at a .10 level of
probability were considered significant. This is explored more
fully in the discussion section.

Results

As shown in Table 1 on page 22, a chi-square value of 13.01 (6, N=76) for responses to question 3 discriminated among the attendance groups at the .05 level of significance. Chi-square values for item 7 (6, N= 78) of 10.75 and item 9 (5, N= 77) of 10.83 discriminated among the attendance groups at the .10 level of significance. Differences among the responses to the remaining six items yielded probability levels at or above .19, suggesting they did not reliably discriminate among attendance groups.

Figure 1 on page 23 presents the individual questions and the percentages of responses organized by attendance rate.

A follow up analysis of the questions with chi-square probability levels significant at .10 or less indicated the following.

Item 3: "In this school I feel like I fit in" The significant chi square cell was low attenders' preference for response "b," "No, I do not feel like I fit in." Individual follow-up interviews found that nine of the 11 low attenders who selected "b" preferred the company of neighborhood friends "from the street" rather than the "new" kids in the building. (See Appendix A on page 26 for the interviewer script during these interviews.)

Item 7: "This school helps me get along better with adults" The significant chi square cells were high attenders selection of "b," "Sometimes it (the school) helps me get along with adults," and "a," "Yes, it helps me to get along with adults."

Item 9: "How do you feel about this school?" The significant chi square cell was the moderate attenders selection of "c," "I'm

not sure if I like this school." (However, the observed frequency
in this category was two, a number far too low upon which to make
inferences.)

Discussion

As previously noted, a .10 probability was employed to
ascertain statistical significance to avoid losing potentially
valuable information.

Linton and Gallo (1975) noted that "there is nothing sacred"
about the .01 or .05 levels of significance (p. 48). The alpha
level should be set by a consideration of the consequences of
making Type I or Type II errors. In some situations they suggest
that an alpha level of .20 can be the better choice. Given the
sample size and the consequences of a Type II error, the .10
level was chosen for between-subject comparisons, so as not to
conclude that "no difference" exists when in actuality real
differences exist. The .10 level reduces the possibility of
disregarding a potentially promising treatment or instrument in
its initial stages of development due to (a) the limitations of
statistical tests which, in part, derive their power from the
number of subjects in groups, and (b) the possibility that the
treatment or instrument needs further refinement to manifest a
more potent impact. All three items differing among the high,
moderate, and low attendance rates at the .10 level of
significance were designed to tap the affective domain.

If the more stringent .05 probability level is used to
determine significance, only responses to question 3
distinguished among attendance groups. Concordant with the trend
when the .10 level of significance was used, this item was

designed to tap the affective domain. Regardless of significance
level used, groups did not differ on responses to the three
questions directly assessing job preparation ("This school gets
me ready to get a job." "In this school the classes that I take
... help me decide what job I want." "I think that going to work
as part of my school day is a good idea."). This finding is
potentially important considering the emphasis in the literature
on job-related skill development and affective training for
students at-risk of dropping out. (While participating students
were classified as SIE IV by the school district, the label
should be de-emphasized and the emotional, physical, and learning
characteristics emphasized when considering the results.)

While both job-related skills and affective components are
essential and should constitute integral parts of a comprehensive
strategy, programs to reverse attrition need to address the
youngster. As indicated by post-investigation interviews with low
attenders who selected response "b" to item 3 (Item 3: "In this
school I feel like I fit in." Response b: "No, I do not feel like
I fit in"), these students preferred association with neighbor-
hood groups; they did not seem to value membership in a group
associated with and cultivated within the school did not seem to
be desirable for these low attending students. Typical of their
responses are the statements:

>   "I'm in a gang and I'd rather be with them."
>
>   "I miss my homeboys."
>
>   "I'd rather chill with my friends."
>
>   "These kids are special eds., I'm not like them."

"On my block no one calls me special ed; here this is a
special ed. school."

"The teachers are okay, but outside is more fun and I
can make more money."

Given the methodological limitations of interviews at a
single site, with relatively small numbers of students, the
results of this study and its extrapolations must be considered
tentative. Clearly, experimental research, with large samples,
across a variety of settings, is needed for conclusions to be
held with a high degree of certitude. The results of this study
offer direction for designing these experimental programs. The
results also offer direct service programs with information that
may prove useful while the field waits for more definitive
results.

The findings suggest that low attending special education
students, like those in this study, are unlikely to benefit
greatly from job readiness training in a positive, affectively-
oriented environment if the program fails to attend to the world
in which they live. For low attenders, programs which ignore what
McPartland and Slavin (1990) call "outside interferences," such
as gang membership, substance abuse, and the possibility and
reality of teen-aged pregnancy may be doomed to failure. A
logical inference from the findings is that community-related
programs, with active home and community outreach components, may
prove more successful in encouraging low-attending, mildly
disabled special education students to attend school. In fact,
three low-attenders were adamant that travel was a problem. They
were very direct: "It's too far to travel." Given these

statements, the affiliation preferences of low attenders, and the low status with which many low-attenders viewed their in-school peers, it makes sense to consider placing programs in neighborhood schools and identifying and removing that which they consider stigmatizing. Locally housed programs with strong home and community outreach components, sensitive to the local culture and responsive to neighborhood forces which impact on low-attenders may have far greater potential for positively influencing retention than programs far distant from students' neighborhoods housed at a large centralized site.

Despite the school's attempt to provide students with choices and to help them feel socially comfortable, low-attenders, as a group, were explicit that they felt they did not fit into the school. Training both regular and special education teachers to identify youngsters who feel out of place in school is an important, initial step in combating low-attendance and attrition. Training only special education teachers will likely prove inadequate as many special education students experience their greatest difficulties in mainstreamed or nonacademic (e.g., lunchroom) situations.

Follow-up discussions with teachers in "Alternative Program A" identified five salient characteristics indicative of "alienation" from the school culture. The following behaviors may appear either individually or in combination.

1. <u>Being a Loner</u>: These students express that they "don't need this," referring to school activities such as clubs,

teams, or special events. Although loners may obtain good
grades, they do not involve themselves in "extra curricular"
school sponsored activities.

2. Absences Condoned By the Home: These students have
patterns of absences ostensibly condoned by the home. Common
are frequent notes, which may or may not be legitimate,
indicating the need to care for a relative or help in family
emergencies.

3. Unique Dress Characteristics: Some students exhibit their
feelings of uniqueness and disdain through dress.
"Overdressing" in a flashy fashion may be a student's way of
declaring uniqueness while manifesting disengagement from
peers and the school.

4. Full Time Employment: Students who work full time are
clearly in danger of dropping out. They have little
opportunity for study or homework and are often tired in
class.

5. Drugs and/or Erratic, Hostile Behavior: Erratic or
hostile behavior is a common precursor of dropping out.
Students on drugs often exhibit such behavior.

Identifying the exact factors influencing the decisions of
individual students is difficult and requires going beyond
nomothetic factors to examining idiographic factors impacting on
individual students. Nevertheless, program design requires that
secondary school educators understand the forces which influence
the decisions of groups of students and initially design programs
to address group needs and subsequently adapt program specifics
to meet individual student needs. The findings of this study

provide information helpful in directing future research and
program efforts to address the needs of mildly handicapped urban
youth "at risk" for dropping out of school.

References

Blackorby, J., Edgar, E., & Kortering, L. (1991). A third of our
    youth? A look at the problem of high school dropout among
    students with mild handicaps. The Journal of Special
    Education, 25, 102-113.

Bruce, L. (1990). Young women of Alaska speak out. Anchorage.
    AL.: Alaska Women's Commission. (ERIC Document Reproduction
    Services No. ED 323474).

Coladarci, T. (1983). High school dropouts among Native
    Americans. Journal of American Indian Education, 23, 15-22.

Driscoll, B., Berle, M., Mandell, L., & Schneider, S. (1985).
    Alternative educational models for junior high school
    students not meeting promotional standards. (Paper presented
    at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research
    Association, Chicago).

Frazier, D. & Stone, S. (1983). Barriers to student completion
    of vocational programs: Final report. Stillwater, OK:
    Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical
    Education.

Glaser, R., Kley, R., & Raymond, C. (1982). Keeping high risk
    students in school. (Paper presented at the annual meeting
    of the National Association of Secondary School Principals,
    San Francisco, CA.).

Guolin, L. (1988). Importance of updating educational thinking as
    seen from the problem of junior high school dropouts in
    Guangzhou City districts. Chinese Education: A Journal of
    Translations, 21, 80-87.

Hendrick, I., Macmillan, D. L., & Balow, I. H. (1989). <u>Early</u>
    <u>school: Leaving in America</u>. Riverside, CA: California
    Educational Research Cooperative. (ERIC Document
    Reproduction Services No. ED 320039).

Lichtenstein, S. & Zantal-Wiener, K. (1988). <u>Special education</u>
    <u>dropouts</u>. Reston, VA.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and
    Gifted Children.

Linton, M., & Gallo, P. S. Jr. (1975). <u>The practical statis</u>
    <u>tician</u>. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Martinez, R. (1986). <u>Minority youth dropouts: Personal, social,</u>
    <u>and institutional reasons for leaving school</u>. Colorado
    Springs, Colorado: Center for Community Development and
    Design, Colorado University.

McPartland, J. K. & Slavin, R. E. (1990). <u>Increasing achievement</u>
    <u>of at-risk children at each grade level</u>. Washington, DC:
    Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ERIC Report
    No. 318-134).

Miller, J. V. (1987). <u>Some current issues in adult, career,</u>
    <u>and vocational education</u>. Columbus, Ohio: Eric Clearinghouse
    on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

Naylor, M. (1987). <u>Reducing the dropout rate through</u>
    <u>career and vocational education</u>. Columbus, Ohio: ERIC
    Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.

New York City Board of Education (1991). <u>Chancellor's working</u>
    <u>group on the Workforce for the year 2000: Final report</u>. NY:
    Author.

New York City Board of Education. (1990). <u>New York City continuum</u>
    <u>of special education services</u>. NY: Author.

Okolo, C. & Sitlington, P. (1986). The role of special education
     on LD adolescents' transition from school to work. Learning
     Disability Quarterly, 9, 141-55.

Seidel, J. F., & Vaughn, S. (1991). Social alienation and the
     learning disabled school dropout. Learning Disabilities
     Research and Practice, 6, 152.157.

Silvestri, K. (1986). The re-emergence of alternative education.
     Equity and Choice, 3, 25-27.

Tidwell, R. (1988). Dropouts speak out: Qualitative data on early
     school leavers. Adolescence, 23, 939-954.

Wood, C. (1991). Are students and school personnel learning to be
     helpless-oriented or resourceful-oriented? Journal of
     Educational and Psychological Consultation, 2 (1), 15-48.

Table 1

Rank Ordering of Probability Levels of
Chi Square Differences (df = 6)

Rank	Question No. [*]	Chi Square	Probability Level
1	3(A)	13.010	.0429 [†]
2	9(A)	10.830	.0939 [††]
3	7(A)	10.750	.0964 [††]
4	1(J)	8.672	.1929
5	2(A)	6.908	.3295
6	4(J)	5.938	.4302
7	5(A)	5.857	.4393
8	8(A)	4.807	.5688
9	6(J)	4.023	.6736

[*] (A) denotes an affective item; (J) denotes a job-skill item

[†] Significant at or less than .05

[††] Significant at or less than .10

24

Figure 1
Interview Response Form and Percentage
of Responses by Attendance Rate

Sample Question

In this school I get reading and math every day.

    a. Yes I get reading and Math every day.
    b. No, I don't get reading and math every day.
    c. I'm not sure it I get reading and math every day.
    d. I can't answer this question

Actual Questions

1 (J). This school gets me ready to get a job.

    a. Yes, it gets me ready to get a job.
        H = 86%, M = 89%, L = 69% [**]
    b. No, it does not get me ready to get a job.
        H = 10%, M = 0%, L = 10%
    c. I don't know if it gets me ready.
        H = 3%, M = 11%, L = 17%
    d. I can't answer this question.
        H = 0%, M = 0%, L = 7%

2 (A). In this school there are things to do that make me feel good
      about myself.

    a. Yes, there are things to do that make me feel good about
       myself.
        H = 50%, M = 39%, L = 35%
    b. No, there are no things to do that make me feel good about
       myself.
        H = 0%, M = 30%, L = 10%
    c. There are some things to do that make me feel good about
       myself.
        H = 43%, M = 30%, L = 52%
    d. I can't answer this question.
        H = 7%, M = 0%, L = 3%

---

[*] The domain identifications (A) for affective and (J) for job-related have been placed on the form for the reader's benefit. These designations were not on the form provided students.

[**] H = High Attenders, M = Moderate Attenders, L = Low Attenders

3 (A). In this school I feel like I fit in. [Difference significant
       at .05.]

   a. Yes, I feel like I fit in.
      H = 68%, M = 42%, L = 45%
   b. No, I do not like I fit in.
      H = 11%, M = 11%, L = 38%
   c. I don't know it I fit in.
      H = 11%, M = 26%, L = 7%
   d. I can't answer this question.
      H = 11%, M = 21%, L = 10%

4 (J). In this school the classes that I take in foods, building
       maintenance, auto or clerical help me decide what job I want
       to do.

   a. Yes, the classes help me decide what Job I want to do.
      H = 79%, M = 89%, L = 70%
   b. No, the classes don't help me decide what job I want to
      do.
      H = 7%, M = 6%, L = 3%
   c. I don't know it these classes help me decide what job
      I want to do.
      H = 11%, M = 0%, L = 23%
   d. I can't answer this question.
      H = 4%, M = 6%, L = 3%

5 (A). This school helps me to get along with other students.

   a. Yes, it helps me get along, with other students.
      H = 50%, M = 53%, L = 40%
   b. No, it does not help me get along with other students.
      H = 0%, M = 11%, L = 17%
   c. Sometimes it helps me get along with other students.
      H = 43%, M = 32%, L = 33%
   d. I cannot answer this question.
      H = 7%, M = 5%, L = 10%

6 (J). I think that going to work as part of my school day is a
       good idea.

   a. Yes, I think it is a good idea.
      H = 79%, M = 68%, L = 83%
   b. No, I don't think it is a good idea.
      H = 7%, M = 5%, L = 7%
   c. I'm not sure that it's a good idea.
      H = 7%, M = 16%, L = 10%
   d. I can't answer this question.
      H = 7%, M = 11%, L = 0%

7 (A). This school helps me get along better with adults.
       [Difference significant at .10.]

   a. Yes, it helps me get along, with adults.
      H = 75%, M = 53%, L = 36%
   b. No, it does not help me get along with adults.
      H = 4%, M = 5%, L = 13%
   c. Sometimes it helps me get along with adults.
      H = 14%, M = 37%, L = 45%
   d. I can't answer this question.
      H = 7%, M = 5%, L = 7%

8 (A). In this school I like the people who teach me.

   a. Yes, I like the people who teach me.
      H = 89%, M = 75%, L = 70%
   b. No, I don't like the people who teach me.
      H = 4%, M = 5%, L = 10%
   c. I'm not sure if I like the people who teach me.
      H = 4%, M = 15%, L = 17%
   d. I can't answer this question.
      H = 4%, M = 5%, L = 3%

9 (A). How do you feel about this school? [Difference significant
       at .10.]

   a. I like this school.
      H = 82%, M = 58%, L = 50%
   b. I don't like this school.
      H = 7%, M = 5%, L = 20%
   c. I'm not sure if I like this school.
      H = 11%, M = 26%, L = 27%
   d. I can't answer this question.
      H = 0%, M = 11%, L = 3%

Appendix A

Follow-up Interview Script

<u>Say to student</u>:

"What you and I say here is confidential. Except for me no one will know what you say. You picked response `b' to this item (the interviewer points to and reads item # 3: `In this school, I feel like I fit in'). I would like you to try to help me find out more about your answer. Can you tell me what you were thinking when you picked this answer?"

<u>If no response, say</u>:

Can you tell me some reasons why you said you feel like you do not fit in this school? I'll give you some time to think.

<u>If still no response, say</u>:

"Now think a minute and try to tell me why you did not pick this answer." (Interviewer points to and reads responses "a," "c," and "d.")

A:\RATE6-94.ART