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Abstract

The purpose of this study has been to design, implement, and evaluate an alternative structure to traditional schools, operationalized as the Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited School. The alternative structure of the school was based on a number of theoretical concepts. The implementation of this structure intended to increase the level of coping skills in student participants who were at risk for dropping out of high school.

There were two theoretical models that influenced the design of the LSYOU School. The first model suggests that the socialization of clients is most effective in organizations that are high in scope and pervasiveness and that exercise control over clients through the use of normative compliance (Etzioni, 1961). The second model suggests that positive outcomes in clients are more likely to occur in organizations that utilize participative management to characterize the relationship between superiors and subordinates (Likert, 1961).

Two main problems were addressed in this study. The first problem dealt with the congruence between the LSYOU School and its theoretical underpinnings. The second problem dealt with the issue of whether the implementation of the LSYOU School could produce positive outcomes in the at-risk student participants.
A control group research design was implemented with funding from the Job Training Partnership Act. A modified form of random assignment was used to select the treatment group (105 students) and the control group (65 students). Two procedures were utilized to validate whether the LSYOU School reflected its theoretical base. The first was a quantitative analysis of the Profile of School. The second was a qualitative analysis of student observations, interviews, surveys, and letters.

Four hypotheses were tested to measure treatment outcomes. These hypotheses predicted that the treatment group would attain significantly higher scores over a control group at the .05 level or beyond in math, reading, career maturity, and intentions to remain in school.

This study has demonstrated two major findings. The first is that the LSYOU Program successfully reflected the theoretical constructs upon which it was based. The second is that this program did produce positive outcomes in the at-risk student participants' level of coping skills.
CHAPTER I
NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter introduces the study by reviewing the background to the problem, which includes the problems caused by dropping out of school; the problems with traditional schools; and the need for an alternative school structure for students at risk for dropping out of school. This chapter also describes the purpose of the study, which is to design, implement and evaluate a program with an alternative structure to traditional schools. This alternative structure is intended to increase positive outcomes for at-risk student participants. Included in Chapter I are the definitions of the major terms used in the study; the statement of the research problem and the hypotheses of the study. The final sections of Chapter I outline the significance and the limitations of the study.

Background to the Problem

The Problems Caused by Dropping Out of School

"...What happens to a dream deferred? Maybe it just sags like a heavy load. Or does it explode?..." (Langston Hughes, Dade County Grand Jury, 1984, p. 28).
Numerous researchers (Levin, 1986; McDill, Natriello, and Pallas, 1985; Hodgkinson, 1985) looking into the issue of high school dropouts have recently predicted dire consequences for our nation if the dreams of twenty-five percent of our population - the high school dropouts - start exploding.

The phenomena of dropping out of high school is as old as the public school system in the United States (Hodgkinson, 1985). At present, statistics vary on the dropout rate due in large part to the disagreement and inaccuracy of defining the concept and of measuring its rate. There is no disagreement, however, that the interest in the dropout issue has increased substantially in the last two years (Rumberger, 1987). There are a number of reasons why state and local officials, researchers and policymakers are devoting more and more time to this issue than ever before (Rumberger, 1987).

These reasons for the increased interest in dropouts include the following issues: there are substantial economic costs associated with not completing high school; the dropout cycle is a regenerating one (Hodgkinson, 1985); the dropout rate is higher for minorities (Rumberger, 1987); the dropout rate correlates with the crime and delinquency rate (Dade County Grand Jury, 1984); the economic progress of our nation requires better educational skills; the dropout rate has become an
indicator of school performance (Rumberger, 1987); and educational reform legislation without remediation is increasing the dropout rate (Hodgkinson, 1985; McDill, Natriello, and Pallas, 1985; Levin, 1986).

Levin (1986) believes the need to address the causes and consequences of not educating the high school dropout is urgent. He states that this is necessary in order to avoid the "social disruption, political turmoil, anguish of wasted lives, and the economic and social losses from undeveloped artistic and scientific talent" (p. 35).

Problems with Traditional Schools

This researcher asserts that the major tendency in studying school dropouts is to focus on the characteristics of the dropout to the exclusion of the school's organizational structure that may contribute to its holding power of the student. In order to understand the school's role in the decision of students to leave school early, it is necessary to focus on the school as an organization.

Bidwell (1965) describes the school as a unique combination of bureaucratic structure and looseness. From a bureaucratic perspective, the school has a press for uniform outcomes; its clients are non-voluntary, grouped in age/grade cohorts, and are regulated by a myriad of rules and regulations; and its staff consists of
a specialized work force existing in a hierarchical setting.

Cusick (1973) notes that there are a number of unintended organizational characteristics that are a result of the formal bureaucratic structure of the school. These unintended characteristics include: a) little teacher - student interaction; b) little student involvement in formal activities; c) fragmentation of the educational experience; d) minimal compliance on the part of students; and e) student concern for the maintenance of their own small subgroup. Bidwell (1965) describes these as functional problems of the school as a social organization.

Wehlage (1986) elaborates on the concept of unintended organizational characteristics of the school. He states that the impersonal bureaucratic structure of large high schools has created a "sense of alienation among students, who feel that the adults do not care for them and that they are likely to be treated in an unfair and arbitrary manner. The comprehensive high school of today may create adult-student relationships that result in skepticism and cynicism in both parties" (p. 390).

Etzioni (1983) has stated that the recent emphasis on school reform revolves around cognitive mastery. He contends that present day schools have ignored two main goals of education which are the development of...
personality and character. He believes that schools do nothing to correct the psychic deficiencies that some students bring with them from the home. He also believes that some schools add psychic damage to the psychically underdeveloped by providing opportunities for further maladjustment. Etzioni contends that schools must not be devoid of structure but must provide a structure where students can learn self regulation.

The Need for an Alternative Structure for At-Risk Students

Wehlage (1982) believes the primary task of schools is to assist each child in developing "social bonds which are attachments, commitments, beliefs and involvements with societal norms, roles, and expectations" (p. 18). Because of unintended outcomes of the school as a bureaucratic organization, the traditional school tends to be too large, too insensitive to children, too teacher oriented, and too preoccupied with issues of control to effectively carry out this mission for all students (Etzioni, 1983). At-risk students do not possess the level of coping skills (Etzioni, 1961; Wehlage, 1984) that enable them to function effectively in regular schools. This limitation causes the at-risk student to feel alienated from the regular school and to eventually drop out of school (Etzioni, 1961; Wehlage, 1986).
In order to effectively socialize at-risk students, an alternative organizational structure appears necessary for the at-risk student to acquire the coping skills that they lack.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to design and evaluate an alternative organizational structure to traditional schools, operationalized as the Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited (LSYOU) School (treatment). This school is intended to increase the level of coping skills of at-risk student participants. Therefore, specifically the objectives of this study include: a) the design of an alternative organizational structure; b) the congruence of LSYOU and its theoretical base; and c) the identification of changes in students resulting from their participation in the LSYOU school.

Definition of Terms

At-Risk Student: For this study, at-risk students are generally from low socioeconomic families; have low grades and little interest in school; come from families that have little support for school; and lack coping skills (Ekston, Goertz, Pollock & Rack, 1986; Bickel, Bond & LeMahieu, 1986; Mertons, 1982; Etzioni, 1983; Wehlage, 1986).
CMI: See Coping Skills

Coping Skills: An individual's ability to concentrate, control impulses, motivate oneself, overcome stress, or commit to a task (Etzioni, 1961). In the school setting, coping skills are understood in terms of such student behavior as the ability to memorize, write a paragraph, or compute (Etzioni, 1961). In this study, student coping skills are operationalized in terms of scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) math applications and concepts (MA), math computations (MC) and reading vocabulary (RV) subscales; scores on the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) for attitudes; and scores on the Intention to Remain in School Inventory (IRS).

CTBS: See Coping Skills

IRS: See Coping Skills

LSYOU School (Treatment): In this study, the LSYOU School (Treatment) is an experimental school for at-risk students designed to incorporate the following elements: a high degree of scope; a high degree of pervasiveness; a high degree of participativeness; and the use of normative compliance.
**Normative Compliance:** Refers to the "allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards" such as grades, honors, or recommendations in order to influence the acceptance or positive responses of subordinates (Etzioni, 1961, p. 5).

**Normative Organizations:** Organizations that utilize normative compliance to gain commitment from the members of the organization (Etzioni, 1961).

**Participativeness:** A subordinate - superior relationship characterized by supportive leadership, shared decision making, open communication, high trust and concern for the attainment of goals (Likert, 1961). In this study, participativeness is measured by the Profile of Schools (POS) Instrument developed by Likert (1972).

**Pervasiveness:** "The number of activities in or out of the organization for which the organization establishes norms" (Etzioni, 1961, p. 267).

**Scope:** The number of activities shared by the participants in the organization, e.g. eating together, going to class together (Etzioni, 1961).
Traditional School: From a bureaucratic perspective, the traditional school has a press for uniform outcomes; its clients are non-voluntary, grouped in age/grade cohorts, and are regulated by a myriad of rules and regulations; and its staff consists of a specialized workforce existing in a hierarchical setting (Bidwell, 1965). In this study, the public school that the students in the treatment and control groups attended prior to the onset of the LSYOU treatment is considered to be a traditional school.

Theoretical Rationale for the Design of the LSYOU School

In order to increase the level of coping skills for at-risk students, a school with an alternative structure to traditional schools must be designed. This alternative structure requires attributes that would enhance the socialization experience of at-risk students by fostering the commitments and necessary attachments for them to acquire the coping and psychic skills that they lack.

Mann (1986) asserts that these attributes must include classes with a low pupil-teacher ratio in schools where the student body is smaller than average. He also agrees with Wehlage (1982) that the structure of a school most suitable to retaining potential dropouts is one that shows a great deal of care and concern for the student. In addition, this structure must include a high level of personal contact; instructional methods that vary and are
suitable to the student's learning style; student tasks that are challenging and feasible; and opportunities for the student to demonstrate initiative and responsibility (Wehlage, 1982). These properties of care and concern are what the "futures literature describe as a high touch school" (Mann, 1986, p. 319).

In this study, two theoretical models were employed to create an organizational structure that enhance the socialization experience of at-risk students. The selected models are thought to fulfill what the literature describes as necessary for schools that have as their goal the socialization of at-risk students.

The first model centers on creating an organizational environment based on high scope, high pervasiveness, and normative compliance (Etzioni, 1961).

The second model utilized creates an organizational structure that enhances the socialization experience of at-risk students and is based on the work of Rensis Likert (1961). Likert (1961) describes along a continuum, the characteristics of organizations relative to superior–subordinate relations.

The Likert (1961) continuum consists of the following four organizational types:

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

b) The benevolent-authoritative type is similar to the exploitive-authoritative type but to a lesser degree.

c) The consultative type is similar to the participative type but to a lesser degree.

d) The participative management type is characterized by supportive leadership in all situations; cooperative and substantial teamwork; and shared decision making in establishing and maintaining goals. There is also a high level of trust and confidence between leaders and subordinates. Communication is characterized by little blockage; flows both vertically and horizontally; and is frequent between groups and individuals. In addition, there are high goals and a concern for performance at all hierarchical levels in the organization.

Statement of the Problem

Stake (1976) notes that appropriate evaluation research addresses at least two key relationships. The
first is the relationship between intended program structure and program implementation. The second is the relationship between program implementation and program outcomes. Keeping this in mind, the problem addressed in this study can be understood in terms of two research questions:

a) Is the implementation of the LSYOU treatment congruent with its intended theoretical grounds?

b) Did the LSYOU treatment make a positive difference in the level of coping skills of student participants?

The first research question was explored in terms of the validation of the LSYOU treatment. This validation was addressed through two avenues detailed by the researcher in the methodology section of this work. First, the researcher examined whether the students who participate in the LSYOU treatment viewed it as having greater participative superior – subordinate relations than the school that they attended prior to attending LSYOU. Second, the researcher examined data from student interviews, surveys, letters, and researcher observation to determine the degree of scope, pervasiveness, and normative compliance perceived by LSYOU students.

The second research question was addressed through tests of hypotheses concerning treatment outcomes.
Hypotheses on Program Outcomes

The following research hypotheses were developed in order to examine whether the implementation of the LSYOU treatment positively effects the coping skills of at-risk student participants.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group on the student CTBS math applications and concepts and math computations scores at the $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group, on the student CTBS reading vocabulary scores at the $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group on the student Career Maturity Inventory attitude scores at the $p < .05$.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group on the Student Intention to Remain in School scores at the $p < .05$. 
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Significance of the Study

This study illustrates at least five main areas of significance:

a) How a social program is a response to a social problem such as dropping out of high school;
b) How the design of a social program can be based on several theoretical perspectives;
c) The importance of evaluating the implementation of the social program as intended by its theoretical framework;
d) The importance of linking program outcomes to the implementation of the program; and,
e) The benefit of a particular theoretical approach as the foundation for a social program that treats students at risk for dropping out of school.

Limitations of the Study

Because this study is an evaluation of a social program rather than an experiment, it generates a number of research limitations due to the inability to control all aspects of the research setting. The following are limitations acknowledged by the researcher because of this inability:

a) The sample for this study was not based on random selection of at-risk students; therefore, generalizing to
the population will have to be made with caution.

b) While this study did employ a modified form of random assignment to test the differences between the treatment and control groups, random assignment only controls pre-treatment equivalence. Therefore, imitation of treatments, compensatory rivalry, compensatory equalization, and demoralization in groups receiving less desirable treatment cannot be eliminated (Cook & Campbell, 1979).

c) Full random assignment was not implemented in developing the treatment and control groups due to the ethical considerations of extraordinary need exhibited by a subset of the applicants. This requires analyses which reflect the special circumstances under which social programs often need to operate. These students are included in the analyses which therefore weakens the internal validity of the inferences.

d) The control and treatment groups had an unequal number of participants due to limitations established by the funding agent.

e) The researcher of the LSYOU project was also the coordinator of the project. Therefore, interpretation of the qualitative data contains some bias associated with the researcher's intentions and expectations for the project.
Summary of the Chapters

The purpose of Chapter I has been to argue that the intended treatment of this study, the Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited (LSYOU) Program was based on a number of underlying theoretical premises. These underlying premises result in the LSYOU school having a very different organizational structure than traditional schools. The purpose of Chapter I has also been to develop hypotheses that link positive outcomes in students to the implementation of the LSYOU school.

Chapter II contains a selected review of the literature. The review of the literature covers the following topics: a) drop out research relevant to the current study, b) research on school structure as it relates to at-risk students, c) research on the theoretical models utilized for the design of the treatment of this study, and d) evaluation literature that is relevant to the current study.

Chapter III describes the intended treatment of the study, the LSYOU school. This description attempts to demonstrate that the components of the LSYOU school were purposefully constructed to reflect the theoretical model of scope, pervasiveness, and normative compliance (Etzioni, 1961) and the theoretical model of participativeness (Likert, 1961).
Chapter IV describes the methodology of the study. This includes the description of the design of the program evaluation, the description of the design of treatment validation, and the description of the design for testing for treatment outcomes.

Chapter V presents the results of the study. It includes the results obtained through both the quantitative and qualitative methodology employed to validate the treatment of the study. It also includes the results obtained through the hypotheses testing for treatment outcomes.

Chapter VI presents a review of the study, a discussion of conclusions drawn from the results of the study, recommendations for future research, and recommendations for utilizing the results of the evaluation.
CHAPTER II
A SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of selected literature relevant to the current study. This review is divided into four sections: dropout research relevant to the current study, research on school structure, research on the theoretical models utilized for the design of the treatment (LSYOU school) of this study, and evaluation literature relevant to the current study. The literature on dropout research is important to the present study because it describes the need for the study as well as the characteristics of at-risk students who made up the sample of this study. The literature relevant to school structure is included because it provides the rationale for the need to develop an alternative school structure for at-risk students. The literature on the two theoretical models utilized to develop the alternative school structure used in this study is included to argue for the benefits of a particular approach to dropout prevention. The evaluation literature reviewed in this chapter is important in understanding the methodology described in Chapter IV of this study.
Drop Out Research

**Impact of Dropping Out of High School**

The present study has selected to focus on the issues surrounding the topic of drop out prevention due to a number of reasons. These reasons can be more appropriately thought of as the impacts of dropping out of high school and will be examined here in detail.

**Individual Economic Impacts**

Lifetime earnings of a high school dropout are approximately $250,000 less than that of a high school graduate, with economic consequences varying for subgroups of minorities (Rumberger, 1987). These personal economic impacts for high school dropouts arise from their real and/or perceived educational deficits.

Rumberger (1987) states that failing to graduate from high school usually indicates that the individual possesses a low level of academic skills. Alexander, Natriello, & Pallas (1985) have provided research that indicates that with personal characteristics held constant, dropouts, on the average, have lower levels of academic skills than their peers who have graduated from high school.
Individual Psychological Impacts

Rumberger (1987) cites that there have been established "no causal relationships between dropping out of school and subsequent physical and mental health problems" (p. 113). However, he further cites that dropping out might effect health indirectly through unemployment or underemployment. Brenner's study (cited in Rumberger, 1987) found a connection between unemployment and increases in overall mortality rates, suicide rates, and the rate of admission to mental hospitals.

Social Impacts

There are a number of social impacts caused by dropping out of high school:

a) The dropout problem appears to be a regenerating one unless the cycle is broken. Research indicates that one of the primary characteristics of the dropout is that, in general, his/her parents did not graduate from high school (Hodgkinson, 1985).

b) In addition, dropout rates have always been higher than average for minority populations. As the number of minorities increase in the population and in the public schools, the dropout rate is expected to rise (Rumberger, 1987).
c) A third reason for concern about the dropout rate centers on statistics relative to crime and delinquency. Research indicates that sixty percent of all high school age juvenile offenders are also high school dropouts (Dade County Grand Jury, 1984). Delinquency theory suggests that youth who have been labeled as delinquent have not "developed social bonds with the norms, values, and roles required by the primary institutions of the society" (Wehlage, 1982, p.10).

d) Economic costs to society are the fourth social impact associated with dropping out of high school. The cost of educating a youth from grades K - 12 is approximately $150,000.00 to a state. If a student drops out of high school prior to the completion of the twelfth grade, he/she will most likely be unemployed or underemployed. In addition to not repaying in taxes the investment that the state has in his/her schooling, the dropout usually becomes a permanent burden on the state in the form of welfare payments, unemployment insurance, etc. (Hodgkinson, 1985). Levin (cited in Rumberger, 1987) estimated that the costs of providing social services such as welfare, medical assistance, criminal justice assistance, and unemployment assistance to high school dropouts is approximately six billion dollars annually. This figure has probably increased in recent years. A study by Catterall (cited in Rumberger, 1987) estimates
that loss in taxes and other governmental revenues amounted to 68 billion dollars over the lifetime of male and female dropouts from the national high school class of 1981.

e) A fifth social impact of dropping out of high school is its relevance to the future job market. From the industrial revolution to the present day, the economic progress of our nation has been dependent upon better education (Hodgkinson, 1985). Rumberger (1987) believes that the most recent state educational reforms, prompted from national reports such as the National Commission on Excellence, all stem from the widespread belief that the technological advances in the workplace will require more and better educational skills. From an individual standpoint, the dropout may have a more difficult time competing for more technologically advanced jobs in the future (Rumberger, 1987). From a social standpoint, the future of our country depends on the ability to compete in international markets. An uneducated workforce will seriously hamper the progress of our nation (Levin, 1986).

**Political Impacts**

There are a number of issues surrounding dropping out of high school that are thought to be political in nature (Rumberger, 1987). These include the following:
a) The dropout rate is considered to be one of the "indicators of judging the performance of public schools" (Rumberger, 1987, p.103). This fact has encouraged the Council of Chief State School Officers to begin the process of developing a national consensus in defining the term dropout and measuring its rate.

b) Another issue involves the new reform legislation, which according to a number of researchers is seeking to upgrade standards in public schools without addressing remediation issues (Hodgkinson, 1985; McDill, Natriello, & Pallas, 1985; Levin, 1986). This has created a new type of dropout called the pushout. Due to the inability of the pushouts to meet the new academic standards, they will leave school early, thus swelling the ranks of the traditional dropouts.

In summary, dropping out of high school appears to have a number of negative impacts both on the individual and on society. From an individual standpoint, impacts are economic, psychological and educational. From a social standpoint, impacts occur in the areas of economics, the job market, the crime rate, and policy making. From the above discussion, it is clear that dropout prevention is an important issue to be addressed.
At-Risk Students

If one wants to address the dropout problem, there are a number of factors that must be examined. The first of these focuses on the students most likely to become high school dropouts. These students have been labeled by educators as "at-risk" for dropping out of high school. At-risk students have a number of characteristics in common which center around the following variables: demographic, academic, family, psychological, cognitive, and social.

Demographic Characteristics

Data from the High School and Beyond Study, which provides the most recent longitudinal data on dropouts, indicates that there is greater risk for dropping out among low socio-economic status (SES) students, males, minorities except Asian Americans, students attending school in the West or South, students in vocational programs, and students attending schools in urban settings (Ekstrom, Goerty, Pollack and Rack, 1986). Rumberger (1983), utilizing data from the National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) of Youth Experience, obtained parallel results. Additionally, Rumberger (1983) concluded that females, regardless of ethnic background, who are pregnant or who have had a child have higher dropout rates.
Demographic characteristics of the potential dropout have been gleaned from the literature by Mertens (1982). She reports the following: a) Minorities drop out of school in much higher numbers proportionate to the population than whites. b) More males drop out of school than females. c) The female dropout's profile usually includes pregnancy. d) Being over age for the grade level that the student is in is a factor contributing to dropping out of school. e) Sixteen is the peak age for dropping out as is the eleventh grade. Additional information found in a review of the literature by Howard (1977) indicates that some dropouts may suffer from chronic health problems such as dental and auditory complaints.

Academic Characteristics

In the academic area, researchers conclude that the at-risk student has "poor grades (failing too many courses); lack of interest in school subjects; and poor reading ability" (Bickel, Bond & LeMahieu, 1986, p.13). Ekstrom, et al, (1986) reports that the at-risk population analyzed in their study reported that their school grades and test scores were low, particularly in reading; their expectations for educational achievement were low; and their completion of homework assignments was poor.
Research also indicates that failure in one or more grade levels and poor school grades are the most significant predictors of potential dropouts (Howard, 1977). Schrieber (1969) found that the chances of a child becoming a potential dropout are eight out of ten if he/she is underachieving academically after first grade, and has failed first or second grade. Howard (1977) summarizes from the literature a number of academic factors that predict future dropout behavior. These factors include the following: a) The student has one or more failures in elementary and high school, particularly at the first, second, eighth and ninth grades. b) By the seventh grade, a student is performing one year or more below grade level in mathematics and reading. c) In mathematics, a student has difficulty in abstract reasoning, generalizing, analyzing, and inferring relationships. d) A student has difficulty memorizing and retaining information.

Schrieber (1969) summarizes the views on intelligence and dropping out of school. He notes that researchers are not in agreement over the role intelligence plays in the student making the decision to drop out of school. From a survey of the literature, he concludes that at least 50 percent of high school dropouts have the intelligence to graduate from a traditional high school. And, ten percent of high school dropouts have the intelligence to
successfully compete in college. What role social factors, such as family characteristics, poverty, etc., played on the test scores of the students that these percentages were based upon is open to conjecture (Schriebner, 1969).

**Family Characteristics**

Mertens (1982) provides the following review and summary of the family characteristics of the potential dropout: a) Dropouts come from families with a large number of siblings. b) Usually, the family has older siblings that have dropped out and/or the parents also did not complete the twelfth grade. c) The absence of the father during the elementary years and the absence of the mother during early adolescence contributed to stress on the child that could lead to his/her dropping out of school. d) A larger percentage of dropouts come from highly disadvantaged homes rather than moderately disadvantaged homes. This characteristic led to a predominance of minority dropouts. The effect of Socio-Economic Status appears to be an indirect rather than a direct cause of dropout behavior. Low SES contributed to academic, psychological and socialization variables that appear to be more directly related to dropout behavior. e) A large percentage of dropouts come from homes where English is not the primary language. f) The residence of
families of the potential dropout appears to effect the likelihood of dropping out, particularly at age fourteen. This influence, however, is complex and varies, by race, sex, and geographic areas. g) The family lacks organization and engages in little outside activity.

Bickel, Bond, and LeMahieu (1986) corroborate the findings of Mrtens (1982). They report that there are three main characteristics that have been consistently related to the families of at-risk students. First, at-risk students tend to come from either physically or emotionally broken homes. Second, because of this, there is generally little parental or adult support and very little emphasis placed on school. Third, the parents of at-risk students tend to be economically disadvantaged. They tend to be "unemployed, on welfare, or employed erratically in unskilled or semi-skilled work" (Bickel, et al, 1986, p.15). In some cases, lack of finances causes the student to leave school and seek employment (Bickel, et al, 1986).

**Psychological/Cognitive Characteristics**

Mertens (1982) also summarizes from the literature many of the psychological aspects of the high school dropout. As early as elementary school, low self-esteem has been indicated as a variable. This low self-esteem coupled with poor academic performance leads to feelings
of alienation, isolation, and insecurity. Other variables included a need for independence, hostility to authority figures, disruptive and aggressive behavior, absence of life goals, and an inability to see relevance between education and life experiences. Ekstrom, et al, (1986) found that an external locus of control was a characteristic of at-risk students.

Etzioni (1983) says that the at-risk student is psychically underdeveloped. He believes that these students lack the ability to concentrate, control impulses, motivate themselves, overcome stress, or commit to a task. He further states that these psychic inabilities are the main contributors to cognitive inabilities such as being able to memorize, write a paragraph, or compute. This, of course, leads to feelings of low self-esteem and alienation.

Wehlage (1982) believes the single largest contributor to a student dropping out of school is his/her lack of coping skills. "Coping skills include self-management skills such as control of aggression, the ability to reconcile conflicting demands, and the ability to adapt to authority; and cognitive skills such as abstract thinking, problem solving, and frame of reference flexibility" (p.5). Wehlage (1982) summarizes from the literature on the concept of abstract thinking as it relates to the dropout. He states that the potential
dropout's behavior is halted at the preconventional stage of thinking, which is a selfish self-centered view of the world. This preconventional way of thinking demands "concrete exchanges for favor or goods" (p.20). Unless the adolescent can make the transition from concrete to abstract thinking and from preconventional thought to conventional thought, which is a more inclusive sociocentered and socially aware view of the world, he/she will have trouble being socialized into society.

Johnson (1984) agrees that cognitive variables can contribute to a student dropping out of high school. By administering the Learning Style Inventory developed by Dunn, Dunn, & Price, Johnson (1984) discovered the following cognitive characteristics to be predictors of dropout behavior. a) Students who drop out prefer some noise while learning, with lower levels of light and warm temperatures. b) They prefer an informal learning environment. c) They learn best with a peer with a minimum of interference from authority figures. d) They have a preference for learning by doing rather than by listening. e) They prefer to move around as they have difficulty in sitting for long periods of time. f) They prefer learning in the late morning. In addition, Johnson (1984) found that when these learning style factors were combined with the academic variables of reading and computing below grade level, and of having one or more
failures; as well as, with the social variables of absenteeism and school rule infractions, one could correctly predict 96.7 percent of future dropouts. The discriminate function was significant at the .01 level for the above research. This identification of the potential dropout could be done as early as the third grade.

Pressholdt, et al, (1984) offers another perspective on the affective characteristics of the potential dropout. Pressholdt, et al, (1984) acknowledges that there are probably as many as eighty or more separate variables that contribute to the student developing dropout behavior. However, he is more interested in identifying the factors that immediately precede the intention of a high school student to drop out of school. In an attempt to do so, he and his colleagues applied the theory of reasoned action, developed by Ajzen & Fishbein (1980), to the problem of students dropping out. A model was then constructed that identifies seventeen specific beliefs about the consequences of staying in or dropping out of school. Pressholdt and his colleagues argue that the identification of this belief system will be successful in identifying potential dropouts at the high school level.

Social Characteristics

Wehlage (1986) contends that the at-risk student's lack of coping skills causes him/her to have difficulty
in becoming socialized to the traditional institutions of society, including school. This often results in delinquent behavior in the potential dropout. This deviant behavior is a result of the student's socialization to "subcultural standards that conflict with the dominant standards of society" (p.19). It manifests itself in school through either "extreme passivity or problems concerning rules, attendance, tardiness, smoking, language, inattentiveness, and an unwillingness to engage in sedentary work" (p.20). It also manifests itself in an unwillingness to participate in extracurricula activities (Howard, 1977).

Etzioni (1983) agrees that the lack of psychic abilities contributes to the plethora of social problems manifested by the at-risk student. Bickel, Bond and LeMahieu (1986) identify the following social patterns exhibited by at-risk students: a) disciplinary problems such as drug use, fighting, stealing and vandalism; b) resistance to authority and the inability to get along with school personnel, a predominantly male phenomena; c) poor attendance patterns; d) desire to marry early, a predominantly female phenomena; e) peer pressure; and f) pregnancy.
Summary of At-Risk Students

In summary, before the dropout problem can be addressed, one must have a good understanding of the characteristics of the at-risk student. These characteristics were subdivided into demographic, academic, family, psychological/cognitive, and social variables. This understanding is essential, particularly in the area of program planning and evaluation because these variables constitute the outcomes which the researcher is aiming to impact positively.

School Structure/Socialization

Existing School Structure as it Relates to At-Risk Students

In addition to understanding the characteristics of the at-risk student, it is also essential to understand how those variables interact with school structure in order to plan and evaluate a dropout prevention program. Or restated, how do variables within the school contribute to the retention of at-risk students? To understand the variables within the school, it is necessary to focus on the traditional school as an organization.

Bidwell (1965) describes the school as a unique combination of bureaucratic structure and looseness. From a bureaucratic perspective, the school has a press for uniform outcomes; its clients are non-voluntary, grouped
in age/grade cohorts, and are regulated by a myriad of rules and regulations; and its staff consists of a specialized workforce existing in a hierarchical setting. According to Bidwell (1965) this "distinctive structural arrangement can be viewed as an adaptation, perhaps largely due to historical circumstances, to the exigencies of coordination" (p.1013). This structure has a degree of looseness, however, resulting from the autonomy of classroom teachers and the student subculture which has its own goals (Bidwell, 1965). Control for this looseness of structure is then counteracted by an additional press for uniform results and the socialization of teachers to accept school system demands as legitimate (Bidwell, 1965). Constituent involvement in the school system is deliberately channeled through organized groups such as the PTA. This process socializes the constituents of the school to accept the status quo of the school structure (Bidwell, 1961). The nurturing aspect of teachers is generally subjugated to issues of control over clients who are there involuntarily (Bidwell, 1965).

Cusick (1973) elaborates on the bureaucratic structure of schools. He states that the traditional high school exhibits the following characteristics: a) the school is vertically organized, usually staffed by a principal, vice principal, department chairs and a teaching staff. b) The students are subordinates who are
organized by grade level.  c) The curriculum is divided into six or seven forty to sixty minute periods.  d) There are a number of specified credits that must be earned yearly for a student to be able to pass to the next grade.  e) A predetermined set of units is necessary for graduation.  f) Numerical grades are assigned which represent student achievement.  g) Achievement is measured by tests, classwork, and homework. In sum, the traditional high school is organized to "facilitate the process of the teacher passing on a particular specialty to batches of students" (Cusick, 1973, p.13).

According to Cusick (1973), the traditional elementary school is one in which students are grouped according to grades. Entry into the first grade is dependent on age not maturity. Schools vary in racial and ethnic make up with urban schools tending to have a predominance of minority children. Students are taught a variety of subjects including reading, math, English, social studies, physical education, and science. These subjects are discrete, although generally taught by the same teacher. Some elementary schools are departmentalized, which means that the subjects are taught by different teachers. Like the high schools, students receive numerical grades to indicate achievement. This achievement is measured by both standardized and teacher made tests, classwork, and homework. The student's grade
is the basis for his/her promotion to the next grade level.

Both the traditional elementary and secondary school tend to foster the middle class norms of order and discipline (Howard, 1977). In addition, Cusick (1973) states that the traditional elementary and secondary school usually have diffuse goals encompassing "self-realization, human relationships, economic efficiency, and civic responsibility (p.13). Students in the traditional high school usually spend their time in small groups hanging out together. These small groups affect other aspects of the organization such as the administration, staff, classroom behavior and extracurricula activities. The social life of the school and conforming to rules and regulations predominate the student's view of the school rather than anything academic. This corresponds to Bidwell's (1965) view of the student subculture. A few students, known as "isolates", are alienated from the social groups of the school which may lead to a lack of socialization into the larger society (Cusick, 1973).

According to Cusick (1973) there are a number of bureaucratic characteristics that contribute to the specific purpose of the school which is to "articulate...a specific body of knowledge, skills, and behavioral patterns in the form of curriculum and then to pass this curriculum to students" (p.206). These characteristics
include the following: "a) subject matter specialization, b) vertical organization, c) doctrine of adolescent inferiority, d) downward communication flow, e) batch processing of students, f) routinization of activity, g) dependence on rules and regulations, h) future-reward orientation, and i) physical arrangements that are conducive to passing on information from teacher to student" (p.208-209).

Cusick (1973) notes that there are a number of unintended organizational characteristics that are a result of the formal bureaucratic structure of the school. Bidwell (1965) describes these as functional problems of the school as a social organization. These unintended characteristics include: a) little teacher - student interaction; b) little student involvement in formal activities; c) fragmentation of the educational experience; d) minimal compliance on the part of students; and e) student concern for the maintenance of their own small subgroup.

Wehlage (1986) elaborates on the concept of unintended organizational characteristics of the school. He states that the impersonal bureaucratic structure of large high schools has created the following:

- a sense of alienation among students, who feel that the adults do not care for them and that they are likely to be treated in an unfair and arbitrary manner. The comprehensive high school of today may create adult - student
relationships that result in skepticism and cynicism in both parties (p. 390).

Carlson (1964) describes the public school as a domesticated organization. A domesticated organization can be defined as one in which the organization has no control over the admission of clients and one in which the clients have no control over their own participation in the organization. This arrangement has serious implications for the client and the staff. Carlson contends that in order for organizations to adapt to unselected clients, they become geared to provide adequate services to some clients and are more responsive to clients who possess a certain set of characteristics. They do this in order to protect valued resources to achieve identified uniform goals.

Carlson believes that clients adapt to this situation in one of three ways. The first is a receptive adaptation. This is defined as the students' not perceiving their relationship with the school as problematic. The second is a dropout adaptation. These students withdraw from the school, probably because they feel that sense of alienation that Wehlage (1986) describes. A third adaptation is one of partially rejecting the school. This partial rejection may display itself in many forms: a) the student engages in situational retirement. This is defined as being physically but not mentally present at
school.  b) The rebellious adjustment is another form of partial rejection of the school. Here, the student engages in brinksmanship by testing the limits of all situations. His/her role is disruptive and problematic. Carlson believes it is a way station to the total rejection of the school -- or dropping out. c) The student may engage in receiving side payments. This indicates that the student accepts the goals of the school as long as he/she is not deprived of receiving side payments such as meeting the opposite sex, engaging in sports, or other extracurricula activities.

Waller (1932) was the first to describe the importance of extracurricula activities as the school's chief response to solving the conflict between the desire for the student subculture to maintain its own values and norms, and the desire of the school to maintain order and motivation through the use of official authority. According to Gordon (1954), Coleman (1961), and Cook (1945), one's position in extracurricula achievements determines his/her social status in the school. Students that lack certain social skills that prevent him/her from effectively participating in the extracurricula activities of school cannot avail themselves of the "side payment" response to the bureaucratic structure of the schools and thus develop less effective methods of coping.
Etzioni (1983) states that the recent emphasis on school reform perpetuates the bureaucratic structure by revolving around cognitive mastery and uniform outcomes. He states that present day schools have ignored two main goals of education which are the development of personality and character. He believes that schools do nothing to correct the psychic deficiencies that some students bring with them from the home. He also believes that some schools add psychic damage to the psychically underdeveloped by providing opportunities for further maladjustment. Etzioni contends that schools must not be devoid of structure but must provide a structure where students can learn self regulation.

Based on the above discussion, it seems that some combination of organizational variables (e.g. class size, authority model, degree of bureaucracy, leadership, climate, etc.) affects the holding power of the school. It also seems that the holding power of the school varies as Carlson (1964) describes with the attributes of the clients.

**An Alternative School Structure to Socialize At-Risk Clients**

This brings us to the logical question of what type of school structure best socializes, thus retaining, at-risk students. Bidwell (1965), Cusick (1973), and Howard
(1977) all agree that the primary function of the school is to socialize students to the predominant norms of society. In addition, Wehlage (1982) believes that the primary task of the school should be to focus on assisting the child in developing social bonds which are "attachments, commitments, beliefs, and involvements with societal norms, roles and expectations" (p. 18). Brim and Wheeler (1966) agree. They conclude that Type IV organizations, defined as organizations that are relatively differentiated and process people rather than things, should have as their primary purpose the goal of changing the knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and skills of those who pass through the organization.

While Brim and Wheeler (1966) believe that schools fit in the Type IV classification, they also believe that there are large differences in the capacity of schools to engage students in such a way that their reactions are a function of the events in the organization. Socialization can also be thought of as a reciprocal relationship. While the social organization has the primary mission of passing along moral and technical norms, attitudes, knowledge and behavior, the individual being socialized may have a variety of responses (Greenfield, 1984). The typical response of the at-risk student to the socialization attempt of the traditional high school is one of alienation or rebellious adjustment (Coleman, 1964).
Since socialization is reciprocal, schools that serve at-risk students must be particularly in tune to their needs if socialization is to be successful. What, then, are the attributes of schools that would foster the commitments and attachments that are necessary for the at-risk student to acquire the coping and psychic skills they are lacking?

Mann (1986) asserts that these attributes must include classes with a low pupil-teacher ratio in schools where the student body is smaller than average. He also agrees with Wehlage (1982) that the structure of a school most suitable to retaining potential dropouts are ones that show a great deal of care and concern for the student. In addition, this structure must include a high level of personal contact; instructional methods that vary and are suitable to the student’s learning style; student tasks that are challenging and feasible; and opportunities for the student to demonstrate initiative and responsibility. These properties of care and concern are what the "futures literature describe as a high touch school." (Mann, 1986).

Etzioni (1983) agrees that existing schools and alternative approaches exhibit traditional bureaucratic problems such as being too large, too insensitive to children, too teacher oriented, and too preoccupied with issues of control. He cautions, however, that reforms
could go too far if we heed the cues of students exclusively, and if we have teachers who become pals to the exclusion of being mentors. He further states that schools should be places where young people are rewarded for work well done; where they find that self organization and achievement are a source of social gratification; and where students abide by rules because they are sensitive to others. He believes that it is not what teachers say but how they behave that effectuates the most change in students. The socialization experience of students, through their interactions at the school, must support "sound character formation, mutuality and civility" (Etzioni, 1983, p.134).

In 1982, Wehlage studied six successful alternative programs for at-risk or marginal clients to identify common organizational variables. His research is classified into administrative variables, teacher culture variables, student culture variables, and curriculum variables. A description of these variables follow.

**Administrative Variables**

The first administrative variable identified is size. Small numbers were essential for personal relationships to develop between students and between faculty and students.

The second variable identified is the autonomy of the teaching staff. The authority in the organization was
clearly in the hands of those who dealt with the students on a daily basis. This autonomy contributed to a feeling of ownership in the program by the teachers. The close personal relationships at the school, as well as teacher autonomy, contributed to a structure where students were closely monitored. The autonomy of teachers also made them more accountable to the community. This fact contributed, unintentionally, to more uniform outcomes of students.

Teacher Culture Variables

There are a number of factors that Wehlage (1982) classified as teacher culture variables. These variables are identified as follows:

a) The "shared assumptions, beliefs, values, and behaviors" (p.171) by teachers were remarkably similar. The primary factors included in this shared belief system are that all students deserve a second chance; all students can learn and become responsible; and, teachers have a personal and professional obligation to assist these students not only for themselves but for society.

b) The teachers felt that their obligation was to the whole child. This meant that they did more than teach their subject matter. They extended their role to provide a "sense of value and moral direction" (p.173) to the lives of the students. They assisted the students in
"personal, social, and psychological needs as well as in academic needs" (p.173).

c) Proper work habits including punctuality and regularity of attendance were emphasized.

d) Expectations of the student's behavior were "both uniform and high" (p.175). However, academic standards were flexible depending on the individual student's abilities.

e) Homework was supervised and done in class.

f) Academic progress was monitored on a daily basis.

g) The teaching staff had a strong sense of collegiality. There was joint decision making and sharing of power.

h) Teachers "communicated a sense of caring" (p.174) to the students. Even when reprimanding, teachers indicated that the behavior was the problem, not the child.

Student Culture Variables

Wehlage (1982) identified the following student culture variables:

a) A family atmosphere existed among students and between students and staff.

b) The program had an exclusive image, rather than a "dumping ground" image.

c) Students verbally committed to the norms of the
program because they felt the program's expectations were fair and legitimate.

d) Peer support for the program was attained through positive experiences by the students. These students in turn encouraged their peers. This peer support led to an "esprit de corp" in the program.

e) Extracurricula activities promoted group cohesiveness.

f) The goals of the program became internalized as the goals of the student.

Curriculum Variables

The following variables were described by Wehlage (1982) as essential to the learning of at-risk students.

a) The curriculum was individualized according to the student's ability.

b) Cooperative learning existed.

c) The curriculum was most effective when it centered around a real problem to be solved because it required greater involvement and a more serious effort on the part of students. This is known as a problematic curriculum.

d) The curriculum was experiential in nature. "Experiential education is defined by its use of activities outside the classroom and conventional subject matter. Typically these programs involve students in
community service, career internships, political/social action, community study, and outdoor adventure" (p.173). Through these activities students are socialized through a variety of ways to the norms of society. These norms include "service to others; interaction with people of different ages, race, and background; involvement with people who are successful in a career; inquiry into social issues; and physical accomplishment" (p.185). Teachers and other adults serve to assist students in selecting, participating, and reflecting about their experiences. The use of an experiential curriculum places students in situations with real problems where their problem solving ability and creativity can flourish.

Wehlage (1982) concludes his review of these six programs by commenting that the program components outlined above had transformed students who were "withdrawn, lethargic, negative, and hostile into active, positive and cooperative students" (p.178). Orr (1987) found similar results to Wehlage (1982) in her review of fourteen dropout prevention programs. She found that all successful programs had four common elements: basic skills remediation, world of work exposure, supportive services, and personal development activities such as self-esteem building.

According to Orr (1987), effective programs had dedicated and committed staff, as well as a caring and
trusting environment. Students were able to work at their own pace in an individualized curriculum. In addition, Orr (1987) cites that the programs had clear goals that were communicated to staff and students. Orr (1987) reports several recommendations to improve dropout prevention programs: a) Follow-up support services are essential to maintain gains. b) Communities and schools should integrate their services. c) Parental and family involvement must be increased.

**Summary of School Structure/Socialization**

In summary, the purpose of schools is to socialize the students who pass through them to the traditional norms of society. Traditional schools have a number of bureaucratic characteristics that have unintended consequences that affect the degree of socialization that takes place for all students. Certain students, however, who are marginal or at-risk for dropping out of school do not appear to have the necessary coping or psychic skills (Wehlage, 1982; Etzioni, 1983) to take advantage of the opportunity that our nation's universal education system offers (Orr, 1987). These students appear to improve these psychic or coping skills (Wehlage, 1982; Etzioni, 1983) when they attend schools or programs that have a different structural organization than traditional schools (Wehlage, 1982; Orr, 1987). An improvement in these
skills results in a more effective socialization for these students. A review of alternative schools indicates that these schools have different organizational structures than the bureaucratic structures of traditional schools (Wehlage, 1982; Mann, 1986; Orr, 1987).

Theoretical Models for the Design of the Treatment

**Likert's Theory of Management Systems**

The first model is based on the work of Rensis Likert (1961). Initially Likert's theory and research was developed for business organizations. Likert (1961) says that this research, however, can apply to other organizations including public schools. In developing and researching his theory, Likert (1961) identified eight organizational characteristics that varied along a continuum between organizations. These characteristics include: a) leadership procedures which varied from supportive to non-supportive; b) force of motivation which varied from low to high; c) communication procedures which varied from weak and distorted to strong and accurate; d) interaction procedures which varied from cold and distant to warm and close; e) decision making procedures which varied from a unilateral, top to bottom flow to a shared approach; f) goal setting procedures which varied from a unilateral, top to bottom
approach to a shared approach; g) control procedures which varied from a hierarchical system to a collegial system; and h) character of performance goals and training which varied from average to extremely high (Likert, 1961).

Likert (1961) divided this continuum into four management systems and developed a method to determine which management system best described a particular organization. The four management systems as developed by Likert (1961) are described in Chapter I of this study.

The organizational characteristics of the participative management system may be defined in the following manner (Likert, 1961): a) Supportive leadership is displayed in all situations; b) Group participation is seen in setting and attaining goals; c) Communication is frequent and with groups and individuals; d) Cooperative teamwork is substantial; e) Decision-making is shared regarding the establishment and attainment of goals; f) Concern for control of performance exists at all hierarchical levels in the organization; g) Extremely high goals are set for the organization to achieve and the level of commitment to goal achievement is high; and, h) Motivation is based on a reward system developed through group participation.

The method Likert (1967) utilized to classify organizations consists of using an instrument entitled the
Profile of Organizational Characteristics (POC). This instrument was modified for use in schools and is entitled the Profile of Schools (POS) (Likert, 1972). Reliability and validity information on this instrument are cited in Chapter IV of this study.

Etzioni's Theory of Normative Compliance

The second model utilized to create an alternative organizational structure to traditional schools is based on Etzioni's (1961) theory of compliance. "Compliance refers both to a relation in which an actor behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power and to the orientation of the subordinated actor to the power applied" (Etzioni, 1961, p.3). Etzioni (1961) uses compliance to differentiate among types of organizations. He characterizes organizations into three primary types:

a) Coercive organizations exhibit a coercive compliance structure. Coercive compliance can be described as the use of coercive power by an organization's superior members to gain the compliance of the subordinate members. The orientation of the subordinated party is intensely negative. He/she displays an alienative response to or involvement with the organization. An example of a coercive organization is a prison.
b) Utilitarian organizations exhibit a utilitarian compliance structure. Utilitarian compliance can be described as the use of remunerative power by an organization's superior members to accomplish its goals. Here, the allocation of salaries, bonuses, etc. is utilized. The orientation of the subordinated party is one of calculation. He/she agrees to subordinate themselves to the organization in return for remuneration. Most business organizations display utilitarian compliance.

c) Normative organizations exhibit normative compliance. Normative compliance can be described as the use of normative power by the organization's members to achieve its goals. "Normative power rests on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations," such as prestige, esteem and grades to insure a "positive response" in subordinates (Etzioni, 1961, p.5). Subordinates in normative organizations respond with a moral involvement to the organization. "Pure moral commitments are based on internalization of norms and identification with authority" (p.11). Examples of normative organizations are churches and schools.

According to Etzioni (1961), all schools are normative organizations. Traditional schools, however, exhibit a number of characteristics associated with coercive compliance resulting in the alienation of some
students from the school (Etzioni, 1961). Etzioni contends that if the goal of an organization is to socialize its clients to the norms of society, then a pure moral involvement is the choice response of its subordinates. This response is more readily attained when pure normative power is utilized in the organization (1961).

All organizations differ in the "degree to which they embrace lower participants" (Etzioni, 1961, p.264). This "embrace" or engagement of subordinates has two features. The first is scope, which is defined as the number of activities shared by the participants in the organization, e.g. eating together, going to class together, etc. In organizations that are high in scope, participants share many activities. The second feature of the "organizational embrace" is pervasiveness. It refers to the "number of activities in or out of the organization for which the organization establishes norms" (Etzioni, 1961, p.267). Churches, for example are high in pervasiveness because they set norms for nearly every aspect of their participants lives.

According to Etzioni (1961), "coercive organizations tend to be broad in scope and low in pervasiveness, utilitarian organizations tend to be narrow in scope and low in pervasiveness..." (p.275). Normative organizations are high in pervasiveness, i.e. they
establish norms for participants' behavior in a large number of activities in and out of the organization; but, they vary in scope or the number of activities that their participants actually share (Etzioni, 1961). According to Etzioni (1961), if the purpose of the organization is to increase the effectiveness of socialization, high scope is recommended. This is because the more similar activities that students share and the more that students are isolated from participating in activities with non-organizational members, the more likely that they will find "significant others" within the organizational community (p.273). "To the degree that these are teachers or guides who share common values, organizational socialization is likely to be effective" (Etzioni, 1961, p.273).

Summary of Theoretical Frameworks

In summary, this section describes two theoretical models that can be utilized in designing an alternative school structure for socializing at-risk students. The first model is based on the Management System research and theory of Likert (1961). His theory describes the participative management system. The second model is based on the compliance theory of Etzioni (1961) which describes normative compliance, high scope, and high pervasiveness.
Evaluation Literature

The Need for Evaluation in Drop Out Prevention Programs

The evaluation of organizations that have as a major goal the making of changes in the clients of that organization is very difficult (Brim and Wheeler, 1966). "Therefore, most social programs operate in the absence of data that bear pertinent evidence on the effectiveness of their program. Where evaluation is difficult, doors are open for highly competing views of appropriate social programs...Determination of policy will then depend on the relative power of special interest groups rather than on evidence of program effectiveness" (Brim & Wheeler, 1966, p.105).

"To the extent that the meaningful evaluation of program effect on recruits remains unknown, there will be no clearly established linkages between program and outcomes" (Brim & Wheeler, 1966, p.105). This in turn undermines the intended purposes of the socializing organization.

The school as a social organization and the policy issue of dropouts are not exceptions to Brim and Wheeler's analysis of the state of evaluation for social programs. Dale Mann (1984) states that most studies dealing with the issue of dropouts have documented the magnitude of the problem. The next step he urges is "to replace current
practice with better practice" (p.317). He continues that
there can be "no improvement without measures of success -
what works?" (p.317) To date, he says that "the public
school dropout field has no data linking programs to
outcomes" (p.317).

Rumberger (1987) also believes that evaluations of
dropout prevention programs must be able to "determine
whether the outcome was actually caused by the program or
cause by something else" (p.118). In addition to
evaluations on program outcomes, Levin (1983) believes
that it is also necessary to document the cost
effectiveness and cost benefits of dropout programs.

In a related area to program evaluation, there is
also a need for more systematic longitudinal evaluation of
student cohorts (Natriello, Pallas, McDill, 1986). This
longitudinal evaluation should be examined in light of
recent educational reforms and its impact on the student
cohort and dropout rate (Natriello, Pallas, McDill, 1986).
In addition, Natriello, et al, (1986) cite four major
components of the dropout phenomena and their relationship
to each other that must be investigated. These include:
"student characteristics, school processes, dropping out,
and the consequences of dropping out" (p.431). Mann
(1986) suggests that it is important to monitor these
components so that effective alternative programs can be
implemented for dropout prevention.
Catterall and Stern (1986) report that vocational education programs and alternative educational programs are thought to be effective in retaining students because they make school more relevant. No systematic evaluations have been done, however, to verify whether these programs actually affect the dropout rate.

Orr (1987), reporting on 14 dropout prevention programs that she reviewed, states that "existing evidence for effectiveness is quite favorable" (p.198). However, since dropout prevention programs are "not intended as experiments, they fail to document whether a selected strategy yields appropriate results "through a systematic evaluation" (p.198). According to Orr (1987), only a small number of programs attempted to link services to outcomes; only one study utilized a control group; and no studies attempted random assignment to groups. Orr continues that a "lack of program evidence does not mean that a program is ineffective" (p.199). It does mean that one cannot be positive that good results are due to program effectiveness or whether poor results are due to poor planning, "insufficient evidence, poor program implementation, appropriate, but inadequate services or inappropriate services" (p.199).
The Design of Program Evaluations

According to Charters & Jones (1973), it is common practice to develop research designs that measure the effects of an experimental program on treatment and control groups. It is not usual practice, however, to measure whether and to what degree the independent variable or treatment was implemented (Charles & Jones, 1973). McLaughlin (1985) agrees that the traditional or hypothetico-deductive model of program evaluation "misrepresents the nature of treatment, the notion of program effects, and the relationship between inputs and outputs" (p.74). McLaughlin (1985) argues that the social legislation passed in the "Great Society" era of the 70's was more complex than the traditional paradigm could accommodate. The hypothetico-deductive paradigm treats program evaluation as if it occurred in a "black box" where only inputs and outputs are considered (p.74). Other critics of the black box theory are Chen and Rossi (1984) who argued that program vs. no program offered little insight into the benefits of a particular social program. This black box model was usually ineffective in producing significant differences when utilized with programs generated by the Great Society legislation (McLaughlin, 1985). Suchman (1976) agrees that if one looks only at program outcomes, the problem of accepting
spurious results is very real to the evaluator.

McLaughlin (1985) believes that five lessons were learned by researchers during the time of evaluation of the social programs produced in the 70's. These lessons forever impacted the way evaluation would be conducted and include the following: "a) treatment effects are indirect; b) implementation choices dominate program outcomes; c) implementation is a multistage developmental process; d) implementors pursue multiple and often competing goals; and e) decisions made closest to the delivery level are most influential" (p.75).

These lessons suggest that evaluation must attend to "how something is done and why it is done"...in addition to "what is done" (McLaughlin, 1985, p.94). Clearly the present focus is on implementation and utilization issues rather than on static "goal driven evaluation designs" (McLaughlin, 1985, p.94). Researchers, program planners, and policy makers must realize that the evaluation of social programs operating in social settings requires a much broader evaluation model than the traditional evaluation paradigm (McLaughlin, 1984).

When an evaluation that takes implementation into consideration is designed, one area that must be addressed is the degree to which the program matches the theory from which it is derived (Trochim, 1985). Trochim (1985) asserts that the degree to which there is a match between
the theory behind the program and the observed implementation of the program gives the researcher a "stronger position to make causal assertions about social programs" (p.576). Trochim (1985) also argues that examination of matching issues generally requires separate analysis from the analysis done on program outcomes. At the present time, however, improvements must be made in matching approaches and accompanying statistical analyses to determine if theories and observations are correlated (Trochim, 1985).

In addition to matching theory to program, it is important to employ evaluation designs that utilize "multiple implementations of the program... and incorporate multiple measures and measurement methods" (Trochim, 1985, p.577). Mark and Shotland (1987) agree that multiple evaluation methods assist the researcher in interpreting findings and in estimating results.

Stake (1976) developed a model of logical contingency and congruence to be utilized for assessing whether there is theory failure i.e. inadequate goals and/or conceptualization of the problem or program failure. Shapiro (1985) describes logical contingency as the relationship between intended "relevant prior conditions," intended treatment and intended outcomes in a time ordered sequence (p.49). He describes congruence as a continuous variable that depicts the degree of correspondence between
intended relevant prior conditions and observed relevant prior conditions; intended treatment and observed treatment; and intended program outcomes and observed program outcomes (Shapiro, 1985). If intended outcomes are not observed, Shapiro (1985) suggests that the response of the evaluator should be to determine if the theory needs to be reexplicated or if the program needs to be reimplemented. Shapiro (1985) refers to Stake's (1976) model as a "theory testing activity" (p.49).

Summary of Evaluation Literature

Research indicates that the traditional positivist paradigm is inadequate to examine the effectiveness of social programs. A number of researchers have suggested that a more desirable model includes the examination of issues of program implementation as well as issues of testing for program outcomes. Trochim (1985) and Stake (1976) offer models to examine whether the program as implemented reflects the theoretical assumptions underlying the program.

A review of dropout literature reveals that dropout prevention programs appear to lack systematic evaluations that link program services to outcomes. Based on the literature, systematic program evaluation should receive a high priority by program planners and policy makers relative to dropout prevention programs.
Summary of Chapter II

The purpose of Chapter II has been to provide a review of selected literature relevant to this study. This literature was subdivided into sections dealing with the four main topics of this study. The first topic, dropout research, centered on the issues of the impact of dropping out of high school and the characteristics of the at-risk client. The second topic, research on school structure and socialization, reviewed existing school structure as it relates to at-risk students and the need for an alternative organizational structure to meet the needs of at-risk students. The third topic, research on the theoretical models, consisted of examining Etzioni's theory of normative compliance and Likert's theory of management systems. The fourth topic, a review of evaluation literature relevant to the current study, describes the need for providing systematic evaluation for dropout prevention programs and reviews some of the latest issues in evaluation of social programs.
CHAPTER III
DESCRIPTION OF THE LSYOU SCHOOL

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter III is twofold. First, it describes the intended treatment of this study, the LSYOU Program. Second, it attempts to demonstrate that the LSYOU program was designed to reflect the two theoretical models described in Chapter I. The first theoretical model is based on the work of Etzioni (1961) and contains the concepts of scope, pervasiveness, and normative compliance. The second theoretical model is based on the work of Likert (1961) and contains the concept of participativeness.

This chapter describes the major activities of the LSYOU program and represents an expanded version of the program description contained in LSYOU Project Evaluation (Shapiro, 1986). These activities include: a) the selection of the LSYOU staff; b) the inservice of the LSYOU staff; c) the organization of the classroom; d) the organization of the academic curricula; e) the selection of student work sites; f) the organization of team meetings; g) the organization of elective classes and extra curricula activities; and h) the implementation of a reward system.
The Activities of the LSYOU Program

LSYOU participants, who attended the program voluntarily, were immersed in an eight week intensive living experience on the Louisiana State University campus. On a half-day basis, the students received academic instruction in math and reading, both in the classroom and in computer labs. The remaining time (four hours per day) was spent at work sites throughout the university. Participants earned minimum wages for work hours. LSU applied to the Louisiana State Department of Education and received permission to be an accredited summer school. Therefore, successful completion of course work in reading and math earned each student one Carnegie unit of credit toward high school graduation. Evening hours were devoted to counseling and elective activities of a recreational nature (see Appendix A). Weekend activities included field trips, speakers, tutoring sessions and parent participation activities.

The program training of eight weeks was high in scope. Participants shared a twenty-four hour day, seven days per week intensive living experience. The participants lived in college dorms, ate their meals in a college cafeteria, attended academic sessions in college classrooms, and worked at campus job sites.

In addition to insuring that the LSYOU school had high scope, an attempt was also made to increase its
pervasiveness. This was done because, according to Etzioni (1961), high scope and high pervasiveness afford the organization the optimum chance of socializing its clients. Therefore, the program's living experience encompassed the norms that the students were to live by while attending the program, when dealing with family and friends during the program, and when returning and adjusting to their regular environment (Guillot, LSYOU Student and Staff Handbooks, 1986).

The Selection of the LSYOU Staff

Based on the number of students and in order to provide equal yet small numbers in each class and group, the staff was selected. The LSYOU staff consisted of one headmaster, nine teachers, eight tutors, two counselors, sixteen peer counselors, and one recreation director. All staff members were selected on the basis of their ability to display characteristics of the participative management style. A review of the applicant's background and the job interview were designed to ascertain if the applicants met the following criteria: supportive behavior; ability to work as part of a team; concern for excellence of performance; open communication style; and a decision making style that utilizes group participation.
The interviewers were the principal investigator, program coordinator, and headmaster. Field notes were compiled on each applicant during the interview. After all interviews for a particular class of positions were held, the applicants who best embodied the described criteria were selected. The selection process was completed upon an examination and discussion of each interviewer's field notes, and the applicants' resume or application.

The Inservice of the LSYOU Staff

In Chapter I, it was described that at-risk students generally lacked identifiable academic and social coping skills, which in turn causes them to become alienated from the regular school environment. Based on this description, all of the students selected to participate in the LSYOU project were identified as at-risk for dropping out of school. A characteristic of at-risk students is that they experience a degree of alienation from the school (Etzioni, 1961).

The Quest National Center developed a program for adolescents entitled *Skills for Living* (Quest, 1982) that is designed to reduce alienation among young people. This program addresses the development and reinforcement of affective and social skills (Crisci, 1986). These skills include the improving of self-concept, dealing
constructively with feelings; developing a positive attitude; building constructive relationships; appreciating and strengthening family bonds; establishing trust, loyalty, and commitment; learning the elements of effective parenting; understanding the principles of financial management; developing goal setting and life planning skills; and discovering meaning in one's life and personal views (Crisci, 1986).

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

The Organization of the Classroom

To facilitate the perception of students that the LSYOU program had a participative management style, students were placed in classes where the ratio of teacher to student was 1:13. In addition, each class had a tutor or teacher aide. This ratio was designed to maximize
small group interaction. In that type of environment, group participation, shared decision making, cooperative team work, supportive leadership, motivation, and goal setting can flourish. The environment of the classroom was designed to reflect certain Quest ideals such as instilling in each student that he/she was a "lovable and capable" individual (Quest, 1982, p. 36).

The Organization of the Academic Curricula

Students were able to earn 1/2 credit in pre-algebra and 1/2 credit in reading toward their graduation requirements for participation in 180 hours of instruction. The curricula of the LSYOU program was constructed prior to the onset of the program by consultants who were noted for their expertise in math and reading. Consultants were given a list of coping skills, identified in the first chapter, that at-risk students appeared to lack. They were asked to design pre-algebra, reading, computer and counseling curricula that were best able to assist at-risk students in acquiring these skills. In addition, the consultants were given a thorough grounding in the background to the problems of dropping out and in the theoretical models upon which the LSYOU school was based.

The pre-algebra course (see Appendix C) was designed to help students acquire abstract concepts through the use
of concrete methods such as handling manipulatives (Guillot, 1986). The reading course (see Appendix D) centered around the Quest curriculum and included reading, speaking, and writing assignments (Guillot, 1986). As previously mentioned, the content of the Skills for Living curriculum (Quest, 1982) is such that it both necessitates and enhances the components of the participative management style. Activities utilized to deliver the units in Quest centered around group participation, shared decision making, and cooperative team work. Supportive leadership was displayed by formal and informal leaders. Communication was frequent within the group. Goal setting, motivation, and high standards of achievement were also emphasized. While the math, counseling and computer curriculum did not teach Quest units, they did utilize the Quest method of delivering their activities.

The computer curriculum was designed to support the reading (see Appendix E) and math (see Appendix F) curricula (Guillot, 1986). Students learned logo or basic in computer labs to support the pre-algebra curriculum. Students learned a word processing program to support the reading curriculum. The counseling curriculum (see Appendix G) assisted the students in gaining career maturity, acquiring self esteem, and managing aggression (Gaston, 1986).
The Selection of Student Work Sites

All students in the LSYOU project spend four hours each day working with a professional on the LSU campus (see Appendix H). Just as the staff was selected based on their ability to display characteristics of participative management style, worksite supervisors were also selected on this basis. Professional counselors who were trained in the participative management style visited job sites that volunteered to participate in the program. Employers were interviewed to ascertain if they could demonstrate supportive behavior; work as part of a team; display frequent and open communication; and demonstrate a concern for performance and high goals. Based on the judgement of these counselors, employers who met the criteria were selected for participation in the LSYOU program as work site supervisors. All selected employers participated in a 1/2 day inservice on the use of the participative management style with LSYOU students.

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

The Organization of Team Meetings

Team meetings were held on a daily basis to discuss the progress of LSYOU participants. Each student had a team consisting of an administrator, counselor, two
teachers, and a tutor who assessed the student's progress based on academic performance, attitude, and behavior. They made specific recommendations for improvement that were shared with other appropriate staff members, such as peer counselors.

In addition to the team meetings serving as a resource for students, they also served two other functions. First, the team meeting concept fostered group participation, shared decision making, cooperative teamwork, and frequent communication among the staff. This reflected a consistent participative management approach throughout the school structure. Second, it was presumed that the staff would model this participative behavior in their relations with students.

The Organization of the Elective Classes and Extra Curricula Activities

Each student belonged to a group in the dormitory that consisted of thirteen students. Each group elected a representative to the LSYOU student council. Through their group meetings, students selected their extra curricula activities, including the cost of the activity to a student, which he/she paid for through employment earnings. This, too, promoted shared decision making, communication, cooperative teamwork, and group
participation in setting and pursuing goals. Prior to entering the LSYOU program, students were able to select their elective classes from chorus, newspaper, tennis, karate, and others. In addition, new electives such as wrestling and track were added through student requests. This reflected shared decision making, supportive leadership, and group participation in setting and attaining goals.

Reward System

The reward system of the LSYOU school was based on the concept of normative compliance (Etzioni 1961). In order to gain the willing cooperation of students, outstanding students were awarded weekly recognition in their classes, dormitories, and job sites. This culminated in an awards ceremony during the closing exercises where students were awarded recognition for progress and/or enthusiasm in academics, work, elective, and social areas. The reward system was structured so that all students could win in some area if they put forth the effort.

In addition to the reward system's reflection of normative compliance, a number of concepts in participative management, such as a concern for performance at all levels and an emphasis on high goals
for participants, were also reflected. As previously mentioned, students were able to earn high school credit for their academic work. Students who did not conform to the rules and regulations of the program, were confined to their dormitory and were unable to attend certain recreational activities. Since the program was voluntary, total noncompliance resulted in the individual student(s) being sent home.

Comparison of LSYOU and Traditional Schools

The LSYOU school has been constructed utilizing concepts from two theoretical frameworks. This researcher contends that the resulting organizational structure is very different from the organizational structure of traditional schools on the dimensions of scope, pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participativeness. Examples of these concepts as operationalized in the LSYOU School are displayed in Table 1. Examples of these same concepts in a traditional school are displayed in Table 2.

Summary of Chapter III

Chapter III has been an attempt to demonstrate that the construction of the components of the intended treatment of this study, the LSYOU school, reflected the two theoretical models upon which this study was designed.
The description of the treatment components provided the reader with a better understanding of how the treatment intended to induce positive outcomes in the at-risk student participants.
Table 1
Examples of Scope, Pervasiveness, Normative Compliance, and Participativeness for the LSYOU School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Pervasiveness</th>
<th>Normative Compliance</th>
<th>Participativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL STUDENTS SPEND LEISURE ACTIVITIES TOGETHER</td>
<td>A CODE OF BEHAVIOR IS ESTABLISHED FOR CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>STUDENTS ARE REWARDED FOR ENTHUSIASM</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION IS OPEN &amp; OFTEN WITH STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS LIVE TOGETHER IN A RESIDENTIAL ATMOSPHERE</td>
<td>A CODE OF BEHAVIOR IS SET FOR ALL LEISURE TIME</td>
<td>STUDENTS ARE REWARDED FOR COOPERATIVENESS</td>
<td>HIGH GOALS ARE SET FOR STUDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS SHARE ALL MEALS TOGETHER</td>
<td>A CODE OF BEHAVIOR IS ESTABLISHED FOR LIVING TOGETHERER</td>
<td>STUDENTS ARE REWARDED FOR ALL POSITIVE CHANGES IN ATTITUDE</td>
<td>STUDENTS SHARE IN MANY DECISIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS ATTEND CLASS-ES WITH THE SAME MEMBERS OF A SUBGROUP OF WORK PLACE</td>
<td>A CODE OF BEHAVIOR IS ESTABLISHED FOR THE STUDENT'S BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>STUDENTS ARE REWARDED FOR WORK AND ALL POSITIVE LIVE AS</td>
<td>STUDENTS SHARE IN PART OF A TEAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

Examples of Scope, Pervasiveness, Normative Compliance, & Participativeness for the Traditional School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Pervasiveness</th>
<th>Normative Compliance</th>
<th>Participativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS DON'T ATTEND CLASS</td>
<td>A CODE OF BEHAVIOR IS NOT EMPHASIS ON ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH THE SAME</td>
<td>SET FOR A STUDENT'S WORK</td>
<td>OF PUPIL CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS NOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SCHOOL FUNCTION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter IV is threefold. The first is to describe the design of the program evaluation, which includes a description of the sample selection and a description of the assignment of the sample to groups. The second is to describe the design of the validation of the treatment. The third is to describe the design utilized to link program outcomes to the implementation of the treatment.

Design of the Program Evaluation

Sample Selection

While the program was available to all Louisiana parishes, five parishes, including Assumption, East Baton Rouge, Jefferson, Lafourche and Terrebonne were selected to participate in the LSYOU program. These parishes were selected for three reasons: their interest in the project; their proximity to Louisiana State University (LSU), the program site; and, the willingness of their Job Training Partnership Act Office (J.T.P.A.) to fund the program. The J.T.P.A. office is federally funded and is required by law to train individuals to qualify for jobs.
in the work force, thus reducing unemployment. A special provision of the Public Law 97 - 300 allows funding for training potential high school dropouts (Job Training Partnership Act, 1982).

After the participating parishes were determined, project coordinators held meetings in each parish to explain the purpose of the program to junior high school counselors. Counselors were requested to recommend students in their school for inclusion in the sample. It was required that students be eighth grade students going into the ninth grade or ninth grade repeaters; be 14, 15, or 16 years old; and exhibit characteristics of being at-risk for dropping out of school. These at-risk characteristics included having academic problems, being over-age for the current grade level of the student, having personal adjustment problems, having family problems, or having self management problems. Program coordinators requested that students with serious discipline problems such as those related to drugs or weapons, as well as those non-high school unit earning special education students, be excluded from the sample. Students could choose not to be referred if they did not want to participate in the LSYOU program. Parents, however, often insisted that these students be referred. Parental permission for the student to participate was required for each student prior to his/her referral to the sample.
All students who were referred by their school had to fill out an application in the JTPA office for participation in the LSYOU School. This JTPA application requested detailed information on family finances, medical and psychological problems. These applications were screened by the JTPA office and only students who met the economic, medical, or psychological criteria, as contained in the Job Training Partnership Act (1982) were retained in the sample.

Once the student met the eligibility requirements of JTPA and the school, he/she officially became part of the sample. In all, 170 students from all five parishes became the sample.

**Assignment to Groups**

The LSYOU project intended to use random assignment as described by Cook and Campbell (1979) to select participants to the treatment group. Due to a number of constraints, however, the project implemented a modified form of random assignment.

A total of 105 students from the available sample of 170 were selected for participation in the LSYOU program (treatment). Because of funding requirements, the LSYOU program selected 35 participants from each JTPA Service Delivery Area (SDA). The first SDA funded the participation of 35 students from Jefferson Parish.
second SDA funded 35 students from East Baton Rouge Parish. The third SDA funded 15 students from Terrebonne Parish, 12 students from Lafourche Parish, and eight students from Assumption Parish for a total of 35 students. These numbers reflected the total population distribution of parishes in the third SDA.

Fifteen of the 105 students were accepted into the project on the basis of extreme need for program services, as identified by the school counselor. Of this fifteen, five slots for this purpose were allotted to each of the three SDA's. From the sample remaining in each SDA after these students were allocated, an equal representation of males and females were then randomly selected to the treatment group. Because of the uneven number of treatment group students (105), a total of 53 males and 52 females were selected. The males were given the extra slot because of the larger number of male applicants. A total of 65 students remaining in the sample from all three SDA's became the control group for the study.

All students were pre-tested prior to assignment to groups. Prior to attending the program, the treatment group had a meeting with the LSYOU staff on program particulars, such as rules, clothing, schedules and permission forms.
The control group became part of the JTPA Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP), where they were employed six to eight hours a day for eight weeks for minimum wage. During that time, control group students worked in public service jobs, received no remediation, and received no counseling services.

All students were post-tested at the end of the eight week program. LSYOU students were post-tested at LSU. Control group students were given the post-tests as part of their regular work day. In effect, control group students were paid to take the post-tests.

Of the original 105 students who attended the program, two students who had been assigned for ethical reasons dropped out during the eight weeks. Therefore, 103 students remained in the treatment group for analysis. Of the original 65 students in the control group, five students dropped out during the eight weeks. Therefore, 60 students served as the control. Across the various analyses, these numbers varied due to missing data. Only complete pre-tests and post-tests of treatment and control group students were utilized.

Design of Treatment Validation

From evaluation literature (Chen & Rossi, 1984; Stake, 1976; Cook & Campbell, 1979; Trochim, 1985; Charters & Jones, 1973; Suchman, 1976; Shapiro, 1982a,
1985b), it can be noted that there is no consensus on established procedures for validation of treatment. At present, the researcher must argue logically that the intended treatment is reflected in the treatment as implemented. In this study, two different procedures were selected by the researcher to argue that the LSYOU program reflected the two theoretical models described in Chapter I.

**Procedure 1: Quantitative Analysis of the Profile of a School**

The first procedure for treatment validation concerned the degree to which the LSYOU school reflected Likert's (1961) model of participativeness. This procedure examines whether the students in the LSYOU school perceived it as having a greater degree of participative management than the last school they attended. This is tested by the following research hypothesis.

**Research Hypothesis**

The LSYOU school will be perceived by LSYOU participants as different from traditional schools on the organizational dimension of superior - subordinate relations (as measured by the POS).
Independent Variable

The independent variable of this hypothesis, the LSYOU school, has been described in Chapter III. Operationally, this variable is defined as participation or non-participation in the treatment group.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable of this hypothesis is the perceptions of LSYOU students on the organizational dimension of superior-subordinate relations. This dependent variable is operationalized as the students' scores on the Profile of Schools Instrument which was developed by Likert & Likert (1972). This instrument was designed to measure the perception of a school's organizational characteristics by either staff or students. The student version will be utilized in this study.

Instrumentation

The items of the Profile of School (POS) are designed to measure eight subscales across four organizational types (Likert, 1972): exploitive-authoritative; benevolent-authoritative; consultative; and participative. These organizational types were described in Chapter I. The eight subscales include the following: a) character
of leadership - from non-supportive to supportive; b) character of motivational forces - from low to high; c) character of communication - from weak and distorted to strong and accurate; d) character of interaction - from cold and distant to warm and close; e) character of decision-making - from unilateral to shared; f) character of goal setting - from unilateral to shared; g) character of control - from hierarchical to collegial; h) character of performance goals and training - from average to extremely high.

The student version of this instrument was utilized in this study as a pre-test and post-test. This version has 62 questions that could be answered on a scale of one through eight, with responses one and two indicating an exploitive-authoritative organizational type; responses three and four indicating benevolent-authoritative organizational type; responses five and six indicating a consultative organizational type; and responses seven and eight indicating a participative organizational type (Likert & Likert, 1972).

A sample question of the POS follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Free</th>
<th>Somewhat Free</th>
<th>Quite Free</th>
<th>Very Free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How free do you feel to talk to your teachers about non-academic matters?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores in each of the combined response categories (one and two, three and four, etc.) are totaled providing a summary score for each of the eight subscales on each of the four organizational types measured.

The Profile of School instrument is derived from instruments that have been utilized in the field of business and industrial organizations. According to Rensis Likert and Associates (1981), these instruments are the product of 250 management studies involving over 200,000 employees and 20 managers over the last 25 years. "The split half reliability of the entire industrial questionnaire is in the mid-nineties" (Likert, 1978, p. vi-viii).

The standard questionnaire used to measure the attitudes of students toward their school had a split half reliability of .90 or higher for normal populations (Likert, 1981). According to Likert (1981) the variance that exists in a group affects the reliability of the POS. The greater the variance, the higher the split half reliability. Moderate ranges in reliability could be expected for homogeneous groups.

Because participants in the LSYOU sample were homogeneous with respect to socioeconomic status, the reliability of the POS for this sample may be somewhat lower than .90. While the reliability of this instrument was not retested in this study, the treatment validation
analysis indicated scores remained constant without significant intervention. This finding supports the test-re-test reliability of this instrument. Likert (1981) argues that validity is much harder to assess in schools than in business. In social organizations such as schools, many other variables such as socio-economic status, family, etc. have influence over educational outcomes. This makes it more difficult to ascertain the effectiveness of certain management programs in schools than in businesses. Nonetheless, a number of recent studies have found criterion and construct validity by establishing linkages between the Participative Management Style and a number of positive outcomes in schools (Likert, 1981).

Research Design

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

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

**Statistical Analysis**

Three sets of analyses were conducted using the POS. The first compared the treatment and control group on pre-test POS scales to determine if pre-treatment equivalence between groups could be assumed. The second analysis compared the control group pre-test and post-test scores to establish the consistency of the instrument over time with students not subjected to the LSYOU treatment. The third analysis compared the LSYOU students perceptions of the program experience with the last school they had attended.

The comparison of pre-tests across groups was accomplished using independent t-tests for unequal n's.
and the pooled variance method for all POS variables. The comparison of control group pre-tests to control group post-tests for stability of attitudes and the comparison of treatment group pre-tests to treatment group post-tests to assess the perceived difference in participativeness was accomplished using dependent sample t-tests for all POS variables.

**Procedure 2: Qualitative Analysis of the Student Data**

The second procedure utilized for the validation of treatment attempted to demonstrate that the LSYOU program reflects the theoretical model of scope, pervasiveness, and normative compliance (Etzioni, 1961). This procedure examined, through the use of qualitative analyses, whether the LSYOU school was different from the students' previous schools on the dimensions of scope, pervasiveness, and normative compliance.

The qualitative analysis included the examination of the LSYOU school through unstructured interviews, observations, surveys, and analysis of student letters. Data from these multiple methods were utilized to develop clusters, and definitions from corresponding field of indicators (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).
**Instrumentation**

In order to obtain convergence, or an explanation of non-convergence, regarding the data that were collected, multiple methods were utilized to collect the data. Guba and Lincoln (1982) refer to this process of validating data as triangulation.

According to Stufflebeam (1981) who chaired the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, "an important distinction between quantitative and qualitative analysis is that for qualitative analysis the observation protocols, categories of information, and methods of summarization cannot all be predetermined" (p. 130). However, this researcher argues that observation data; survey data; data from student letters regarding their program experience; and, data from student letters regarding their worksite experience are appropriate to examine whether the LSYOU school is qualitatively different from traditional schools on specified dimensions.

Regarding the LSYOU School Survey data, students were asked to respond to open ended questions regarding their participation in the LSYOU program. Sample questions of the LSYOU School Survey included:

1. Do you think the LSYOU School is different from the school you attended last year?
2. If you do think the LSYOU School is different, please describe how you think it is different.

Regarding the observation data, students were observed in all phases of their participation in the LSYOU program. Research field notes were kept on all of these observations for future analysis by an evaluator who was a faculty member of the College of Education at Louisiana State University and who had no involvement with the program other than conducting and reporting observations.

With respect to data from student letters regarding their program experience, students received a letter (see Appendix I) from the LSYOU staff two months after they had returned home from the program. This letter asked the students to write to the LSYOU program and to report how they were doing at home and at school. The letter also requested them to report if they perceived their present school as being different from the LSYOU school that they had attended during the summer.

Data from student letters regarding their worksite experience were obtained by asking the students to nominate their boss by letter, if they desired, as the "Boss of the Summer." Students were asked to elaborate on why their boss should receive this honor. These letters were requested during the seventh week of the eight week LSYOU program. Data from both sets of student letters and student surveys were kept for future analysis by the
program coordinator and author of this dissertation.

**Description of Analysis**

Glaser and Strauss (1967) describe the constant comparative analysis method for use in analyzing qualitative data such as that which is obtained from observation, interviews, open ended surveys, and letters. In this method, the researcher collects data and develops categories or clusters of similar information. New data is constantly compared to previous data collected and new categories are developed and/or previous categories are either expanded, eliminated, or merged with other categories. This process continues until analysis yields no new or emerging clusters. At the end of the process, this coded research has a number of categories or clusters with corresponding definitions and field of indicators, defined as those individual segments of data that gave rise to the cluster formation.

The constant comparative method was utilized to examine the observation data, open interview data, open ended survey data, and data from student letters obtained during and after the LSYOU program. This coded information was utilized to validate the LSYOU treatment on the dimensions of scope, pervasiveness and normative compliance.
Design for the Evaluation of Testing Treatment Outcomes

The purpose of this section is to link specified observable outcomes to the effectiveness of the LSYOU prevention program. This is argued through the testing of the following research hypotheses.

H1: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group on the student CTBS Math Applications and Concepts and Math Computations scores at the p < .05.

H2: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group on the student CTBS Reading Vocabulary scores at the p < .05.

H3: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group on the student Career Maturity Inventory attitude scores at the p < .05.

H4: There will be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group on the Student Intention to Remain in School scores at the p < .05.

Operational Definitions

Operational Definition of the LSYOU Treatment

The LSYOU treatment has been described in Chapter III. Operationally, this variable is defined as participation in the treatment group or non-participation in the treatment group. For the purposes of this study,
the treatment group is coded as one and the control group is coded as zero.

Operational Definitions in Hypotheses One and Two

The students' post-test scores on the mathematics computations (MC); mathematic concepts and applications (MA); and the reading vocabulary (RV) sections of the CTBS are defined as the number of correct answers.

Operational Definition in Hypothesis Three

The student's post-test scores on the attitude portion of the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) are defined as the number of correct answers.

Operational Definition in Hypothesis Four

The student's post-test scores on two subscales of the Intention to Remain in School (IRS) Inventory are defined as the student responses to the items in these scales on a Likert scale ranging from one to seven.

Instrumentation

Hypothesis One and Two

For hypotheses one and two, the standardized instrument, the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) was utilized. Pre-test and post-test data were collected
on three sub-tests: reading vocabulary, mathematics computation, and mathematics concepts and applications.

Reliability and validity information for the CTBS test is reported in the Technical Bulletin of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Test Coordinators Handbook (1984). The CTBS was designed to provide both national and large city norms. The sample was selected from both Catholic and public schools in fifty states. A special black sample was also utilized in the norming process.

According to the CTBS Technical Report (1984, p. 212), internal consistency was obtained using the KR20 during the standardization process for all grades and levels of the CTBS. It was also reported (CTBS, 1984) that the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM) for each scale score indicates the most accurate description of reliability available for a test. The SEM's for all scale scores on the CTBS indicate high reliability for all mid range scores. As with all tests, "the SEM will be larger if a score is near the floor or ceiling of the range of performance measured by a given test" (CTBS, 1984, p. 107).

The CTBS Technical Report (1984) cites content validity by discussing the procedures employed to insure that the CTBS measured the basic skills that are prerequisite to learning both in and out of school. The
methodology utilized to describe item selection is also reported (pp. 11-15).

The CTBS Technical Report (1984, p. 14) also indicates that item difficulties utilized for discrimination between grades were valid. It was also found that the CTBS test was valid for discriminating between achievement levels within specific grades (CTBS, 1984, p. 15).

In summary, the CTBS authors (1984) argue that the items selected represent the mastery of selected educational objectives. While the authors contend that the items are representative of various skill domains, no claim of infallibility is made. Therefore, items representing CTBS content objectives "are intended as guidelines not sacrosanct standards" (p. 15).

**Hypothesis Three**

For hypothesis three, the Attitude Scale of the Career Maturity Inventory, a standardized instrument, will be utilized. Pre-test and post-test data will be collected for five sub-tests: decisiveness in career decision making; independence in career decision making; orientation to career decision making; involvement in career decision making; and compromise in career decision making.
Reliability and validity information for the CMI is reported by Crites (1978). Internal consistency estimated by the Kuder Richardson Formula 20 was .74 for the Attitude Scale (Crites, 1978, p. 12). Internal consistency for the attitude scale, which measures a group of related attitudes, is not as high as a more "homogeneous measure" such as a special aptitude test (Crites, 1978).

According to Crites (1978), the stability or test-re-test coefficient for the Attitude Scale is .82. This correlation was derived using a statistical method that took maturational variance into account. When maturation is considered, the test-re-test measure of career choice attitudes over a specified interval by the CMI is almost as reliable as the measurement of single traits with aptitude tests (Crites, 1978). "Coefficients of equivalence for the Attitude Scale of the CMI have not been determined, because alternate forms of the test are not available" (Crites, 1978, p. 13).

According to Crites (1978), content validity for the CMI was evidenced through two sources. From a logical point of view, the Attitude Scale was derived from central concepts in career development theory. In addition, empirical evidence for content validity was also obtained. Judges rated the agreement of the empirical scoring key and a rationally derived scoring key for the CMI. Crites
(1978) asserts the 74% agreement between these two keys constitutes evidence for content validity.

Criterion validity for the CMI was obtained by correlating the data obtained on the Attitude Scale with other measures of career maturity (Crites, 1978). Crites summarized the research on the CMI regarding criterion validity and found that the Attitude Scale of the CMI correlated significantly with other empirical measures of career maturity such as success in college and vocational schools; achievement on the Iowa Test of Educational Development; life adjustment patterns; and successful completion of career orientation and counseling classes.

Hypothesis Four

For hypothesis four, pre-test and post-test data were collected on two subscales that were created from Pressholdt, et al's, (1984) instrument. The first subscale was comprised of questions related to the students' intention to remain in school until the end of the year. The second subscale was comprised of questions related to the students' intention to remain in school until graduation. Students responded on a seven point scale ranging from "extremely likely" to "good" to "extremely unlikely" or "bad". Sample questions included: a) My staying in school will lead to meeting people and making new friends is likely versus unlikely; and, b) The job I
would get as a high school graduate is good versus bad. All questions in the subscales were developed by Pressholdt, et al, (1984). These subscales were selected for use because Pressholdt, et al's, research (1984) on students dropping out of high school indicates that the student's immediate intention of dropping out is the best predictor of whether or not that student will or will not actually drop out of school. This research was based on the Theory of Reasoned Action developed by Ajzen & Fishbein (1980). This theory argues that "an individual's behavior is closely approximated by the person's intention to perform the behavior" (Pressholdt, et al, 1984, p.48).

Pressholdt, et al, (1984) selected a sample of 356 students who indicated through interviews and questionnaires that there was a likelihood they would drop out of school. He matched each of these students with another student, who through the same survey process, indicated that there was very little likelihood that he/she would drop out of school. These students were selected from ten high schools in five school districts that ranged from small to large in size and ranged from rural to urban in location. All of these students were administered the Student Opinion Questionnaire, developed by Pressholdt, et al, (1984). This questionnaire, based on the Theory of Reasoned Action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), was aimed at assessing the attitudes, beliefs, and social
influences that contributed to the student's intention to drop out of school.

Pressholdt, et al, (1984, p. 50) obtained predictive validity ($R=0.60$) in determining a student's intention to remain in school or to leave school based on the student's specific attitudes relative to dropping out or staying in school and on his/her perceptions of what significant others wanted him/her to do. Pressholdt, et al, found that the student's attitudes relative to dropping out were a stronger predictor of intention than the perceived influences of others. These attitudes were based on the student's belief system regarding the consequences that will result if one remains in school or drops out of school. These findings are consistent with Ajzen & Fishbein's (1980) Theory of Reasoned Action. This researcher argues that these results suggest the utility of this theory as an effective model to predict and to understand a student's decision to stay in or leave school.

**Research Design**

In order to ascertain whether the LSYOU students will increase their scores in mathematics, reading vocabulary, career maturity, and intentions to remain in school, pre-tests were administered to all of the students prior to their assignment to groups. Post-tests were administered
to both groups during the last days of the LSYOU eight week program.

**Statistical Analysis**

**Hypotheses One and Two**

An analysis of covariance was conducted on all of the post-test scores in reading vocabulary; mathematics computation; and mathematics concepts and applications, controlling for all pre-test scores.

**Hypothesis Three**

An analysis of covariance was also conducted on all of the post-test scores of the subscales of the CMI on group, controlling for all pre-test scores of the subscales of the CMI. The subscales include decisiveness in career decision making, independence in career decision making, involvement in career decision making, orientation to career decision making, and compromise in career decision making.

**Hypothesis Four**

An analysis of covariance was conducted on the post-test scores for the students' intention to remain in school for the current year and for the students'
intention to graduate from high school on group, controlling for all pre-test scores.

Summary of Chapter IV

Chapter IV was divided into three primary sections. The first section described the design of the program evaluation. This section described the selection of the sample and the assignment of the sample into a treatment and control group. The second section described the validation of the treatment. This section presented procedures that attempted to demonstrate that the treatment of the study, the LSYOU school, was based on two theoretical models. The first theoretical model was based on the concept of participative management (Likert, 1961). The second theoretical model was based on the concepts of scope, pervasiveness and normative compliance (Etzioni, 1961). The third section described the evaluation of the program outcomes. This section presented four intended program outcomes that the researcher attempted to link to the LSYOU school (treatment). This section also presented the statistical methods that were used to address these hypotheses.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study. The first section presents the results of the validation of the treatment through both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The second section presents four program outcomes that are analyzed quantitatively.

Treatment Validation

Analysis of the Profile of School

Of the 105 students in the treatment group that were available for pre-testing, only 99 students completed the instrument. Of the 65 students selected to serve as the control group, 51 students completed the POS pre-test. The first analysis, utilizing the POS, compared the treatment and control groups on pre-test POS scales to determine if pre-treatment equivalence could be assumed.

The organizational variables in the participative management system that were measured by the POS are described in Table 3. The pre-test means of the treatment and control group responses on these variables using independent t-tests for unequal n's and the pooled variance method are compared in Table 4.
Table 3
Profile of a School Organizational Variable Definitions for the Participative Management System

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

Table 4

Comparison of Pre-Test Means of the Treatment and Control Group on the Profile of a School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POS Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.463</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.210</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.294</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.295</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.863</td>
<td>1.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.586</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Result</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.465</td>
<td>2.480</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.633</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.843</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.755</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.762</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.840</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.840</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.595</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05.

As indicated in Table 4, no statistically significant differences were found between the control and treatment groups on any POS variables at the p < .05. This suggests that the two groups had equivalent perceptions of their schools prior to the treatment group attending the LSYOU program.
Thirty-eight students completed the pre- and post POS test in the control group. The results of the POS which compared the pre- and post-test means of the control group are depicted in Table 5. This analysis was accomplished through the use of dependent t-tests for all POS variables. As indicated, no significant differences at the .05 alpha level were found for any of the POS variables except for the communication variable. These results indicate that in the absence of significant intervention, the POS scores will remain constant.

Ninety-nine of the students completed the POS pre- and post-tests in the treatment group. The pre-test and post-test means of the treatment group on all POS variables are compared in Table 6. This analysis was accomplished through the use of dependent t-tests for all POS variables. A significant difference at the .05 alpha level was found for all of the POS variables. This indicates that students who received the LSYOU intervention perceived the LSYOU school, as measured by the post-test as having a more participative organizational structure than their regular schools, as measured on the pre-test.
### Table 5

**Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Means of the Control Group on the Profile of a School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean</th>
<th>SD of Difference Between Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.342</td>
<td>5.663</td>
<td>1.274</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.320</td>
<td>4.698</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>2.154</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.934</td>
<td>5.079</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Result</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.184</td>
<td>5.789</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>1.799</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>5.673</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.996</td>
<td>5.057</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.834</td>
<td>5.013</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.876</td>
<td>5.934</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. 

---
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Table 6
Comparison of Pre- and Post-test Means of the Treatment (LSYOU) Group on the Profile of a School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean</th>
<th>SD of Difference Between Means</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.210</td>
<td>6.384</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>7.036</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.295</td>
<td>5.763</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>9.676</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.586</td>
<td>5.934</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>5.806</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Result</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.465</td>
<td>6.101</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>6.088</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>6.473</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>6.885</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.755</td>
<td>6.098</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>9.186</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.840</td>
<td>6.144</td>
<td>1.439</td>
<td>9.023</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.595</td>
<td>6.450</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>6.017</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.
Analysis of Qualitative Data

Through a methodology known as triangulation, the researcher analyzed data from multiple sources such as observations, interviews, surveys, and student letters to ascertain whether the LSYOU students perceived high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance in the LSYOU program.

Survey Data

At the conclusion of the LSYOU program, 97 of the 103 participants answered an open ended survey regarding their participation in the LSYOU program. Each question was reviewed and responses were coded into major clusters that developed during the analysis of the responses. This methodology, developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), is explained in Chapter 4 of this study. These data were originally reported in the LSYOU program evaluation (Shapiro, et al, 1986). The complete survey and coded student responses are located in Appendix J of this study. For the purpose of this study, the data were reanalyzed to determine if students perceived the variables of high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance to be reflected in the program. Since the original 97 student surveys were no longer available, the analysis was conducted on the composite of
results obtained from the original data. Clusters of student responses for each question that was open ended were reanalyzed for the indication of one or a combination of the following variables: high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance. This recoded data are also available in Appendix J. The percentage of clusters for each question that indicate the above variables are depicted in Table 7. The following information is reflected in Table 7: a) The number of the items on the survey; b) The total number of original clusters that developed spontaneously for that item based on student responses; c) The total number of 97 respondents who answered each item; d) The total number of the respondents whose answers are included in one or more of the original clusters for each item. e) The percentage of the original clusters of each item that were recoded as reflecting one or more of the following variables: high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management, and normative compliance. Sample recoded clusters of student responses are depicted in Table 8.
Table 7

Percentages of Clusters from Survey Data Reflecting High Scope, High Pervasiveness, Participative Management, and Normative Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Number of clusters</th>
<th>No. of respondents for each item</th>
<th>No. of respondents for combined clusters</th>
<th>Percentage of Clusters Reflecting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. S represents high scope; P represents high pervasiveness; Pa represents participative management; and NC represents normative compliance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Field of Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Scope</strong></td>
<td>I loved living in the dorm with the college kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night classes should be earlier in the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We need more independent time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We need to go home more often on the weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Pervasiveness</strong></td>
<td>I learned a greater self responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned to respect others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The classes taught me how to cope with my problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can use &quot;I&quot; messages to better communicate with my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participative Management</strong></td>
<td>Teachers care and understand. (supportive leadership and climate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on completing school makes me want to stay in school. (high goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I know how to share my feelings. (communication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It helped me to select courses for my career. (decision making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Compliance</strong></td>
<td>Teachers care and understand students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned to respect others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The LSYOU classes kept me out of trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I earned a school credit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As can be noted in Table 8, the field of indicators under each variable are examples that demonstrate that the LSYOU students perceived high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance in program activities. All of the comments in Table 8 reflecting the variable high scope indicate that the students perceived that they engaged in many activities together, such as living in the dorm and attending night classes. Even somewhat negative comments such as "needing more independent time" and "needing to go home more often" reflected the notion that students spent a lot of time together. The comments reflecting the variable high pervasiveness indicate that the students learned new norms and values that extended beyond the confines of the program. The variable participative management has a number of subcategories as defined in Chapters I and III of this study. The comments reflecting this variable indicate that the students perceived supportive leadership, open climate, shared decision making, an emphasis on high goals, and an emphasis on open communication. The comments reflecting normative compliance indicate that the students perceived that they were not coerced to perform but were rather motivated by a number of symbolic rewards such as care, respect, staying out of trouble and earning school credit.
In the reanalysis of the original data, only comments that reflected high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance were coded. Comments that were neutral, negative, or positive without reflecting these categories were eliminated from the recoding process.

Observation/Interview Data

Michael (1987) observed the activities of the LSYOU program for eight weeks on the LSU campus and interviewed the participants of the program. Utilizing Stake's (1967) model of contingency and congruence, Michael provided descriptive evaluative data on the contingencies between program antecedents and program transactions and, on the congruence between program intents and program observations in the LSYOU school. While Michael's (1987) paper dealt with the issue of triangulation and the presentation of arguments to explain the non-convergence of results, the information presented in her paper has been reanalyzed to validate that students and staff perceived high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participativeness in various program areas. Examples from Michael's (1987) paper that argue for the presence of these elements in the LSYOU program are displayed in Table 9. Because the original field notes were not available, it is not possible to provide
percentages of observations or responses that reflect the above variables. Also, it should be noted that in Michael's (1987) paper, information is presented by teachers that indicate that students were taught negative norms through the weekend component of the program. Weekend staff, however, disputed this perception.
Table 9

Examples from Observation and Interview Data Describing Student and Staff Perceptions that the LSYOU Program Reflected High Scope, High Pervasiveness, Participative Management and Normative Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Field of Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Scope</td>
<td>The students' day began at 6:45 a.m. or earlier...they reported to class at 7:30 a.m. or work at 8:00 a.m....Students who went to class in the a.m. went to work in the p.m. and vice versa. After 4:30 p.m., students had supper together and then participated in counseling, study hall, and elective activities until 9:00 p.m. Students turned in for the night after socializing between 10:15 and 11:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pervasiveness</td>
<td>Teachers worked with students to help them achieve respect for themselves as well as for each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During one class observation, a teacher was observed gently taking a student to task for using a &quot;killer statement&quot;. The student then had to compliment the other student three times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>A key transaction identified by all participants was a nurturing environment. (climate, leadership, motivation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Students received a great deal of individual attention and seemed to be able to speak with teachers, vocational counselors and peer counselors as the need arose. (communication climate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Compliance</td>
<td>Students perceived that teachers and others cared about them. As one student put it, &quot;they go over the material until you get it; they also try to help you with personal experiences.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Teachers act more like they know how it is to be a person.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The indicators presented are direct quotes from Michael (1987).
As demonstrated in Table 9, the field of indicators that reflect the concept of high scope describe a typical student day as observed by Michael (1987). This description reflects the observation that students shared many activities together. The field of indicators that reflect the concept of high pervasiveness indicated that it was observed that program staff were teaching norms and values to the students that were meant to be internalized and utilized beyond the confines of the program. There are a number of indicators that reflect the perception of the variable participative management in program activities. These indicators present evidence that the observer perceived an open climate, supportive leadership, motivation and open communication in the program. The concept of normative compliance was indicated by comments taken from student interviews. These comments reflect that the students perceived that they were not coerced to achieve. Rather, the comments indicate that student performance was motivated by a caring and patient atmosphere.

Data from Student Letters Regarding Their Worksite

As reported in the LSYOU Project Evaluation (Shapiro, et al, 1986), students were asked to nominate their worksite supervisor as "Boss of the Summer" if they
desired. Letters nominating bosses were received from 62 of the 103 participants. When these letters were analyzed according to the Glaser and Strauss (1967) method, a number of major categories emerged.

The percentage of students that responded to each theme are reflected in Table 10. The themes that emerged from the indicators are presented in Table 11. The complete listing of themes and indicators from the Boss of the Summer Letters is contained in Appendix K of this study.

For the purpose of this study, the themes and indicators were reanalyzed to provide evidence that students perceived that high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management, and normative compliance were reflected in the LSYOU program. The percentage of student comments from the Boss of the Summer letters that were recoded to reflect the above variables are depicted in Table 12. The complete recoding of comments is contained in Appendix K. In Table 12, the following information is provided:

a) The themes that spontaneously emerged from the student letters;

b) The number of student comments or indicators that gave rise to the corresponding theme; and

c) The percentage of indicators for each theme recoded as reflecting one or more of the following
variables: high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management, and normative compliance.

Examples from the Boss of the Summer letters that were recoded as reflecting high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management, and normative compliance are presented in Table 13.

Table 10

Percentage of Students Responding to One or More Themes of Boss of the Summer Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Developing Personal Relationships</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Learning on the Job</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Developing a Work Ethic</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Recognizing the Patience and Understanding Displayed by the Supervisor, Particularly when the Student Makes Mistakes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Appreciating the Faith, Encouragement and Advice Given by the Supervisor</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11

**Themes and Indicators from the Boss of the Summer Letters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sample Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Developing Personal Relationships</strong></td>
<td>1. He was more than a person - He was like a father to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. She helped me recapture the dreams I had lost and helped me to become a person of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Appreciating Learning Experiences</strong></td>
<td>1. I learned a great deal. I learned how to disect fish and goats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. He showed me how to use the computers at work and to mix chemicals to water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Developing a Work Ethic</strong></td>
<td>1. He is a nice man - but, what I like about him is that he cares about his work. I respect how hard he works - but most of all he is a kind smart man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I'd like to nominate my boss because she is very enthusiastic in her work. Her desk is very organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Recognizing the Patience and Understanding Displayed by the Supervisor, Particularly, When the Student Makes Mistakes</strong></td>
<td>1. He helps me with things I didn't know. When I had trouble learning he made sure I understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When I make a mistake, she doesn't get upset, she just come and show me the right way to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Appreciating the Faith and Advice Given by the Supervisor</strong></td>
<td>1. She tells me not to get involved in drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. She keeps her faith in me and my work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of Indicators Reflecting Each Theme</th>
<th>Percentage of Indicators Recoded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Developing Personal Relationships</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>S 100 38 Pa 92 NC 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Learning on the Job</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>P 0 100 Pa 72 NC 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Developing a Work Ethic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P 0 100 Pa 74 NC 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Recognizing the Patience &amp; Understanding Displayed by the Supervisor, Particularly when the Student Makes Mistakes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>S 100 86 Pa 100 NC 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Appreciating the Faith, Encouragement &amp; Advice Given by the Supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>P 0 92 Pa 67 NC 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. S represents high scope; P represents pervasiveness; Pa represents participative management; and NC represents normative compliance.
Table 13

Examples from the Boss of the Summer Letters Describing Student Perceptions that the LSYOU Program Reflected High Scope, High Pervasiveness, Participative Management and Normative Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Scope</td>
<td>I'd like to thank my boss for the things he did like bringing me to the infirmary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She really cares for me...not only in the office but out of the office too...She brought me to their club to eat dinner and to swim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pervasiveness</td>
<td>She tells me not to get involved with drugs. She is fair with different situations and management...she never quits. She wants me to be a better person...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Management</td>
<td>Me and my boss gets along well because we talk a lot. (communication)  \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor is a loving caring person. (supportive leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You gave me the best encouragement...I now know what is expected of me. (high goals, motivation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Compliance</td>
<td>When I make a mistake, she doesn't get upset she just come and show me the right way to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She is nice and cooperative, open and honest. She never puts people down in a mean way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I make a mistake, he tells me so I won't make it again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 13, the concept of high scope is reflected somewhat indirectly. According to Etzioni (1967), when high scope is present, participants spend more time with significant others in the program. The comments indicating high scope in Table 13 reflect this aspect of the variable. Because students spent most of their time in program activities, a portion of these activities included spending time with their boss, mentor, or significant other. The concept of high pervasiveness is reflected in comments that indicate that students understood the norms and values that they were being taught, not just for the job but in other interpersonal situations. Students also perceived that there was open communication, supportive leadership, and an emphasis on high goals and motivation in the job aspect of the program. These indicators support the argument that the students perceived participative management in the program. The variable of normative compliance is evidenced in that students perceived that they were not coerced to perform their jobs correctly. Rather, student comments indicate that they perceived they were motivated to perform through more normative measures.

Responses were received from approximately 60% of the students who participated in the program. These responses were almost entirely positive. Whether the 40% of LSYOU students who did not respond to the invitation to nominate
their boss as "Boss of the Summer" had negative or neutral experiences, or whether they were apathetic to the request for nominations, is unclear.

Data from Student Letters After They Returned Home

As described in the LSYOU project evaluation (Shapiro, et al, 1986), LSYOU students were sent a letter one month after they returned home. This letter is contained in Appendix I of this study. There were 67 student letter responses out of the 103 students who completed the program. These letters were analyzed according to the Glaser and Strauss (1967) method. The percentages of students responding to one or more themes are indicated in Table 14. The major themes that emerged from corresponding indicators are depicted in Table 15. A complete list of student indicators is contained in Appendix L.

For the purpose of this study, the themes and indicators were reanalyzed to provide evidence that the students perceived that high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management, and normative compliance were reflected in the LSYOU program. The percentages of student responses that were recoded to reflect the above variables are depicted in Table 16. The complete recoding of comments is contained in Appendix L. In Table 16, the following information is provided:
a) The themes that spontaneously emerged from the student letters;

b) The number of student comments or indicators that gave rise to the corresponding themes; and

c) The percentage of indicators for each theme recoded as reflecting one or more of the following variables: high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance.

Examples from the Student Letters After Returning Home that were recoded as reflecting high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance are presented in Table 17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Relating to Their New School</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Appreciating What LSYOU Did for Them</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Reflecting on Home Life</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Missing the LSYOU Program and Wanting to Return</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Understanding How LSYOU Helped Them at School</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Distinguishing Between the LSYOU School and Regular School</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Asking for Assistance</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Living on a College Campus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Emphasizing Personal Relationships</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Appreciating Follow-up Contact</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Recognizing the Change in Their Self Image</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Themes and Indicators from the Students' Letters After Returning Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sample Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Relating to School</strong></td>
<td>1. I really enjoy school this year. I find its really what you make of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. It's fun to be at school when you get along with everybody... Now I'm a cheerleader and on the ROTC Drill Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Appreciating What LSYOU Did For Them</strong></td>
<td>1. I deeply appreciate the things you all done for me. I was taught self respect by my teachers, discipline by everyone and the program itself made me an all around better person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. LSYOU have turned my life completely around...I needed LSYOU to get me started in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Reflecting on Home Life</strong></td>
<td>1. Home life is much better for me now because I have learned to be myself and handle problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When I was away from home I never had a problem...but no matter what, I will be as good as I was at LSYOU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Missing the LSYOU Program &amp; Wanting to Return</strong></td>
<td>1. I haven't forgotten you all - never...I have missed you a lot. I will never lose contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I think the LSYOU Program kept me out of trouble and I want to come back.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sample Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V. Understanding How LSYOU Helped Them at School | 1. After my summer with the LSYOU program, I have discovered that life in school can be exactly what you want it to be.  
2. School is going great, by my attending LSYOU, I'm ahead of all 9th grade students. |
| VI. Distinguishing the Difference Between LSYOU and Regular School | 1. My school is not better than the LSYOU School because they carry guns and sell drugs at our school.  
2. My school is very different...I have one teacher who calls us "stupid dummies". |
| VII. Asking for Assistance | 1. Could you help me find a job after school. It would really help my family.  
2. The subjects I need tutoring in are math, English and Reading...but really math. |
| VIII. Living on a College Campus | 1. It was really fun living on a college campus. I felt like I was a college student.  
2. I would love to give another kid a chance to visit LSU college. |
| IX. Emphasizing Personal Relationships | 1. I love you all at LSYOU; you are so warm loving and caring.  
2. I know everybody at LSYOU love me...I consider all of you my family and I will never forget you as long as I live. |
Table 15 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sample Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X. Appreciating Follow-up Contact</td>
<td>1. I feel very special for you to be writing to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I'm so glad you all still care about us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Recognizing the Change in their Self Image</td>
<td>1. I learned that I am somebody. I am worth something and that I feel good about myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Life after LSYOU is different because I have found a new person inside myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Number of Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Relating to Their New School</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Appreciating What LSYOU Did For Them</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Reflecting on Home Life</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Missing the LSYOU Program and Wanting to Return</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Understanding How LSYOU Helped Them at School</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Distinguishing Between the LSYOU School &amp; Regular School</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Asking for Assistance</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of Indicators Reflecting Each Theme</th>
<th>Percentage of Indicators Recoded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Living on a College Campus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Emphasizing Personal Relationships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Appreciating Follow-up Contact</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Recognizing the Change in Their Self Image</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. S represents high scope; P represents high pervasiveness; Pa represents participative management; and NC represents normative compliance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sample Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Scope</td>
<td>When I got home...all I did was think about...all the precious time we spend together. I was so glad that I went to the LSYOU Program. It was fun at school...at work...at the union...at electives...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pervasiveness</td>
<td>I have changed very much now I get along with people at the school, thanks from LSYOU. I learned how to work hard to get what you want and the biggest thing I learned was to love people and never to hate people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Management</td>
<td>...But most of all I learned to work as a team (teamwork). It is wonderful what you did...we have a different relationship now we can talk openly (communication). I wish all schools could be as great and as close as we were (climate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Compliance</td>
<td>My school is very different from LSYOU, I have one teacher...who calls us all stupid dummies and I felt bad. I feel very special for you to be writing me. Thank you for the letters and concern. I'm glad you care about us so much.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As reflected in Table 17, comments reveal that the students were aware of spending time together in many activities. This perception substantiates the presence of high scope in the program. The variable of high pervasiveness was evidenced as being present in the program by comments that indicated that the norms learned in the program were translated into the students' lives at home and school. The concepts of teamwork, open communication and open climate, indicated in student comments, reflect that the students perceived that the variable of participative management was present in the program. The student comments that indicate the presence of normative compliance in the program reveal that students perceived that care and concern were the chief motivators for behavior. In addition, as evidenced by the first indicator for normative compliance, students perceived that in regular schools, teachers often resorted to more coercive methods of pupil control.

As can be noted, approximately 67% of the LSYOU students responded to the request to write the LSYOU staff. These responses were almost entirely positive. Whether the 33% of the LSYOU students who did not respond to the request had negative or neutral experiences to the program or whether they were apathetic to the request for responses is unclear.
Treatment Outcomes

Analysis of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills

Of the 103 students in the treatment group who completed the program, 92 students completed the pre- and post- reading vocabulary test. Ninety-one students completed the pre- and post- mathematics computation and mathematics concepts and applications tests. Of the 60 students in the control group who completed the program, 51 students completed pre and post tests for reading vocabulary, mathematics computations, and mathematics concepts and applications. Of the 15 students in the treatment group who had been selected based on ethical considerations, i.e. their significant need for the program as indicated by counselor reports, 13 completed the program. The researcher tested for pre-treatment equivalence between the treatment and control groups on all subtests prior to conducting an analysis of covariance on each subtest. Independent t-tests for unequal n's using the pooled variance method were conducted to test the difference between the treatment and control group for all pre-tests. CTBS raw data was utilized in the analysis. The results of these t-tests are displayed in Tables 18, 19, and 20.
Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.765</td>
<td>7.921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.957</td>
<td>9.129</td>
<td>2.754</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.980</td>
<td>8.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22.868</td>
<td>8.658</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.
Table 20

Comparison of Pre-Test Means of the Treatment and Control Groups on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Math Concepts and Applications Subtest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.157</td>
<td>7.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26.154</td>
<td>7.561</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

As can be noted in Tables 19 and 20, pre-treatment equivalence was found between the treatment and the control groups on both the math computations and the math concepts and applications subtests. However, as can be noted in Table 18, pre-treatment equivalence was not found between the treatment and control groups on the reading subtest. Because of this, it was determined to separate the 13 students that had been selected to the treatment group on the basis of ethical considerations from those students who had been selected to the treatment group through random assignment. An independent t-test for unequal n's using the pooled variance method was conducted to test the difference between the treatment group with only randomly assigned members and the control group. This was done to determine if pre-treatment equivalence
was achieved between the treatment and control groups when students selected for ethical considerations were removed from the treatment group. The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 21.

Table 21
Comparison of Pre-Test Means of the Randomly Assigned Treatment Group and the Control Group on the Reading Subtest of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.765</td>
<td>7.921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomly Assigned Treatment</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28.810</td>
<td>9.303</td>
<td>2.562</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

As demonstrated in Table 21, pre-treatment equivalence was not obtained between the treatment and control group even when students selected for ethical considerations were removed from the treatment group. An independent t-test for unequal n's using the pooled variance method was also conducted to test the differences between the students in the treatment group who were randomly assigned and the students in the treatment group who were selected for ethical considerations on the reading subtest. These results are presented in Table 22.
As displayed in Table 22, there was pre-treatment equivalence between the students who were randomly assigned to the treatment group and the students who were selected to the treatment group for ethical considerations on the reading subtest. These results indicate that the treatment group was homogeneous with respect to reading scores, but the treatment group as a whole differed from the control group.

Hypothesis one predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on the student CTBS Math Applications/Concepts and Math Computations scores at the p < .05. In order to test this hypothesis, an
analysis of covariance was conducted for both math post-tests on group, controlling for both pre-tests. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 23 and 24. For the purpose of these analyses, the control group is coded zero and the treatment group is coded one.

Hypothesis two predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on the student CTBS reading vocabulary scores at the $p < .05$. In order to test this hypothesis, an analysis of covariance was conducted for the reading post-test on group, controlling for the reading pre-test. Also, an additional analysis of covariance was conducted on the reading post-test on group, controlling for the reading pre-test, after the students selected for ethical reasons were removed from the treatment sample. For the purpose of these analyses, the control group is coded zero and the treatment group is coded one. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 25 and 26.
Table 23

Student Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Math Computations Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coef</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computations</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>12.467</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>8.718</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>8.657</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Math Computations Post-Test
N: 142 Multiple R: .805
Squared Multiple R: .649
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .644
Standard Error of Estimate: 5.724

*p < .05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coef</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.471</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.318</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Concepts and Applications Pre-test</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>9.508</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>7.573</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>6.907</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Math Concepts and Applications Post-Tests
N: 142  Multiple R: .729
Squared Multiple R: .532
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .525
Standard Error of Estimate: 6.215

* p < .05.
Table 25

Student Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Reading Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coef</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.202</td>
<td>1.744</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>11.141</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>0.040*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Reading Post-Test
N: 142   Multiple R: .720
Squared Multiple R: .518
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .511
Standard Error of Estimate: 6.099

* p < .05.
Table 26

Randomly Assigned Student Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Reading Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coef</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>10.402</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Reading Post-Test
N: 129  Multiple R: .710
Squared Multiple R: .505
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .497
Standard Error of Estimate: 6.067

p < .05.

As can be noted from Tables 23 and 24, the treatment group recorded statistically significant higher scores in the positive direction over the control group in mathematics computation and mathematics concepts and applications. In addition, as can be seen in Table 25, the treatment group recorded statistically significant higher scores in the positive direction over the control group in reading when all treatment group students are considered. However, as Table 26 displays, when the students who were selected to the treatment group due to ethical considerations were removed, the treatment group
did not register statistically significant higher scores in the positive direction over the control group in reading. This renders the effect of the program on reading vocabulary much more difficult to interpret.

Analysis of the Career Maturity Inventory

Of the 103 students in the treatment group who completed the program, 89 students completed all attitude subtests of the pre and post Career Maturity Inventory. Of the 60 students in the control group, 51 students completed all attitude subtests of the pre- and post-Career Maturity Inventory. As in the case of the CTBS, tests for pre-treatment equivalence were conducted on all CMI subscales. This was due to the fact that some students were assigned to the treatment group on the basis of ethical considerations rather than on the basis of random assignment. The attitude subscales of the CMI that were utilized in the analysis are described in Table 27. Independent t-tests for unequal n's using the pooled variance method were conducted to test for the differences between the treatment and control group on all subscales of the pre-test. These results are displayed in Table 28.
Table 27
Definitions of the Attitude Subscales of the Career Maturity Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness in Career Decision Making</td>
<td>Extent to which an individual is definite about making a career choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Career Decision Making</td>
<td>Extent to which an individual is actively participating in the process of making a choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence in Career Decision Making</td>
<td>Extent to which an individual relies upon others in the choice of an occupation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to Career Decision Making</td>
<td>Extent to which an individual is task or pleasure oriented in his/her attitude toward work and the values he/she places upon work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise in Career Decision Making</td>
<td>Extent to which an individual is willing to compromise between needs and reality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The above definitions were adapted from Crites (1978).
Table 28

Comparison of Pre-Test Means of the Treatment and Control Groups on the Career Maturity Inventory Attitude Subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Decision</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.020</td>
<td>2.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.856</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Involvement</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.176</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.056</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>2.402</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Independence</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.824</td>
<td>2.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.461</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>1.866</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Orientation</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.784</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.079</td>
<td>2.546</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Compromise</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.202</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

As can be noted in Table 28, pre-treatment equivalence was found between the treatment and control groups on all subtests of the CMI except involvement. Because of this, it was determined to remove the 13 students selected on the basis of ethical considerations from the sample for this subtest. An independent t-test for unequal n's using the pooled variance method was conducted to test the differences between the treatment group with only randomly assigned members and the control group. This was done to determine if pre-treatment equivalence was achieved between the treatment and control groups.
groups when students selected for ethical considerations were removed from the treatment group. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 29.

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.176</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomly Assigned</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.066</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

As demonstrated in Table 29, pre-treatment equivalence was not obtained between the treatment and control group on the Involvement subtest even when students selected for ethical considerations were removed from the treatment group. Thus, for some unexplained reason, pre-treatment equivalence was found on all CMI subtests except involvement. Since it did not appear to make a difference whether the 13 students selected for ethical considerations were members of the treatment group, this researcher determined to have them remain in the treatment group for further analysis.
Hypothesis three predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on the student Career Maturity Inventory attitude scores at the $p < .05$. In order to test this hypothesis, an analysis of covariance was conducted on all subscales of the post-test on group, controlling for all subscales of the pre-test. For the purpose of these analyses, the control group was coded zero and the treatment group was coded one. While the choice of analysis of covariance is appropriate to test for outcomes for all sub-tests, it is particularly appropriate for the involvement subscale which did not have pre-treatment equivalence. Without pre-treatment equivalence on the involvement subscale, the effects of treatment on post-test differences are not as certain. The results of this hypothesis are presented in Tables 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, with each table depicting a different subscale.

As indicated in Tables 30, 31, 33, and 34, the treatment group recorded statistically significant higher scores over the control group on their career maturity attitudes on the following CMI subscales: decision-making, involvement, orientation and compromise. However, as Table 32 displays, the treatment group did not record statistically significant higher scores over the control group on the independence subscale of the CMI.
### Table 30

**Student Career Maturity Inventory Decision Making Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.325</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.438</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test on</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.639</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.561</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Dependent Variable: Decision-Making Post-Test  
N: 140  Multiple R: .489  
Squared Multiple R: .240  
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .228  
Standard Error of Estimate: 2.041

* p < .05.

### Table 31

**Student Career Maturity Inventory Involvement Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test on</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>8.235</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>5.390</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Dependent Variable: Involvement Post-Test  
N: 140  Multiple R: .682  
Squared Multiple R: .466  
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .458  
Standard Error of Estimate: 1.679

* p < .05.
Table 32

Student Career Maturity Inventory Independence Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.401</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.499</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>4.891</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Independence Post-Test
N: 140  Multiple R: .411
Squared Multiple R: .169
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .157
Standard Error of Estimate: 1.778

* p < .05.

Table 33

Student Career Maturity Inventory Orientation Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.676</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>6.362</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>4.155</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Orientation Post-Test
N: 140  Multiple R: .555
Squared Multiple R: .308
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .298
Standard Error of Estimate: 2.216

* p < .05.
Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.166</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>5.504</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>2.964</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Compromise Post-Test
N: 140 Multiple R: .487
Squared Multiple R: .237
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .226
Standard Error of Estimate: 1.297

* p < .05.

Analysis of the Intention to Remain in School

Of the 103 students in the treatment group who completed the program, 90 students completed the pre- and post- IRS inventory. Of the 60 students in the control group who completed the program, 49 students completed the pre- and post- IRS inventory. As in the case of the CTBS and the CMI, tests for pre-treatment equivalence were conducted on both IRS subscales. This was due to the fact that 13 students were assigned to the treatment group on the basis of ethical considerations rather than on the basis of random assignment. The results of independent t-
tests for unequal n's using the pooled variance method to test the differences between the treatment and control group on both subscales of the pre-test of the IRS are presented in Table 35.

As can be noted from Table 35, pre-treatment equivalence was found between the treatment and the control group on both IRS subscales. Because of this, it was determined that an analysis of covariance could be conducted on these subscales without removing the 13 students who had been assigned for ethical reasons.

Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intentions to Remain in School to the End of the Year Pre-Test</td>
<td>Control 50</td>
<td>163.94</td>
<td>12.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment 90</td>
<td>166.511</td>
<td>13.941</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions to Remain in School until Graduation Pre-Test</td>
<td>Control 48</td>
<td>130.146</td>
<td>14.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment 90</td>
<td>128.556</td>
<td>15.346</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
Hypothesis four predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on both Student Intention to Remain In School Inventory subscales at the $p < .05$. In order to test this hypothesis, an analysis of covariance was conducted for both subscales of the post-test on group, controlling for both subscales of the pre-test. For the purpose of these analyses, the control group was coded zero and the treatment group was coded one. The results of this hypothesis are presented in Tables 36 and 37.
Table 36

Student Intentions to Remain in School Until the End of the Year Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>71.826</td>
<td>11.870</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.051</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions to Remain in School Until the End of Year Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>7.869</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>5.811</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>0.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Student Intentions to Remain in School Until the End of the Year Post-Test Scores
N: 139  Multiple R: .597
Squared Multiple R: .356
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .347
Standard Error of Estimate: 11.309

*p < .05.
Table 37

Student Intentions to Remain in School Until Graduation Post-Test Scores by Group Adjusting for Pre-Test Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Std Coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>70.615</td>
<td>9.532</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.408</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Intentions to Remain in School Until Graduation Pre-Test</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>6.365</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>6.272</td>
<td>2.258</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>2.778</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent Variable: Student Intentions to Remain in School Until Graduation Post-Test Scores
N: 128  Multiple R: .506
Squared Multiple R: .256
Adjusted Squared Multiple R: .245
Standard Error of Estimate: 12.617

* p < .05.

As evidenced in Tables 36 and 37, the treatment group registered statistically significant higher scores over the control group on their intentions to remain in school.

Summary of Chapter V

Chapter V was divided into two primary sections. The first section presented the results that were obtained in attempting to validate the treatment. These results...
consisted of the quantitative analysis of the Profile of School data and the qualitative analysis of program surveys, observations, interviews, and student letters. The analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative data support the notion that the LSYOU School reflected its underlying theoretical concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management, and normative compliance.

The second section presented the results that attempted to link the LSYOU School to student outcomes in mathematics, reading, career maturity and intentions to remain in school. The results of the analysis of quantitative data in these areas indicate that the LSYOU School produced positive outcomes in student participants over the control group in math, reading, career maturity and intentions to remain in school.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter has five sections. The first section reviews the purpose of the study and the theoretical concepts underlying the treatment of the study. The second section presents a discussion of the results as it relates to treatment validation. The third section presents a discussion of the results as it relates to treatment outcomes. The fourth section discusses the conclusions of the study. The fifth section presents recommendations for future research and for the utilization of results.

Summary

Review of Problem and Theoretical Frameworks

Traditional schools are thought to have a number of unintended outcomes related to its bureaucratic structure (Bidwell, 1961; Wehlage, 1982; Etzioni, 1983) that produce alienation in some of its clients (Carlson, 1964; Etzioni, 1983; Wehlage, 1986). This alienation leads some of these students to eventually drop out of school. The students who become alienated from the traditional school generally do not possess a level of coping skills that enable them to function effectively in regular schools
(Etzioni, 1961; Wehlage, 1984). This information suggests that an alternative structure to traditional schools appears to be necessary if at-risk students are to acquire the coping skills that they lack.

This researcher asserts that if at-risk students acquired a higher level of coping skills, they may be able to function more effectively in the bureaucratic structure of traditional schools, as well as in other institutions of society.

The purpose of this study has been to design, implement, and evaluate an alternative structure to traditional schools, operationalized as the Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited (LSYOU) School. The alternative structure of the school was based on a number of theoretical concepts. The implementation of this structure intended to increase the level of coping skills in student participants who were at risk for dropping out of high school.

There were two theoretical models that influenced the design of the LSYOU School. These two models were selected because it is this researcher's opinion that they fulfill what the literature (Wehlage, 1982; Mann, 1986) described as necessary for schools that have as their goal the socialization of at-risk students.

The first theoretical model suggests that the socialization of clients is most effective in
organizations that are high in scope and pervasiveness and that exercise control over clients through the use of normative compliance (Etzioni, 1961).

High scope is a concept that refers to the participants in the organization sharing a great many activities together (Etzioni, 1961). High pervasiveness refers to "the number of activities in or out of the organization for which the organization establishes norms" (Etzioni, 1961, p.267). Normative compliance refers to the exertion of influence over clients through the "allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards" (Etzioni, 1961, p.5).

The second theoretical model suggests that positive outcomes in clients are more likely to occur in organizations that utilize participative management to characterize the relationship between superiors and subordinates (Likert, 1961). Participative management features supportive leadership in all situations; cooperative and substantial teamwork; shared decision making; a high level of confidence and trust between leaders and subordinates; open communication; high goals; and a concern for performance at all hierarchical levels in the organization (Likert, 1961).

In this study, there were two main problems that were addressed. The first problem dealt with the congruence between the LSYOU School and its related theoretical
underpinnings (treatment validation). The second problem dealt with the issue of whether the implementation of the LSYOU School (treatment) could produce positive outcomes in the at-risk student participants (treatment outcomes).

**Treatment Validation Discussion**

Evaluation literature (Chen & Rossi, 1984; Stake, 1976; Cook & Campbell, 1979; Trochim, 1985; Charters & Jones, 1973; Suchman, 1976; Shapiro, 1982a, 1985b) does not produce a consensus on the established procedures for validation of treatment. Therefore, the researcher must present logical arguments that the treatment as implemented reflects the treatment as intended (Stake, 1976). In this study, the researcher must argue logically that the implementation of the LSYOU School (treatment) reflected the theoretical ideas of high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance and participative management. Two methodologies were employed to present this argument.

The first methodology utilized an instrument entitled the Profile of a School that was developed by Likert (1972) to assess the degree of participative management perceived in an organization. This instrument was administered as a pre- and post-test to students in the treatment and the control groups. All but 15 of the 170 students who applied for the program were randomly...
assigned to treatment and control groups. The 15 students who were not randomly assigned were appointed to the treatment group due to ethical considerations of their extreme need for the program as articulated by their school counselor. In all, 105 students were selected to the treatment group. Of these 105 students, 103 completed the program and were included in the analyses. Sixty-five students were assigned to the control group. Of these 65 students, 60 completed the program and were included in the analyses.

Results indicated that prior to the implementation of the LSYOU School, students in both groups had equivalent perceptions of their school on all POS variables. At the conclusion of treatment, the control group had not changed in their perception of their school on POS variables. This suggests that attitudes measured by the POS remain stable over time in the absence of a significant school experience. The treatment group, however, registered statistically significant differences on all POS variables from pre-test to post-test. This suggests that the treatment group perceived the LSYOU School to reflect a significantly greater degree of participative management than the school they had previously attended. In terms of treatment validation, these results are consistent with the argument that the LSYOU School reflected the
Theoretical model of participative management (Likert, 1961).

The second methodology utilized to measure the congruence between the treatment as implemented and its intended theoretical base entailed qualitative analysis. Data from observations, interviews, surveys, and student letters were analyzed to develop clusters and definitions from a corresponding field of indicators (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). This coded data were then reviewed to determine if they reflected the concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, participative management and normative compliance. Through the analyses of multiple sources of data, this researcher argues that the LSYOU students perceived that the LSYOU School had a high degree of scope and pervasiveness, and that the LSYOU students perceived that normative compliance was utilized to gain their commitment and compliance to program goals. Analyses of data also suggest that the LSYOU students perceived different aspects of participative management throughout all phases of the program. This methodology, which used multiple sources to validate the information obtained in the data gathering process, is known as triangulation (Guba & Lincoln, 1982). When triangulation produces a consensus regarding the data obtained, the researcher can be more confident in the results that were produced. In this instance, triangulation produced findings that
indicate that the students in the LSYOU program perceived that the LSYOU School reflected the concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participative management.

**Treatment Outcome Discussion**

For the purposes of this study, coping skills were operationalized in terms of student scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills math and reading subtests; the Career Maturity Inventory attitude subscales; and the Intention to Remain in School inventory. Four hypotheses were constructed to test whether the LSYOU program produced positive outcomes in these areas. Treatment and control group students were administered pre- and post-tests in the math computations; math concepts and applications; and reading vocabulary subtests of the CTBS. They were also administered pre- and post-tests for the five subtests of the CMI and the two subscales of the IRS.

In the discussion of the POS, it was noted that there were 103 treatment group students and 60 control group students available for analyses. Of the 103 treatment group students, 13 were assigned due to ethical considerations. All of the other students were randomly assigned to both groups.
Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on the student CTBS Math Applications/Concepts and Math Computations scores at the $p < .05$. Comparisons of pre-test means between the treatment and control group indicated that pre-treatment equivalence was obtained in both math subtests even though 13 students were not randomly assigned. Two analyses of covariance indicated that there were statistically significant differences favoring the treatment group on both math post-tests when the effects of the pre-tests were controlled. For the purpose of these analyses, the control group was coded zero and the treatment group was coded one. These results imply that the LSYOU treatment did produce positive outcomes in the student participants.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on the student CTBS reading vocabulary scores at the $p < .05$. Comparison of pre-test means in reading between the treatment and the control groups indicated that pre-treatment equivalence was not present. Based on the results, the researcher
determined to remove the 13 students, who were not randomly assigned, from the sample and compare pre-test means of the treatment and control groups. For unexplained reasons, removal of these students did not provide pre-treatment equivalence in reading.

In the absence of pre-treatment equivalence, analysis of covariance is often employed, substituting statistical control of pre-test differences for true equivalence. In this study, two analyses of covariance were conducted on the reading subtests to ascertain if the 13 students who were assigned for ethical considerations had any effect on reading outcomes.

The first analysis included the 13 students who were not randomly assigned. This analysis revealed that there was a statistically significant difference in reading favoring the treatment group, controlling for the effects of the reading pre-test. The second analysis did not include the 13 students who were not randomly assigned. This analysis did not reveal a statistically significant difference in reading at the .05 alpha level favoring the treatment group, controlling for the effects of the reading pre-test. A possible explanation may be that the non-randomly assigned students may have benefitted more from the treatment than randomly assigned treatment members, thus inflating the significance level. In light of the complexity of the reading data, it is simply less
clear whether the LSYOU treatment produced positive outcomes in the student participants.

**Hypothesis Three**

Hypothesis three predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on the student Career Maturity Inventory attitude scores at the $p < .05$. Comparisons of pre-test means between the treatment and the control group indicated that there was pre-treatment equivalence between groups on all CMI subtests except involvement. This researcher determined to remove the 13 students, who had not been randomly assigned, from the sample and to compare pre-test means of the treatment and the control group on the involvement subscale. Removal of these students did not provide pre-treatment equivalence. In fact, the significance level remained the same in both instances. It is not understood why there was not pre-treatment equivalence on the involvement subscale of the CMI.

An analysis of covariance was then conducted on all five subtests of the attitude section of the CMI. As previously mentioned, in the absence of pre-treatment equivalence, analysis of covariance is often employed, substituting statistical control of pre-test differences for true equivalence. However, in the absence of pre-
treatment equivalence, the results of the involvement subscales are less certain than the results of the other CMI subscales. Results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference, favoring the treatment group on all CMI post-test subscales except for the subscale of independence, controlling for the pre-tests.

A possible explanation for this variance stems from the goals of the program. In an effort to resocialize the at-risk student, the LSYOU program attempted to change the students' attitudes and values regarding school and career goals. Through the variables of high scope and pervasiveness, LSYOU participants could have become more dependent on their program mentors when making choices related to school or careers. Overall, however, the results of the CMI suggest that positive outcomes were produced in program participants in the area of career maturity over the control group.

**Hypothesis Four**

Hypothesis four predicted that there would be a statistically significant difference favoring the LSYOU treatment group over a control group on both subscales of the student Intention to Remain in School Inventory scores at the $p < .05$. Comparison of pre-test means between the treatment and control group indicated that
there was pre-treatment equivalence between groups on both IRS subscales. An analysis of covariance was conducted on both subscales of the IRS. Results revealed that there was a statistically significant difference favoring the treatment group on both intentions subscales, controlling for both pre-tests. These results suggest that the LSYOU School had a positive impact on the treatment groups' beliefs about the consequences of staying in school and the consequences of dropping out of school. According to Pressholdt, et al, (1984), one's belief system governs his/her intentions to perform a behavior. In this case, the change in the treatment group's belief system regarding staying in school positively affected their intentions to remain in school until the end of the year and their intentions to graduate. Based on Ajzen & Fishbein's (1980) Theory of Reasoned Action, one might suspect that these immediate intentions to remain in school will lead to the corresponding behavior.

Conclusions

This section presents, within the limits of social science and the reality of problems in implementing social programs, two major conclusions. These conclusions are used to summarize the important findings of this study and are presented below.
CONCLUSION 1: The first is that the LSYOU Dropout Prevention Program appeared to have successfully reflected the theoretical constructs upon which it was based.

Dropout prevention programs can be based on several relevant theoretical perspectives. This implies that the design of dropout prevention programs or other social programs needs to be based on a general framework that argues for the logical connection between program activities and program outcomes. For a social program to claim success, the evaluation of the implementation of the program is important. If one is uncertain whether the implementation reflects the program's theoretical underpinnings, attribution of the program's outcomes to anything but a "black box" is impossible. In order to duplicate successful social programs, one must be certain, within reasonable limits, that the positive outcomes are indeed a product of underlying assumptions as operationalized in the implementation.

In the area of dropout prevention, this study provides significant insights. First, this study implies that an alternative organizational structure to traditional schools is a key element in increasing the level of coping skills of at-risk students. Second, this study implies that the alternative structure recommended to produce positive changes of at-risk students should be based on the concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness,
normative compliance (Etzioni, 1961), and participative management (Likert, 1961). Third, this study suggests that dropout prevention programs, that successfully incorporate these concepts into their implementation phase, will produce positive changes in the level of coping skills of at-risk students. Fourth, based on a review of the literature (Howard, 1977; Wehlage, 1982; Wehlage, 1986; Bickel, et al, 1986; Levin, 1986; Natriello, et al, 1986; Rumberger, 1987; Orr, 1987) there appears to be common implementation level elements in successful dropout prevention programs. These elements were heretofore unlinked to any larger more encompassing framework. Based on the examination of these common program elements, it is suggested that they reflect, in varying degrees, the theoretical concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participative management.

The implementation of a social program, based on theoretical concepts, expresses the relationship of an operational definition and a theoretical definition. To that extent, there will always be a degree of congruence between a program's implementation and its intended theoretical base rather than perfect congruence. As an example, the implementation of the LSYOU program did not reflect Etzioni's (1961) full concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, and normative compliance or Likert's (1961) full concept of participative management. Rather, it
reflected degrees of these concepts. In addition, different program components reflected varying degrees of these ideas. The program taken as a whole, however, was perceived by students and staff to reflect greater degrees of scope, pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participative management than traditional schools.

The fact that the notions of high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participative management are not perfectly reflected in the implementation of the LSYOU program raises yet another issue. This issue is the threshold at which each of these concepts must be reflected in the implementation of a dropout prevention program in order to produce desired outcomes. While findings in this study tend to reflect the importance of theoretically grounded program structure, little light is shed on the most appropriate level of implementation necessary for each concept.

CONCLUSION 2: The second conclusion is that this program appeared to produce positive outcomes in the at-risk student participants' level of coping skills.

Dropping out of school is a significant social problem. Social programs can be developed and implemented to effect this social problem in positive ways. Evaluation designs must attempt to link program outcomes to the implementation of the program. Duplication of
successful social programs rests on how effectively program outcomes can be linked to implementation.

In the final analysis, the success of any social program rests on the program's ability to resocialize the client to the norms and institutions of society (Wehlage, 1982). Short term measures will always be inadequate to ascertain the long range effects of program participation. The complete success of the LSYOU program will not be ascertained until longitudinal data are provided on whether the program participants complete high school and become productive citizens.

Short term indicators, however, are possible in estimating the possible long term effects of social programs. In the area of dropout prevention, research (Wehlage, 1982; Etzioni, 1983) indicates that at-risk students possess a lower level of coping skills than students who are not at-risk. Students with low levels of coping skills do not generally interact successfully with the traditional school as described by Waller (1932), Carlson (1964), Bidwell (1965), and Cusick (1973). This lack of success at school causes the student to become alienated from the school and to eventually drop out of school (Wehlage, 1984). Therefore, a short term indicator of the success of a social program aimed at dropout prevention is the increase in coping skills in the at-risk student participants.
As described in Chapter 2, coping skills include the ability to concentrate, control impulses, motivate oneself, overcome stress and commit to a task (Etzioni, 1983). Wehlage (1982) includes within his definition of coping skills: the ability to think abstractly, the ability to solve problems, and the ability to be flexible in changing one's frame of reference. Etzioni (1983) further states that examples of manifestations of coping skills in the school setting include the ability to memorize, write a paragraph, and compute. In this study, coping skills were defined as the student's math ability, reading ability, attitudes toward career decision making and intentions to stay in school. Based on the literature, the researcher suggests that these areas are examples of manifestations of coping skills in the school setting. The researcher further suggests that increases in these areas are possible short term indicators of the success of a dropout prevention program.

The predictive power of short term indicators is subject to how faithfully the indicator reflects the construct it is measuring. This researcher acknowledges that the short term indicators of coping skills selected for this study appear to be adequate though incomplete measures of the concept. There are many other school setting manifestations of coping skills such as the student's locus of control, the student's self esteem, the
student's study skills, the student's school grades, and the student's decrease in disciplinary and attendance problems. Therefore, there may be a need to improve operational definitions of this construct.

Recommendations

The findings obtained in this study suggest a number of different avenues for further investigation such as:

a) While the LSYOU program did indeed increase the level of coping skills for at-risk students over the control group, it did not produce any evidence whether an increase in these skills enabled the participants to function effectively in the traditional environment until graduation. Therefore, an essential and obvious extension of this research is to obtain longitudinal data on participants.

b) Social programs cannot fully reflect the theoretical concepts upon which they are based. Researchers, however, who choose to implement dropout prevention programs based on the theoretical concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participative management are encouraged to measure the degree of faithfulness that their program's implementation has to these concepts.

c) Researchers that operationalize the concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance, and
participative management differently from LSYOU should describe explicitly how these concepts are reflected in their program. In addition, there should be a description of the length of time that the program operated and the intensity of the program. This is necessary so that one can examine the relationship of the program's implementation to its rate of success and to the outcome measures utilized.

d) School setting manifestations of coping skills must be examined. A determination must then be made as to which school setting manifestations of coping skills predict high school retention with the best success. This could mean that instruments may need to be developed or refined to adequately measure these manifestations.

e) The relationship between the student's level of coping skills and his/her retention in school needs to be examined. Dropout prevention programs may affect students who possess varying low levels of coping skills differently. Students with the lowest levels of coping skills may need a permanent alternative structure to become socialized to societies "norms roles and expectations" (Wehlage, 1982, p.18). Students with mid range levels of skills may be able to be mainstreamed from the alternative environment to the traditional school once their level of coping skills have increased, providing they receive support services from the alternative
structure in the form of follow-up. Finally, an at-risk student in the upper range of coping skills may adjust to the traditional school after only a short stay in the alternative environment.

f) Those individuals responsible for monitoring and implementing social reform legislation such as the Job Training Partnership Act must carefully examine the implementation level of the policy. For example, the 1986 amendments to the JTPA mandate that attention be paid to dropout prevention. Because of this, a large number of JTPA youth programs added academic remediation to existing work components. This researcher suggests that policy makers, charged with funding JTPA dropout prevention programs, examine carefully the concepts of high scope, high pervasiveness, normative compliance, and participative management and the manner in which these concepts can be operationalized to effect the levels of coping skills of at-risk students. This researcher contends that remedial efforts offered in traditional settings with no link to the coping skills of at-risk students offer little hope of short term or long term success in the areas of dropout prevention or employability.

Other areas of investigation involve the type of approaches traditional schools might incorporate to provide a more receptive environment to its student
clientele, particularly those students with low levels of coping skills. Suggested topics for research include early identification of at-risk students; intervention programs that address student learning styles and cognitive styles; programs that link community and family agencies to provide additional support for at-risk clients, such as after school tutoring and mentoring; inservice of faculty and staff on the problems and methods of working with at-risk students; counseling programs for parents of at-risk students; a review of how retention and suspension policies impact at-risk students in a particular school or district; and a review of how reform legislation affects the at-risk clients in a particular school or district.

In urging researchers to act upon these recommendations, one must remember the words of Dale Mann (1986) who stated the following:

the clock that measures our efforts is calibrated with young people...In middle-size cities..20 students drop out each week. If you are charged to "do something"...a survey of existing practices could take a month (and 80 students); a needs assessment will take two more months to circulate and analyze (160 more students); writing a program and getting board approval could be three months (and 240 more young people gone). That is 480 dropouts before anything different or better is tried. Our efforts here are measured by time and money and by what does and does not happen to children and youth (p.331).
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**Appendix A**

**Sample Student Schedule**

**Master A.M. Students Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group A (13)</th>
<th>Group B (13)</th>
<th>Group C (13)</th>
<th>Group D (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30-9:30</td>
<td>Reading (1)</td>
<td>Reading (2)</td>
<td>Math (3)</td>
<td>Math (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-11:45</td>
<td>Math (3)</td>
<td>Math (4)</td>
<td>Reading (1)</td>
<td>Reading (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45-12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-4:30</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-6:00</td>
<td>Free Time Supper</td>
<td>Free Time Supper</td>
<td>Free Time Supper</td>
<td>Free Time Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:30</td>
<td>Electives (M)</td>
<td>Electives (T)</td>
<td>Electives (W)</td>
<td>Electives (TH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45-9:00</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills</td>
<td>Vocational Counseling (M)</td>
<td>Vocational Counseling (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading (M)</td>
<td>Reading (M)</td>
<td>Counseling (W)</td>
<td>Counseling (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math (W)</td>
<td>Math (W)</td>
<td>Counseling (W)</td>
<td>Counseling (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Counseling (T)</td>
<td>Vocational Counseling (T)</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills (T)</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling (TH)</td>
<td>Counseling (TH)</td>
<td>Reading (T)</td>
<td>Reading (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name Check</td>
<td>Name Check</td>
<td>Name Check</td>
<td>Name Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Group 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:45</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-12:00</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-2:30</td>
<td>Reading (5)</td>
<td>Reading (6)</td>
<td>Math (7)</td>
<td>Math (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45-4:45</td>
<td>Math (7)</td>
<td>Math (8)</td>
<td>Reading (5)</td>
<td>Reading (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45-6:00</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
<td>Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supper</td>
<td>Supper</td>
<td>Supper</td>
<td>Supper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-7:30</td>
<td>Electives (M)</td>
<td>Electives (T)</td>
<td>Electives (W)</td>
<td>Electives (TH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45-9:00</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills</td>
<td>Vocational Counseling</td>
<td>Vocational Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading (M)</td>
<td>Reading (M)</td>
<td>Counseling (M)</td>
<td>Counseling (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math (M)</td>
<td>Math (M)</td>
<td>Counseling (M)</td>
<td>Counseling (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Counseling</td>
<td>Vocational Counseling</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills</td>
<td>Tutoring and Study Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling (T)</td>
<td>Counseling (T)</td>
<td>Reading (T)</td>
<td>Reading (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling (TH)</td>
<td>Counseling (TH)</td>
<td>Math (TH)</td>
<td>Math (TH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:30</td>
<td>Name Check</td>
<td>Name Check</td>
<td>Name Check</td>
<td>Name Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Sample Quest Inservice

Implementation of Skills For Living

URGENT RECOMMENDATIONS

To the Sponsor

Our experience in conducting hundreds of training workshops for a decade has taught us many valuable lessons not only about agendas and learning environments, but also about long-term program effectiveness. Because of our commitment both to quality training and to successful implementation of the Skills For Living program, we are asking each sponsor of a training workshop to communicate the following important information to the administrators of each participating school:

1. We urgently recommend that a minimum of two, preferably more, professional staff members participate in the training workshop. For example, in addition to the one person teaching the program, we suggest that support people could be guidance counselors, building administrators and other teachers.

   This recommendation is based on extensive evaluation of Skills For Living programs around the country and is confirmed in the literature on effective school programming. In schools where more than one person is trained, even with only one person teaching the class, the impact of the program on the students, their families and the school is consistently greater than in schools with an isolated teacher.

   By committing to this level of involvement, a school is saying loudly that it is stacking the deck for success.

2. We urgently recommend that Skills For Living be taught as it was designed—as a class meeting daily for a minimum of one semester. However, because some schools must initiate the Skills For Living experience through another course, our experience has shown that the materials must be integrated a minimum of three class periods a week in order to achieve the desired results. We wish to state clearly that teaching Skills For Living fewer than three class periods a week is to do a disservice both to the students and to the program.

3. Our final recommendation centers on administrative involvement. Again, the research is clear—if there is strong administrative buy-in and support, a program's opportunities for success increase dramatically. We suggest three avenues of involvement that will assist administrators in understanding their role in the Skills For Living program.

   A. Invite administrators to attend the second day of the workshop. Not only will they participate with their teachers in quality training sessions, they will also give a supportive message to their teachers that this program is important in their school. The only additional cost would be lunch.

   B. Several days or weeks before the workshop, the sponsor could organize and present a brief (1 - 2 hour) information session, explaining in some detail the objectives of the Skills For Living program. In addition to presenting an overview of the Skills For Living program and training, the session could serve as an initial networking among the schools that will be teaching the program. Quest will provide materials for this meeting.
As soon as the Sponsor and Quest agree on which of the two ways administrators will be involved, Quest will provide a handout that the Sponsor will send to each school administrator, providing the details of these urgent recommendations.

These recommendations are not suggestions that would be nice for schools to implement. We call them urgent recommendations because after evaluating Skills For Living programs across the country for the past seven years, we have found these components critical for its success.

We urge Sponsors of Skills For Living workshops to do whatever they can to encourage schools to get involved at these levels of recommendations. And while we realize there is no satisfactory way to require schools to follow through with these urgent recommendations, we present them with the hope that teachers and administrators will seriously consider how best they can respond to what research, experience and common sense demonstrate about the successful impact of the Skills For Living program.
Appendix C

Sample Math Curriculum

LSYOU '86

(Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited)

Math Curriculum

Summer Session
Overview

The curriculum for the mathematics program for the LSYOU project is based on the premise that concepts are learned in three stages, concrete, pictorial, and abstract. It is believed that students who have not been successful in mathematics may not have been exposed to the first two stages of concept development.

With this in mind, the focus of the mathematics program emphasizes the understanding of concepts and their application in problem solving, rather than teaching skills in isolation. Concepts will be developed through a manipulative approach. Problem solving, the process of applying previously acquired knowledge to new and unfamiliar situations, should be integrated into every concept developed in the curriculum.

In addition, it is believed estimation is an important concept to be integrated into each aspect of the curriculum. Skillful estimation requires flexible thinking and decision making. Students need planned practice in analyzing situations with respect to these and other decisions.

It is recognized that all students entering the program will not have the same needs. Therefore the type of instruction provided should vary according to the learning needs of the student. It is recommended the students be homogeneously grouped for mathematics instruction based upon scores on a mathematics achievement test. The degree to which the manipulative materials are used should relate directly to the level of needs of the students in each class. Suggested activities to use with the manipulative materials, problem solving, and estimation are provided in the curriculum guide.
* The following activities should be incorporated into concept development in each class:

1. Students will perform an estimation activity.
   Example:
   
   1) What whole numbers are 7/8 and 8/9 between.
   
   2) Estimate the length of the room.
      Source of additional activities are:
      Developing Skills in Estimation by Dab Seymour
      Book A (grade 7-8)
      Book B (grade 8-9)
      Dale Seymour Res.

2. At least fifteen minutes will be devoted to a problem solving activity;
   Example:
   Learning a new problem solving strategy and applying this to an everyday problem.
   Some suggested problems can be found in Problem Solving Experiences in Mathematics
   Grade 8 by Randy Charles et al. Addison Wesley.

3. Time should be spent on the review of basic number facts. Some suggested activities can
   be found in Pre-Algebra with Pizzaz. Series by Stene & James Marcy, Creative Pub.
**NAME** Problem Solving

**AREA** Pre-Algebra  **OBJECTIVE** Students will use the problem solving strategies to work everyday problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE TIME/LINE</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>EVALUATION (Strategies/criteria)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Development of specific problem solving strategy</td>
<td>at least 3 times a week</td>
<td>Addison Wesley Problem Solving Book-Grades 8</td>
<td>Teacher observation of increased skill in problem solving and increased willingness to attempt problem solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Sample Reading Curriculum

LSYOU'86
(Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited)

READING CURRICULUM
Summer Session
General Comments:

A Vocabulary:

a) All words should be put on note-cards and reviewed frequently for word recognition and meaning.

b) Crossword puzzles can be made with the aid of a computer program.

c) Vocabulary will be varied according to the needs of individual students. All students, however, will have to master some key words in order to master the material in the units.

d) The teacher can develop a number of "context", "synonym" etc. activities to adapt to her class.

e) Students should be encouraged to use the new vocabulary as much as possible in both oral and written activities.

B Comprehension:

a) The chapters in You Are Somebody Special, must all be read. The students will do some silent, oral, and cloze reading. Listening to the teacher read parts of each chapter will aid those having difficulties with the text. These chapters are not to be read in one sitting. The material in the manual and chapter contents must be discussed over a number of days.

A great deal of preview and discussion is necessary to complete this course correctly.
b) The reading skills suggested will need to be adjusted to fit the needs of your class. You may have to do similar activities on different levels of difficulty. These are not all outlined for you. You may not be able to cover all you should, however, include all the skills and activities you can.

c) Writing, evening, and content area skills are integrated into this program. Management of time and scheduling of all these activities will be essential.

d) The instructor will need to make weekly plans and daily plans to include all the skills suggested.

e) Evaluation will be done by participation, work completed, and attitude development. Skills tests will be time-consuming. All written work as well as oral participation should be evaluated, and records should be kept.

A skill checklist can be developed for each student.
Week 1

Goal: To develop vocabulary and comprehension skills using *Skills for Living* Units 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary Skills</th>
<th>Comprehension Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC, IE</td>
<td>Locates details B-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies synonym, antonym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA, IC, ID</td>
<td>Recalls details B-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies meanings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB, ID</td>
<td>Selects main idea B-15, B-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies meaning of vocabulary in Context</td>
<td>Recalls sequential order B-2, B-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes fact/opinion B-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes cause - effect B3, 9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes inferences B5, B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listens critically B4, B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws conclusions B13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Sample Computer Curriculum for Reading

LSYOU'86
Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited

Reading and Computer Curriculum
Summer Session
Overview

Reading is a complex developmental task, consisting of the major skill areas of word recognition and comprehension. It also appears that reading is an instructional area for which it is difficult to provide computer-based instruction. However, many believe that the word processor may be the most powerful computerized tool that can be incorporated into reading and writing instruction. It is clear that reading is inherent in most writing, and there is research evidence supporting the idea that the development of writing skills enhances the development of reading skills. For anything to be learned or comprehended, it must be given considerable attention by the student. A practical way to involve students actively in the comprehension process may be to require them to respond in writing to words and ideas that they are asked to recall, reproduce, restate, select from, generalize, integrate, or elaborate upon.

Motivating and engaging students in productive writing sessions is often a major challenge for the teacher. It is believed that students develop a more positive attitude toward the writing process and show general gains in revising abilities when they write using a word processor. A word processor provides the capability to create text and carry out various editing functions including inserting, deleting, moving, and altering words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs. Because a word processor eliminates the need for recopying, writers are freer to use the writing process as a stimulation to thinking. In addition, use of word processing may contribute to the alleviation of writer anxiety resulting in increased self-esteem and more successful writing sessions.

The Computer and Reading Curriculum is designed to provide students with the opportunity to apply the skills they learn in the reading portion of the curriculum. Application of these skills in another setting, the computer-writing lab, should enhance the development and improvement of the reading process for these students.
### Curriculum

#### Reading and Computer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY</td>
<td>TIME/LINE</td>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1:</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>Introduction to lab will be given to students.</td>
<td>Mr. Watkins, Lab Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student will become familiar with the computer lab, operation of the microcomputer, and computer keyboard</td>
<td>45 min.</td>
<td>Students will use a demonstration diskette</td>
<td>13-Apple Presents Apple diskettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2:</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Students will be given a short passage they will type onto the computer as a vehicle to learn to use the BSW.</td>
<td>13-Bank Street Writer diskettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student will learn to use the Bank Street Writer word processing program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13-Initialized Data diskettes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Sample Computer Curriculum for Math

LSYOU ' 86

(Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited)

Math and Computer Curriculum
Summer Session
Overview

The purpose of incorporating computer-based activities into the Math Curriculum is to facilitate the attainment of two goals, the development of cognitive abilities and achievement in pre-algebra skills. In order to achieve these goals, students will engage in programming activities in either the BASIC or LOGO programming language. Differential use of computers by students of different cognitive ability has been documented. Generally, students who are good in math and high achievers are more likely to receive instruction in programming and problem solving skills. In contrast, low achieving students are more likely to receive computer-assisted instruction in the form of drill and practice. This situation may well result in a wider disparity in achievement between students of low and high cognitive ability. The computer and math curriculum is designed to give the LSYOU students the opportunity to participate in the programming process.

It is believed that programming may help students to develop problem solving skills. More specifically, programming teaches students to solve problems by breaking the problem down into small components and it teaches students how to represent the steps involved in solving a problem. In addition to higher level thinking skills, programming languages may be useful in teaching students some of the specific skills requisite to the understanding of algebra. Some of the skills to be enhanced via the programming process include order of operations, understanding of algebraic expressions, the concept of variable, and understanding of geometric patterns and angles. Two separate computers and math curricula have been planned with half the classes using the BASIC programming language and half using the LOGO programming language. Since these two languages are different in form, the objectives for each set of classes will reflect the inherent features of the language learned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TIME/ LINE</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To understand</td>
<td>Class discussion to discover</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
<td>Basic Discoveries pVII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the uses of</td>
<td>ideas students have about</td>
<td></td>
<td>pictures of computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computers</td>
<td>computers. (In classroom before going to lab)</td>
<td></td>
<td>from magazines, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Sample Counseling Curriculum

LSYOU '86

(Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited)

Counseling Curriculum

Summer Session
Lesson: Orientation

Time: 1 hour & 15 min.

Objective: To introduce the students to the Counseling Program

Activity: 1. Student Folder
   a. Distribute to each student a folder. Instruct him/her on filling out the information pertinent at this time.
   b. Explain the usefulness of the folder in keeping track of important school information. This information is necessary for future planning (i.e. materials, information needed for yearbook, paper, college/voc tech/etc. applications, job applications and personal information).

2. Orientation - Career Awareness Packet
   Read and discuss orientation package. The counselor will explain the difference between interest, aptitudes and values and how they relate to their lives. They will explain to the students that they will work with them in the following counseling sessions to determine their interest, aptitudes, and values (i.e., C.O.P.S., C.A.P.S. and C.O.P.E.S.)

Materials: Student Folders
          Orientation Package
          Pencils
Appendix H

1986 LSYOU Jobsites

Evaluation of the Quantitative and the Qualitative Data of the Students' Work Experience at Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited

In the LSYOU Project, students were placed in worksites around the LSU campus. Jobs were selected for the students based on an interest inventory administered to them prior to entering the program. The purpose of the worksite component was four-fold: First, it gave the student the opportunity to earn some badly needed income. Second, and more importantly, it exposed the students to a multitude of professional careers. This of course gave them insight into many occupations of which they would normally not be aware. Third, the students were exposed to a positive work ethic. And, fourth, the students learned many new skills and valuable work experiences to make them more employable in the future.

The following list comprises the various worksites where the LSYOU students were employed:

**JOB LIST**

1. TELEPHONE COMPANY - Telephone Repair/Installer
2. STUDENT AFFAIRS - Office Work
3. GRADUATE SCHOOL - Office Work
4. MEDIA - Equipment/TV Handling
5. MATH DEPARTMENT - Office Work
6. GRAPHICS - Assistant
7. PHOTOGRAPHY - Lab Assistant
8. LIBRARY - Office Work
9. OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE RELATIONS - Office Work
10. MUSIC - Office Work
11. MUSIC/DRAMATICS ARTS - Office Work
12. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS ABROAD - Office Work
13. EDAF - Office Work
14. COSTUME SHOP - Sewing Costumes
15. SCENE SHOP - Creating Scenery
16. SPEECH AND HEARING CLINIC - Office Work
17. PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY - Office Work
18. LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE - Office Work
19. SCHOOL OF ARTS - Office Work
20. COLLEGE OF DESIGN - Gallery and Classroom Maintenance
21. CAMPUS MAIL - Delivering and Picking Up Mail - General Mailroom Duties
22. ATHLETIC COUNSELING - Office Work
23. ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES - Office Work
24. MUSEUM OF GEOSCIENCE - Office Work
25. GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT - Office Work
26. LAB SCHOOL - Office Work
27. LAB SCHOOL - Teacher Assistant
28. INTERNATIONAL STUDENT OFFICE - Office Work
29. ENTOMOLOGY DEPARTMENT - Lab Assistant
30. ENTOMOLOGY DEPARTMENT - Lab Assistant
31. ENTOMOLOGY DEPARTMENT - Museum Assistant
32. ENTOMOLOGY DEPARTMENT - Research Lab Assistant
33. ENTOMOLOGY - Lab Assistant
34. ENTOMOLOGY - Lab Assistant
35. HOME ECONOMICS - Lab Assistant
36. DAIRY SCIENCE - Outside Work
37. WETLAND RESOURCES - Lab Assistant
38. CENTER FOR WETLAND RESOURCES - Lab Assistant
39. WETLAND RESOURCE - Office Work
40. WETLAND RESOURCES - Office Work
41. WETLAND RESOURCES - Library Work
42. CENTER FOR WETLAND RESOURCES - Lab Assistant
43. WETLAND RESOURCES - Lab Assistant
44. COASTAL FISHERIES INSTITUTE - Office Work
45. ELECTRONICS LAB - Lab Assistant
46. COASTAL FISHERIES - Library Work
47. SCIENCE SUPPLY - Warehouse Work
48. SCIENCE SUPPLY - Office Work/Warehouse
49. COASTAL ECOLOGY - Assistant
50. ENERGY CENTER - Office Work
51. NUCLEAR PHYSICS - Office Work
52. HORTICULTURE - Lab Assistant
53. HORTICULTURE - Outdoor Work & Research Activities
54. VET SCHOOL - Lab Assistant
55. VET SCHOOL - Lab Assistant/Office Work
56. VET SCHOOL - Lab Assistant
57. VETERINARY MEDICINE - Office Work
58. HORTICULTURE - Lab Assistant
59. MECHANICAL ENGINEERING - Office Work
September 2, 1986

Dear ___________________,

We really miss you at LSYOU. You are special, and we care about you and your future.

Please write and tell us how you are doing! How is school? Is your school different from LSYOU? How is home life? Would you like to come back to see us? Write to us about life after LSYOU.

Thank you for being part of the LSYOU family!

Yours truly,

LSYOU Staff

****
Appendix J

Student LSYOU Survey

Evaluation of the Qualitative Data of the Student Experience from 
The Louisiana State Youth Opportunities Unlimited Program

Two types of data collection devices were utilized to ascertain the quality of the students' overall experience in the LSYOU program. Both of these devices yielded rich information on the quality of the students' experience, as well as information for program improvement. The results of this data collection are described below:

1. LSYOU School/Program Survey

The students answered open-ended questions regarding their participation in the LSYOU Project. Responses from 97 students were received. Each question was reviewed and responses were coded into major themes that developed during the analysis of the responses.

Following is the original open ended survey with accompanying results.

LSYOU SCHOOL/PROGRAM SURVEY

97 students were given this survey. The following data is from the responses of 97 students.

1. DO YOU THINK THE LSYOU SCHOOL IS DIFFERENT FROM THE SCHOOL THAT YOU ATTENDED LAST YEAR?

97% answered YES
3% answered NO

IF YOU DO, PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU THINK IT IS DIFFERENT?

96% answered

of those responding.
34% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
66% - identified one or more of the following:
LSYOU is different due to:
- fewer students in classrooms
- teachers care and understand students Pa - NC
- emphasis on development of self-responsibility P
- computer classes
- emphasis on completing school "makes me want to stay in school" Pa - P

Note. Normative compliance symbolized by NC; participative management symbolized by Pa; pervasiveness symbolized by P; scope symbolized by S.
2. WAS THE LSYOU PROGRAM WORTHWHILE TO YOU?  
IF IT WAS WORTHWHILE, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY. TRY TO INCLUDE SPECIFIC AREAS SUCH AS  
JOBS, CLASSES, TEACHERS, ELECTIVES, PEER AND RECREATION COUNSELORS, DORM LIFE,  
ETC.

94% answered

of those responding,
3% - answered YES
12% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes
listed below
85% - responded yes and identified one or more of the following:

- I learned to be more independent
- I learned to respect others
- I received experience of a "real job"
- I loved my job
- I earned school credit
- I earned money during the summer
- I lived like a real college student
- The classes taught me how to cope with my problems
- LSYOU kept me out of trouble
- I learned a particular skill at my job (i.e. typing)

3. IF YOU HAD THE OPPORTUNITY, WOULD YOU COME BACK TO THE LSYOU PROGRAM NEXT YEAR?

98% answered YES

4. DO YOU THINK THIS WOULD BE A GOOD PROGRAM FOR OTHER STUDENTS TO COME TO NEXT  
YEAR?

99% answered YES

5. WHAT ADVICE CAN YOU GIVE TO IMPROVE THE LSYOU PROGRAM NEXT YEAR IN THE FOLLOWING  
AREAS?

A. CLASSES/TEACHERS

84% answered

of those responding,
14% - responded keep the same
25% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes
listed below
61% - indicated one or more of the following:

- Classes should be shorter
- Teachers were great

B. ELECTIVES

83% answered

of those responding,
2% - responded cut out electives
24% - responded keep the same
8% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes
listed below
66% - indicated one or more of the following:

- Need more electives to choose from
- I really liked my elective
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C. CAREER PLANNING

74% answered

of those responding,
18% - responded keep the same
9% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
73% - indicated one or more of the following:

- Helped me to select courses for my career
- I know how to get another job
- Career Counseling needs to have more variety

D. DORM LIFE/COUNSELORS

77% answered

of those responding,
12% - responded keep the same
15% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
73% - indicated one or more of the following:

- I loved living in the dorm with "college kids"
- I needed more sleep
- My peer counselor was the "best"

E. WEEKENDS

78% answered

of those responding,
22% - responded keep the same or Great!
8% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
70% - indicated one or more of the following:

- We need more independent time
- We need more activities planned
- We need to be able to go home more often

F. WORK

74% answered

of those responding,
10% - answered keep the same
25% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
65% - answered one or more of the following:

- I want to be able to choose where I want to work
- I need more work to keep me busy
- Earning money was great

G. ANYTHING ELSE

47% answered

of those responding,
22% - stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
78% - indicated one or more of the following:

- Night classes should be earlier in day
- We need more field trips
- Need more home visits on weekends
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6. Do you think that the things the LSYOU program taught you will help you when you leave LSU?

94% answered

of those responding,
98% answered YES

How will it help you at home?

91% answered

of those responding,
15% stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
85% indicated one or more of the following:

- I learned study skills
- I learned how to budget money
- I increased my self confidence
- I know how to share my feelings
- I can use eye messages to better communicate with my family

7. How will it help you at school?

92% answered

of those responding,
17% stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
83% indicated one or more of the following:

- I'll be ahead of the other students
- I've learned new study skills
- I know what courses to take in school for a job

8. How will it help you in other areas of your life?

88% answered

of those responding,
23% stated various positive responses not included in the major themes listed below
77% indicated one or more of the following:

- I've learned to make it on my own
- The career counseling helped me in choosing a career
- The career counseling taught me how to apply for a job
- Now, I'll be ahead of the other students at my school
- LSYOU helped me learn about college
- I can get along with others better
- I've learned how to deal with problems at home
- I've learned how hard it is to earn money and never take it for granted
- It taught me how to be nice and respect others
- LSYOU taught me to be a better person
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Appendix K

Themes and Indicators from the Boss of the Summer Letters

Complete Listing of Themes and Indicators from the Boss of the Summer Letters

I. Theme: Developing Personal Relationships

He was more than a person - He was like a father to me. (2 - BMJ) Pa - S

She helped me to recapture the dreams I had lost and helped me to become a person of responsibility. (6 - BFT) Pa - P - S

We have developed a wonderful relationship. (10 - BFJ) Pa - S

My supervisor is a loving and caring person. (11 - BFB) Pa - S

When there is no more work to be done, we sit around and talk about our feelings. (11 - BFB) Pa - S

She really cares for me - I care for her too....not only in the office but out of the office too.... She brought me to their club to eat dinner and to swim. (12 - WMT) S - Pa

She tells me not to get in trouble.... She treats me like one of her own sons or as if I would be a member of her family. (12 - WMT) Pa - P - S

Me and my boss gets along well because we talk a lot. (20 - BMB) Pa - S

She has been a major influence in my life. (12 - WMT) P - S

...when I came to work for my good friends. (13 - BMJ) Pa - S

I wish my boss could meet my family. (29 - BMT) Pa - S

My supervisor is the kind of person who cares about her employee. She helps you out when you down and lonely....She shows her love and affection on which the things she do for you and the things you do for her. (30 - WF) Pa - NC - P - S

I'd like to thank my boss for the things he did for me like bringing me to the Infirmary. (31 - BMB) S - Pa

He is a nice person to work with....He helps me with the things I need. He is nice and sweet. (34 - WFJ) NC - Pa - S

I thank you for your kindness and help when I need it - I'm grateful and when summer is over I'll never forget you. Pa - S

So keep in touch with a friend like me. I am just writing this letter to tell you how nice and understanding you have been to me. (37 - BFT) Pa - NC - S

Because my boss is nice and kind and friendly and understanding. And when ever I need help, if he has the time, he'll stop and help. He may not be the best but, he is my boss and thats all that matters. (38 - BMB) Pa - NC - S

He understands when I need help and will help me. (43 - WMT) Pa - NC - S

Note. Normative compliance symbolized by NC; participative management symbolized by Pa; pervasiveness symbolized by P; scope symbolized by S.
My supervisor likes me working for him. (48 - WMJ) Pa - NC - S

He is very nice to me and the other persons are nice to me as well. When he gets a cold drink, he gets one for me too. (54 - WFJ) Pa - S

The most fun part of this program was working for the two of you. You have been a big help to me. (56 - BFB) Pa - P - S

She is nice and sweet and the little things she do just for me such as buying books that will help me learn about things I don't know too much about. (57 - BFB) Pa - P - S

I want to thank you for all the help and time you spent with me. (63 - BMJ) Pa - P - S

I have the best boss of the summer because she is the nicest person I ever had for a boss. She gives me everything she's got. I love my job. (62 - BFB) Pa - P - S

11. Theme: Learning on the Job

Very interested in my learning the material she assigns. (-1 - BFT) P - NC - Pa

She helped me to strengthen my experience, knowledge, and success toward my future. (5 - AFJ) P - NC - Pa

She has taken time to teach me things I know teachers would not help me with. (1 - BFT) P - NC - Pa

This is the first time I've ever considered veterinary science as a career. (9 - WMT) P

She taught me how to use the phone properly and the phase computer. (12 - WMT) P - Pa

You taught me how to look up the mail and shared your knowledge of working at campus mail. (BMB) P - Pa - NC

He has taught me things I'll need to know if I ever work in an office. I can type a little faster. (13 - WMJ) P - NC - Pa

My boss knows so much about electronics. He teaches me the basics about transmitters and the kinds of tools I need. If it wasn't for him, I wouldn't be so interested in electronics in a career. (15 - BMB) P - NC

I learned a lot (4 - WMJ) P

Helped me get the feel of a real job. (6 - BMT) P

I learned a great deal. I learned to dissect fish and goats (9 - WMT) P

My boss is well trained in landscape architecture. (19 - WMT) P

I learned a lot of new things like how to grow test tube strawberries and how to freeze dry. (20 - BMB) P - NC - Pa

I learned a lot from my job and working on the microscope. (21 - BFB) P - NC - Pa

I had fun learning how to work different machines. (25 - BFB) P - NC - Pa

Thank you for teaching me what I know. (29 - BMT) P - NC - Pa
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Thank you for hiring me and teaching me your professions. (35 - BMT) P - NC - Pa

I learned so much at horticulture. I learned a lot about plants and how to care for them. She has taught me about all sorts of things (36 - WMJ) P - NC - Pa

He showed me how to use the computers at work and how to mix chemicals to water. (39 - BMJ) P - NC - Pa

I have learned a lot this summer, particularly about fall army worms. (41 - WMT) P - NC - Pa

He taught me things that can really help me with some cameras. He likes working with people. (48 - WMJ) P - NC - Pa

She loves to help us on things that don't have to do with work. (49 - BFT) P - S

It has really been fun and worthwhile working with you this summer. (55 - WFJ) P - S - Pa

I enjoyed working with the computer. (59 - WMJ) P - NC - Pa

I really think I have learned a whole lot from you guys by listening and of course observing. (BFT) P - Pa - NC

III. Theme: Developing a Work Ethic

She is a person willing to do her work right. She do more than she ought to do - put effort - always double checks everything she do in all kinds of ways. (3 - BFB) P - NC

He is a nice man but what I like about him is that he cares about how work - I respect how hard he works - but most of all he is a kind, smart man. (7 - BMJ) P - NC

She keeps me working at all times. (11 - BFB) P - NC

She complements me on all the hardwork I did. (12 - WMT) P - NC

She is fair with different situations and management. She has great qualities about doing things. (14 - BFT) P - NC - Pa

She works hard at everything....She has one quality that I admire her for...She never quits. She wants to be a better person. (18 - BMJ) P - NC - Pa

They always keep me busy and are so nice. (20 - BMB)

She wants hardworkers to work for her. They want me to be loveable and capable in life. (27 - BMB) P - NC - Pa

My boss made us a great team of workers. (28 - BMT) P - NC - Pa

Privilege to work under a great person. (2 - BMJ) P - NC - Pa

I'd like to nominate my boss because she is very enthusiastic in her work. Her desk is very organized. (32 - WFJ) P - NC - Pa

He is nice, he is bright, he is thoughtful, I admire his originality in the field he supervises. (33 - BFT) P - Pa

My boss is very smart. She does anything to keep me and my friend busy. She is very calm. (36 - WMJ) P - Pa - NC

My boss loves to work with computers. (38 - BMB) P
You really helped me a lot especially when you told me that if I were your secretary you would have fired me, and I really thought about that, and now I know how to handle a job. (44 - BFB) Pa - Pa - NC

She is a very hard working woman who tries to get the job done right. (51 - BFB) Pa - Pa

She works very hard and puts in lots of overtime. (51 - BFB) Pa - Pa

They all feel that they do not want me to leave because I work hard with them. (54 - WFJ) Pa - Pa - NC

I've really learned a great deal about the job you enjoy doing and I enjoy it too. (63 - BMJ) Pa - Pa - NC

My supervisor is capable, understandable, intelligent, kind, sweet and a hard worker. (61 - WFT) Pa - Pa

IV. Theme: Recognizing the Patience and Understanding, Displayed by the Supervisor, Particularly When the Student Makes Mistakes

She showed me things over and over and never gave up on me. (8 - BFJ) Pa - Pa - NC - P - S

She is very lenient and patient with me. (1 - BFT) Pa - Pa - S

She is kind in all ways. (3 - BFB) Pa - Pa - S

She is very patient and understanding....She never raised her voice or stopped smiling. (8 - BFJ) Pa - Pa - NC - S

When I made mistakes, I felt bad, but she warms my heart up and makes me feel discovered again. (5 - AFJ) Pa - Pa - NC - S

She is sweet but not so sweet as till she won't tell me when I'm wrong. (10 - BFJ) Pa - Pa - P - S

When I do something wrong she corrects me and keeps me out of trouble. (11 - BFJ) Pa - Pa - P - S

She is nice and cooperative, open and honest. She never puts people down in a mean way. (14 - BFT) Pa - Pa - P - S

When she tells you that you're wrong so you won't make the same mistake again, she tells you in a mannerable way whereas she won't be putting all the blame on you. (14 - BFT) Pa - Pa - P - S

When I did not understand she explained to me until I did understand. (17 - ) Pa - Pa - P - S

I want to thank him for how nice and understanding he has been to me. (21 - BFJ) Pa - Pa - P - S

He did nice things for me at work. (39 - BMB) Pa - Pa - P - S

He helps me with things I didn't know. When I had trouble learning, he made sure I understood. (22 - BMJ) Pa - Pa - P - S - NC

When I do something my coworkers have trouble doing, he compliments me. (22 - BMJ) Pa - Pa - P - S

If I make a mistake, he tell me so I won't make it again. (22 - BMJ) Pa - Pa - P - S

You have helped me through a lot and I appreciate it. I know its hard for you to give me direction and information while you are working with your work. (40 - AFJ) Pa - Pa - P - S - NC
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I would like to nominate my boss because when I answer the telephone... and make a mistake she doesn't get upset, she just come and show me the right way to do it. (BMB) Pa - P - NC - s

She feels concern about me and the things that I do. She gives me freedom and respect. She stops what she is doing and comes to help me if I have a problem. (45 - BMJ) NC - Pa - P - s

If the other bosses treat their employees like she treats me, I couldn't see why anyone would be scared on their first job. (45 - BMB) NC - Pa - P - s

My boss is very nice to work with. She is not a very fussy person. (45 - BFT) Pa - S

I nominate my boss because she is a really a nice person to work with. Everytime she asks me to do something she says it in a very nice and sweet way. (53 - BFT) NC - Pa - P - S

Because she is one of the most understanding people I ever met. On my first day I was nervous and kept messing up until she started going around with why I work so I could improve and get better. (58 - BMB) NC - Pa - P - S

Theme: Appreciating Faith, Encouragement, and Advice Given by the Supervisor

She tells me not to quit school...to respect older people because that is how you build up your reputation. (12 - WMT) P

She tells me not to get involved in drugs. (12 - WMT) P

She helps me when I need help with my school work or work on the job. She corrects me when I'm wrong. (18 - BMJ) P - NC

He would take time and talk to me for instance when I had a problem. (2 - BMJ) P - Pa

She keeps her faith in me and my work (1 - BFT) P

I'm glad she agreed to put up with me. (4 - WMJ) Pa

She puts her trust in me and I put my trust in her (12 - WMT) Pa - P

They encourage me to do better things with my life. (27 - BMB) Pa - P

They helped me with my problems and that meant a lot to me. (23 - BFB) Pa - P

I thank them for talking to me and giving me advice. (25 - BFB) Pa - P

You gave me the best encouragement I need in order to become what I want... I now know what is expected of me. (26 - BFT) Pa - P - NC

You made my life feel important and that you make me feel my career would come true. (40 - AFJ) Pa - P
Appendix L
Themes and Indicators from Student Responses After
They Returned Home

Complete List of Responses Categorized by Theme from the
Students’ Letters After Returning Home

I. Theme: Relating to School

I’ve been busy with school work and football practice. (13 - BFJ)

I love my new school. I enjoy making new friends. (13 - BFJ)

I’m having a lot of fun with school. I have a lot of new teachers and friends.
(20 - WFJ)

I really enjoy going to school this year...I find its really what you make of it. (21 - WFJ)

I am making out good at school...my teachers are great. (23 - WMJ)

School is going alright so far. (29 - BFB)

It’s fun to be at school when you get along with everybody. I am a cheerleader
now and on the ROTC Drill Team. (31 - BFB)

I go to Broadmoor High its very nice. I take piano and its fun. (33 - BFB)

I’m a volleyball player at Capitol Sr. High. We won all our games...I learned a lot about volleyball up there. It did a lot of good... (35 - BFB)

I enjoy school very much since school has started back. I am not happy with my grades but I am studying more to improve. (37 - BFB)

I like attending high school. I play the alto saxophone in the marching band. My classes are interesting. (31 - BMB)

I feel comfortable at school because my friends are there. (43 - BMB)

I really enjoy school now. I think anybody that will have a chance to go should go because it really gives you a chance to really like school. (45 - WMT)

I’m doing great in school I’ve passed all my tests so far. (53 - BFB)

I’m fine in life...I’m starting on the basketball team...I’m doing good in school except English... (59 - BFT)

I started playing basketball and baseball...I might start running track again. (63 - BMT)

I’m doing fine in school...its a great school and I really like it. (6 - BBB)

II. Theme: Appreciating What LSYOU Did for Them

I deeply appreciate the things you all done for me. I was taught self respect by
my teachers, discipline by everyone, and the program itself, just made me an all
around better person. (19 - WMJ) P — NC

Note. Normative compliance symbolized by NC; participative
management symbolized by Pa; pervasiveness symbolized by
P; scope symbolized by S.
Thank you for what you have done for me. (12 - BFJ) P

I miss you people and all that was done for me; I just want to thank you for your help. (1 - BFB) P

Thanks again for your help. (2 - AFJ) P

I'm doing very well in school with the help of the program you had this summer. (4 - BFB) P - Pa

I have learned so much I do things I never thought I could do. (7 - BMT) P - Pa

It was a pleasure and an experience being at LSU. I learned a lot, thanks to the staff counselors and teachers. (6 - BFT) P - Pa

Life after the LSYOU Program have turned my life completely around. I learned how to gain more responsibility; how to accept life as it is and not for what I want it to be. Thanks to y'all I've found out what life is really all about...I needed the LSYOU program to get started in life. Thanks for y'all kindness and support. (8 - BFT) P - Pa

Thank you for letting me be in a great program. I think LSYOU was the best thing that ever happened to me. (13 - BFJ) P

Thank you for caring about me. (20 - WFT) Pa - P

I was so glad that I went to LSYOU program. It was fun. It was fun at school and at work. The union was fun...All the teachers I had was fun and all of the elective teachers was fun...It was fun getting $20.00 a week. (22 - WFJ) Pa - P

I would come back next year and work for free...It could be my way to repay all of you for what you gave me. (21 - WFJ) P - Pa

I have learned a lot this summer and I have you to thank. (26 - BFB) P - Pa

I thank you all for the most unforgettable summer...I will write often as long as I am a part of the LSYOU family. (33 - BFB) Pa - P - S

My son has really improved in his attitude and behavior I just wanted to say thanks a lot for everything. (44 - WMB) P - Pa

I feel that I should thank LSYOU because if it wasn't for that summer program I don't know what would have happened to me over the summer. So heres to you LSYOU, you're #1 in my book and always will be. (48 - BFT) Pa - P

I want you all to know that I appreciate everything you have done for me. I never knew they had such sweet people in the world. (54 - BFJ) Pa - P

I will never forget you and what you did for me...You all really helped me a lot. (55 - WBJ) Pa - P

I am very proud to be a part of the wonderful glorious LSYOU family. I will never forget you and the purpose of this wonderful program. (56 - BFT) Pa - P - S

I finally realize how much the program means to me and I would like to come back. (58 - BFJ) Pa - P

My teachers made a big difference in my life also. You did too...the way you talked I felt the meaning to your words. (59 - BFT) Pa - P - NC

Your decision to let kids know that there is more in life than living. Education means success. (59 - BFT) Pa - P - NC

I thank you for the chance to show my talent (63 - BMB) Pa - P

I miss my boss, Mrs. .... and Mr. ....they encouraged me to keep going with my future career. (63 - BMB) Pa - P

My old boss taught me everything I know about engineering...(63 - BMB) Pa - P

The money I earned helped my family a lot. (66 - WMB) P
III. Theme: Reflecting on Home Life

Home life is great. (19-BMJ)

Things at home have been all right. I haven't got into any trouble at home or at school. (19-BMB)

My life being at home is good. (7-BMT)

My home is great...they spoiled me...yeah, I love em. (11-BFJ)

Home life is dull but I am getting through it. (13-BFJ)

As for my home life, it is just great. (15-BMJ)

Home seems very different from LSYOU. (22-WFJ)

My home life is fine...I can handle it just a little better than I could before the program. (24-AFJ)

Home is still the same...boring as ever. (26-BFB)

Its ok at home...but dull. (29-BFB)

My life being at home is good. (7-BMT)

Home life is much better for me now, because I have learned to be myself and handle problems. (41-BMB)

Home life is fine except for my father's griping. (43-BMB)

My home life is going great, thanks to y'all. (44-WMB)

When I was away from home I never had a problem because I was happy but I'm not happy at home...It's not the same as LSYOU but I can live with it because no matter what happens I will be as good as I was at LSYOU. (47-BMT)

It is wonderful what you did for my daughter; now we have a different relationship; now we can talk openly. I am a high school drop out myself...we don't need anymore drop outs. (49-BFT)

Home life is ok but it could be better. (51-IFT)

Things at home have been all right. I haven't got into any trouble...and I think the LSYOU program helped me stay out of it. (57-BMB)

My mom doesn't want her youngest to grow-up...she won't let me take a chance...some days we don't speak I don't need that...I need a hug from her letting me know that she'll be there when I need her most. (59-BFT)

IV. Theme: Missing the LSYOU Program and Wanting to Return

I'd love to come back next summer to learn more and help others...please allow me to return. (19-BMJ)

I think the LSYOU program helped me stay out of trouble and I want to come back next summer. (39-BMB)

I would love to come back and see all of you. I miss all of you very much. (12-BFJ)
Life after LSYOU is like having something you loved very much and enjoyed very much and left it standing in one place and didn't come back to see it, but keeping what you have loved in your heart. (12-BFJ) Pa - S

I miss all of you very much and especially my “daddy” [Headmaster] who said that he was going to adopt me. (1-BFB) S - Pa

I haven't forgot all of you I really want to come back so bad...0 I just want to come back. (-BFB) S - Pa

I miss you so much. I know it has been a long time since I wrote. I have not forgot about you. (5-BFB) S - Pa

Do you think we can come back...I close my letter but not my love. (5-BFB) S - Pa

I miss you so much that I wish I would be with you...I never thought I would miss being up there so much but I do. (7-BMT) S - Pa

I missed being at LSU...I miss all of my friends and teachers very much. Every night I sit down and think about how much love and fun I had being in the program. I'm dieing to come back to see my family again. If everyone could come back for a reunion I would be the happiest person on earth. (9-BMB) S - Pa

Write soon and let me know if I can come back. (10-BFJ) S - Pa

I would like to come back and work in the office. (11-BFJ) S - Pa

Each day I think of LSU...work, school, electives, tutoring... I would love to come and see you. (13-BFJ) S - Pa

I would love to come back. I miss you LSYOU. Everybody wants to come back. Miss you a lot, everybody does. (14-BFJ) S - Pa

I miss you all. I would love to come back and be a junior counselor. (15-BMJ) S - Pa

I deeply miss the program, especially the staff. You have a special place in my heart and I would like to see you all again. (16-BMJ) S - Pa

I really miss everyone involved in the LSYOU program...I would like to come back again. (17-BMJ) S - Pa

I would like to come back next year...Can I work 8 hours? Can we have a reunion? Will the teachers come? (18-BMJ) S - Pa

I truly miss all the staff, teachers, and most of all students. I would truly enjoy going to see you sometime in the near future. (20-WFJ) S - Pa

I haven't forgotten you all, never...I have missed you a lot, also the program...I will never lose contact with you. (23-WMJ) S - Pa

I miss you...don't forget to write. (27-BFB) S - Pa

I would love to come back to LSYOU...I had fun and I learned a lot. (28-BFB) S - Pa

When I got home...all I did was think about...all the precious time we spend together. I miss LSYOU very much. (29-BFB) S - Pa

I really miss being in the program, and all of the new people...my best wish is to come back. (26-BFB) S - Pa

I really missed you...I hope I get another chance to visit my big friendly family. (31-BFB) S - Pa

How much I miss you all...one day we could have a reunion, everybody! I pray to God that we could come back and have the same people to do this program again... (32-BFB) S - Pa
I told my friends about LSYOU...and they told me they wish they was there to find out for themselves. I think there should be another program. (31-BFB) S - Pa

Hopefully we can have a reunion...I'd like to see my friends I met over the summer...I will always remember that I am a part of the LSYOU family. (34-BFB) S - Pa

I want to come back...I wish you let my friends come back too. I miss them alot. (35-BFB) S - Pa

I have been thinking about LSU alot. Some times I wish I was still there with all my family. (36-BFB) S - Pa

I have been praying that everyone who attended LSYOU program last summer is doing very well. I hope we get the chance to meet again. (37-BFB) S - Pa

I would like to come back for a visit not the whole summer...because I would like to give another kid a chance to see what life is like at LSYOU. (37-BFB) S - Pa

It's a little boring since I left LSYOU and I wish that I was still there. (38-BFB) S - Pa

I would like to see everybody again sometime I really missed everybody...I cried on the last day because they were true friends to me. (40-BMB) S - Pa

I would love to come back. (41-BMB) S - Pa

I enjoyed myself so much that I want to return next year...please let me know how. (42-BMB) S - Pa

I would love to be a part of your wonderful program again this summer. (43-BMB) S - Pa

I really miss ya'll more than you think I do...you can bet that I'll be there if ya'll have it next year. (44-BMB) S - Pa

I would really like to go back to LSYOU because it was so much fun, experiencing, as well as learning...(45-WMT) S - Pa

I wish I could come back next summer and be with someone I love and who care about me. (47-BMT) S - Pa

I enjoyed being part of the LSYOU family...I would like to go back for a long long visit. (51-IFT) S - Pa

I miss the program and staff...I wish some day I could come again. (52-BFB) S - Pa

I want to come back again next summer. (57-BMT) S - Pa

I would really like to come back even if it is more than 8 weeks. (58-BFJ) S - Pa

I have been missing you all...I have been lonely...not waking up every morning together. (60-HMJ) S - Pa

I really miss LSYOU and the staff. (61-HMJ) S - Pa

I miss you all a lot. (62-BMT) S - Pa

I'd like to come back and do it all over again. (63-BMB) S - Pa

I wish we could come back and see my old friends...my brother and my friends want to go back. (67-HKJ) S - Pa
V. Theme: Understanding How LSYOU Helped Them at School

School is going great. By me attending LSYOU, I'm ahead of all 9th grade students. (19-BMU) Pa - P

The LSYOU program helped me in algebra a lot, I got a high C. (39-BMB) Pa - P

I am doing better in math and science. Mr. B. gave me some help over the summer...He is a very good teacher...my math teacher asked me where I learned the good math I was doing and I said from my math teacher over the summer. (11-BFB) Pa - P

I have learned a lot since being in the program. I learned so very many skills that have been a great help. (15-BMJ) Pa - P

After my summer with the LSYOU program, I have discovered that life in school can be exactly what you want it to be...I guess the difference between this year and last year is knowing that when it's time for fun I have fun and when it's time for work I work. (21-WFJ) Pa - P

The program has helped me a lot specially with my military future. (24-AFJ) Pa - P

I have learned from LSYOU if you want to get out of high school do your work. (26-BFB) Pa - P

My LSYOU teacher was right, I did get a head start in algebra. (24-AFJ) Pa - P

I have changed very much now I get along with people at the school, thanks from LSYOU. (31-BFE) Pa - P

My reading and math teacher has taught me a great deal. My mom says you all have spoiled me cause I talk about how good and how much the program has been a help to me. (32-BFB) Pa - P

I've been doing very well in my school courses and feel that those tutoring classes really helped me in my reading ability at school. (34-BFB) Pa - P

School has been better compared to other years. While going to school at LSYOU, I learned to care more about school because the staff taught me that education is important. (36-BFB) Pa - P

I was very pleased with my subjects I was taking at LSYOU. Reading and math really paid off. (37-BFB) Pa - P

The math class helped me because I am having the same thing now as I did then. Reading has helped me with my reading abilities. (38-BFB) Pa - P

I learned how to work hard to get what you want and the biggest thing I learned was to love people and never to hate people. I learned how to budget my money. I learned never to give up. I learned a lot more things that will help me in life. But most of all I learned to work as a team. (40-BMB) Pa - P

I learned a lot while I was there; I've earned enough credits to be moved from pre-algebra to algebra I. (42-BHB) Pa

My bosses taught me a lot of interesting things about fish life. (43-BMB) Pa

I am doing good in school thanks to the best teachers in the whole world. (47-BMT) Pa - P

I feel that I'm going to try harder this year than I did last year. (48-BFT) Pa - P

Things are better and school is fine. I'm making great grades...my life really did change. (50-MFT) Pa - P

I am doing fine in school...my grades are better and improve everyday... (52-BFB) Pa - P

I've used some of the things I learned at LSU at school and in my everyday life. (53-BFB) Pa - P
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My teachers and tutors have showed me how to make learning fun...my grades are better. (54 - BFJ) Pa - P - NC

I am doing very well in school, as a matter of fact better than I thought I would, and what you did for me has a great deal to do with it. (56 - BFT) Pa - P - NC

The LSYOU program helped me in Algebra a lot..(57 - BMT) Pa

I haven't got into any trouble at school and I think the LSYOU program helped me stay out of it. (57 - BMT) P - Pa - NC

VI. Theme: Distinguishing the Difference Between LSYOU School and Regular School

My school is very different from LSYOU. We work more, there are no breaks between class either. (19 - BMJ)

My school isn't much different from LSYOU accept we have more classes.(39 - BMJ)

My school is very different, I have one teacher...who calls us all stupid dummies and I felt very bad. (12 - BFJ) NC

Things are OK at school, but its not the same as going to LSU. (9 - BMJ)

My school is not better than the LSYOU school...because they carry guns and sell drugs at our school. (10 - BFJ) NC

My school is very different...I have more freedom, and no breaks during class. Classes are a little boring..but thats life because school is very important. (11 - BFJ)

My school is not that different. Teachers are still a pain and I hate to get up early.

School is different because they teach different things than what we were taught. (28 - BFB)

The school I go to is not like LSYOU it is very different...we don't have as much fun as we did at LSYOU. (31 - BFB) NC - Pa

...My school is kind of similar to LSYOU because we have understandable teachers just like LSYOU. (32 - BFB) NC - Pa

School is OK but is not like LSU. I have more work to do now. (35 - BFB)

I wish all schools could be as close and great as we were. (36 - BFB) Pa - NC

LSYOU had more activities, fun, and work than regular school. I also enjoyed meeting new faces. (37 -BFB) S

School is different from my old school. At the high school I go to, we have a lot of homework and we have 7 hours of class. (40 - BMB)

School is fine...but is much different from school at LSYOU. (41 - BMB)

My school is very different from LSYOU because we have 30 students in our class. and there is no assistant to help out. (45 - WMT) Pa

I think school is very different from LSYOU because in school, I made bad grades but when I came to LSYOU it changed my whole life. (47 - BMT) Pa - P

My school is a lot different than LSYOU schooling, because the people at LSYOU are nicer than my high school. (48 - BFT) NC - Pa

I rather go to LSYOU school, than the one I'm going to now. (50 - WFT) Pa - NC

School is fine. It certainly is different from LSYOU. I rather LSYOU. (51 - IFT)Pa - NC
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LSYOU is different in the way that each day you had a plan. Your day was full and organized. I had an idea of where I was going and how my time was going to be spent. (55 - BFB) S - Pa - NC

I wish school was as fun and taught as easy in regular school as it was at LSYOU. My teachers even made it fun. (54 - BFJ) S - Pa - NC

I love LSYOU better than my school...its more active... (56 - BFT) S - Pa

My math class is terrible...the teacher teaches her way and when I tell her I don't know how to do it that way...she gets mad and tells me to go outside...she doesn't care how I was taught... (62 - BMT) NC - Pa

VII. Theme: Asking for Assistance

I need help in English. (12-BFJ) Pa
I do need tutoring on French and especially English subjects. (2-AFJ) Pa
Would you please send me a print out of how much models and actors make? (4-BFB) Pa
School is alright but my grades aren't. (28-BFB) Pa
Could you help me find a job after school...it would really help me and my family. (30-BFB) Pa
If you could help me get a part-time job, I sure would appreciate it. (53-BFB) Pa
The subjects I need tutoring in are math, English, and reading...but really math. (58-BFJ) Pa
As far as report cards...I got an F in English. (59-BFT) Pa
I was wondering if you could help me with some information about ROTC in high school and college. (60-HM) Pa
I am looking for a job...can you give me a hand? (60-HM) Pa
I might need tutoring for math...its pretty confusing. (61-HM) Pa
Can you help me find a job...I have been looking all over. (61-HM) Pa
How can I borrow money to go to college? (61-HM) Pa
Will you send me some information on being an MP in the Navy? (61-HM) Pa
I got an F in civics, science, and English. (66-HM) Pa
I need to improve my grades...I didn't do too good the first nine weeks. (67-HM) Pa

VIII. Theme: Living on a College Campus

It was really fun living on campus. I felt like I was a college student. (1-BFB) S - Pa
I wish I was back on campus. (29-BFB) S - Pa
I loved pillow fights with my friends...I wish I was back at LSU. (33-BFB) S - Pa
I would like to give another kid a chance to visit LSU college. (37-BFB) Pa
I would give anything to be back on that fantastic campus. I wish at this very moment to be on LSU campus. (56-BFT) S
I miss getting up early and eating in the college cafeteria...and moving around at Peabody at night. (63-BMB) S
IX. Theme: Emphasizing Personal Relationships

I think you're the best friends to me in the whole wide world. I wish you luck through your whole life and I hope you be successful in everything you do. (3-BFB) Pa - NC - S

I wish there was something I could do to show you how much I love you and care about you and think about you. (4-BFB) Pa - NC - S

I hope you are doing okay...it means a lot to me...just meeting you has brought happiness into my life. (5-BFB) Pa - NC - S

Tell Mr. ..., I miss and love him for being my adopted father while I was sick. (6-BFT) Pa - NC - S

You have a special place in my heart...I love you all. (15-BMJ) Pa - NC - S

I am very happy being part of the LSYOU family. (17-BMJ) Pa - NC - S

I hope to see all of you very soon. I love everyone very much...I love you very much. (29-BFB) Pa - NC - S

Kiss everybody for me...I love you very much. (30-BFB) Pa - NC - S

The program is truly marvelous, magnificent, outrageous, outstanding and very organized and I really mean all those positive things. (32-BFB) Pa - NC - S

I'm closing my friendly letter but not my love for LSYOU...and if you need my help you got it. (33-BFB) Pa - NC - S

I will always remember the people, friends, teachers and counselors in my prayers. May God bless each and everyone of you. (37-BFB) Pa - NC - S

The people that was at LSYOU is just like a family to me and I miss them very much. (38-BFB) Pa - NC - S

I know everybody at LSYOU love me...I consider all of you my family and I will never forget you as long as I live. (47-BMT) Pa - NC - S

People will go and sometimes run away but in my heart the love for LSYOU will forevermore stay. (48-BFT) Pa - NC - S

I love you all at LSYOU; you all are so warm, loving, and caring... (49-BFT) Pa-NC-S

Y'all are like family. (50-WFT) Pa - NC - S

I enjoyed myself very much and came to care deeply about the people I lived and worked with. (53-BFB) Pa - NC - S

I love you all truly abundantly... (55-BFT) Pa - NC - S

I have a key to one of the rooms at the dorm...I'm going to keep it as a little trinket. (62-BMT) S

Tell everyone I love them and miss them. (64-WFT) Pa - NC - S

I really enjoyed myself there at LSYOU...it was very very special to me. (67-WMJ) Pa - NC
X. Theme: Appreciating Follow-Up Contact

I feel very special for you to be sending me letters. (4-BFB) Pa – NC

I'm happy that you all are trying to get out to our schools to visit with our counselor. (4-BFB) Pa – NC

I feel very special for you to be writing to me. (3-BFB) Pa – NC

Thank you for being so concerned about my school work and the way I feel about it. (6-BMB) Pa – NC

Thank you for the letters and the concern. (24-AFJ) Pa – NC

Today I got your letter and read it...so I rush to call everybody. (25-AFJ) Pa – NC

I was very glad to hear from all of you...thanks for caring because I care about all of you. I will be looking forward to you visiting my school. (30-BFB) Pa – NC

Thank you for your concern. (40-BMB) Pa – NC

I'm so glad y'all still care about us so much. (50-WFT) Pa – NC

I liked talking to you when you came down. I am looking forward to seeing you again. (55-WMJ) Pa – NC

I want you to know I am aware of your concern for my opinion and I really appreciate the accurate attention. (56-BFT) Pa – NC

Could we have a reunion of all the students from the whole LSYOU? (65-BFK) Pa

How's everything going about us coming on the weekend? (66-WMJ) Pa

XI. Theme: Recognizing the Change in Their Self Image

I learned that I am somebody. I am worth something and that I feel good about myself. (21-WFJ) P – NC

I hope the next group of kids that go to LSYOU...learn that they are special and are worth something...that they have a chance to feel what I learned about myself. (21-WFJ) P – NC

I changed a lot...I've talked more. The confidence in me has gained pretty much...I'm not shy anymore. (24-AFJ) P – NC

Tell Mr. .....I am standing up straight and tall like he said facing everyone that I can. That why I am a cheerleader. (31-BFB) P – NC

Life after LSYOU is different because I have found a new person inside myself. (41-BMB) P

Since I came back from LSU I think that I have been to myself but a lot of people think more positively about me now. (45-WMT) P

I knew that I can do something in life. I never got an award in my whole life...not in school...but when they call my name to come and get award at LSYOU, I was the happiest person in the whole world. (47-BMT) P – NC

The first day when I got home, the next day was so different everyone was looking at me like I was the new girl on the block. A lot of people told me that I looked different, I acted different and I really changed a lot to myself. (48-BFT) P – NC

I haven't been the same since I've left LSU...I haven't gotten into any fights after using eye messages. (54-BFJ) P – NC

You all helped me a lot...some saw me and said you'll make it - I know you want too much...you know they are right. I'm hanging in there. (59-BFT) P – NC

I am loveable and capable. (59-BFT) P
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