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ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship of individual student achievement with four variables - school social climate, race, gender, and socioeconomic status. Each of these variables was expected to be significantly related to student achievement. Student achievement was measured by the LEAP scores (averages of mathematics, language arts, and writing components of the test). School social climate was measured by the Brookover (1969) school social climate questionnaire.

Researchers have searched for years for an explanation of the differences in student achievement levels. The differences in student achievement levels were noted as early as the 1800's, and many studies have been done linking various variables to student achievement. Climate is one of the variables that researchers have linked to student achievement. Yet, few researchers look at school social climate as defined by the Tagiurian typology as a variable affecting student achievement. Furthermore, few researchers look at factors that affect individual achievement of students (using the individual student as the unit of analysis).

In this study, it was predicted that school social climate, gender, race, and socioeconomic status would be predictors of individual student achievement.
Statistical analyses support the hypotheses. However, the relationship between individual student achievement and each of the variables is marginal. Race was the greatest predictor of student achievement accounting for only 1.4% of the variance. All other variables in the analysis were found to be contributors to individual student achievement. Yet, very marginal relationships exist.

Case studies were also conducted in four schools to further investigate the relationship of school social climate, socioeconomic status, race, and gender to individual student achievement. Across schools, the students possessed characteristics, demonstrated behaviors, and gave responses that confirm patterns in the data. These patterns confirmed that relationships exist with student achievement and race, gender, socioeconomic status and school social climate.
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND

Introduction

Although schools began as very primitive organizations in terms of their structure, the goal of schools -- that is, to educate children -- has always been rather complex. The one room schoolhouse of the 1800's and early 1900's seemed sufficient for a country struggling for its survival. However, as time progressed, society became more and more complex, and so did schools. Today's schools are filled with much larger student populations. In addition, student populations as well as faculty and staffs of schools are much more diverse.

There has been a consistent effort to improve many aspects of schooling. Schooling, of course, refers to the process of progressing from grade level to grade level meeting the requirements at each level. This process starts when the child begins school and continues with the student on to the university (the completion of schooling). Parson (1994) suggests that schooling is a process intended to perpetuate and to maintain the society's existing power relations and the institutional structure that support the arrangement.

Prior to and since the report, A Nation at Risk (1983), much more attention has been given to improving schools. This report suggests that American students
are not performing very well academically. *A Nation at Risk* has led to efforts on the part of researchers and teachers to improve many aspects of schooling. A primary effort has been made to improve student achievement. These efforts are a part of what is called the reform movement of the 1970's and the 1980's. Artley (1981), Chartes & Jones (1975), Deal (1975), Kirst (1985), and Bennis (1975) are among those who have conducted studies related to educational reform. Findings of these studies suggest failure on various levels within schools. According to the report by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1976), disillusion with massive efforts to improve education has brought "disbelief under fire."

According to Anderson (1982), the effects of schooling on students have long been of interest to educators as well as policy-makers. During the 1960's and 1970's, research tended to suggest that schools had little or no effect on student outcomes. Madaus and colleagues (1980) argued that some earlier researchers believed that 80% of intelligence was due to genetically determined factors. These researchers concluded that schools were not important contributors to scholastic development. Jencks and colleagues (1972) also supported the notion that schools were not contributors to student achievement. They believed
that most student achievement differences were due to factors that schools do not control like race, gender, and socioeconomic status. Madaus and colleagues (1980) contended that the findings of Coleman et al. (1966) raised doubt about the contributions of schools to student achievement.

Research of the late 1970's and 1980's as well as the early 1990's suggests that school factors do contribute to achievement. Brookover and colleagues (1979) reported that schools as social systems affect student outcomes. Madaus and colleagues (1980) also found the atmosphere of the classroom to relate to variations in achievement. In addition, Anderson (1982), stated that school climate affects both cognitive and affective student outcomes. The findings of Cheal (1990) are also consistent with Anderson (1982). She argued that school climate affects many student outcomes including cognitive and affective behavior as well as personal growth and satisfaction. Although earlier research seems to suggest that schools do not affect student achievement, the most recent literature suggests that school climate does affect student achievement.

According to Hymes (1994), climate is inherent in the life of every organization. Furthermore, climate is a very broad term that is difficult to define
because of the diversity of climate typologies that have been developed. Anderson (1982) suggests that many of the typologies have common roots. For the purpose of this study, the definition of climate is derived from the typology of Tagiuri (1968). Tagiuri believes that there are four dimensions of climate including ecology, milieu, social system, and culture. Ecology, milieu, and social systems are components of the organizational climate while culture is a component of climate/atmosphere.

Culture is concerned with belief systems, values, cognitive structures and meanings of persons within the school. Ogawa and Miskel (1988) say that the belief systems, values, and cognitive structures are negotiated and renegotiated through social interaction. The social interaction of the members of an organization therefore determine the belief systems, values, and cognitive structures of an organization. Furthermore, Anderson (1982) says that culture is a social dimension. In this study, I will refer to the cultural component as the social climate.

The social climate is based on the perceptions of faculty and staff as well as the students. According to Litwin and Stringer (1968), perception is a critical ingredient of climate. Climate is also among the
most important concepts that affects how well schools function. Deal (1985) suggests that past reform efforts have been unsuccessful because they do not account for school climate. Moreover, both Anderson (1982) and Gonder (1994) suggest that understanding the influence of school climate and how it affects behavior and attitude is crucial to school improvement.

Statement of the Problem

Much of the recent literature suggests that school climate does affect student achievement. Studies have been done across different grade levels utilizing a variety of conceptualizations for climate. Researchers of the early 1980's, specifically Madaus (1980) and Anderson (1982), suggest that the studies that look at the relationship of school climate to student achievement utilize a mean or an average student achievement score. According to Raudenbush and Bryk (1989), more recent studies have begun to use students as the unit of analysis using multilevel modeling. However, much of this work has used archival data for the analysis, and a limited amount of this work has focused on the relationship of school climate to student achievement. The problem addressed in the study is the lack of data on the relationship between school climate and individual student achievement.
Hypotheses

Primary Hypothesis
There is a significant relationship between the climate of a school and the achievement of individual students within schools.

Secondary Hypotheses
There is a significant relationship between the socioeconomic status of a student and the achievement of the student.
There is a significant relationship between the gender of a student and the achievement of the student.
There is a significant relationship between the race of a student and the achievement of the student.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between school climate and student achievement. Previous literature depicts conflicting views. Most of the earlier literature suggest that schools make little or no contribution to student outcomes while later literature suggests that schools do make contributions to student outcomes. I explore the relationship between school climate and the individual achievement of students.

Significance of the Study
This study is important for several reasons. First, by using the individual student as the unit of
analysis, I account for the variance that is possibly lost in studies that use mean or average scores to measure achievement. Most of the previous studies use schools as the unit of analysis. As a result, effects of school climate on student achievement are limited to the average of the entire school. I attempt to address the relationship of school climate to the achievement of students on an individual basis.

I believe that this study will add to the body of related literature. On a practical level, I would hope that as a result of this study, practitioners will began to look more at the needs of individual students as opposed to the needs of groups of students. When we look at averages or mean scores of groups of students, that is all that the averages give us. That is, averages give a representation of the student populations which, in most instances, may be an inaccurate representation of the individual students.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Research depicts conflicting views on the contributions of schools to student achievement. The findings of earlier studies indicate that schools make little or no contributions to student outcomes while the findings of more recent studies indicate that schools do contribute to student outcomes. Some researchers conclude that nonschool factors like socioeconomic status, race, and gender are the greatest contributors to student achievement (Mayeske & Beaton, 1975; Coleman et al., 1966; Madaus et al., 1980). Other researchers suggest that school factors including teacher and student variables are the greatest contributors to student achievement (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; Brookover et al., 1979).

The consistent effort on the part of researchers to look for explanations for the effects of schools on children prompted the study of school climates. As early as 1963, Halpin and Croft began to map the organizational climate of schools. In addition to mapping profiles of school climates, they identified six basic clusters ranging from open to closed. In 1968, Tagiuri argued that climate is a summary concept concerned with the overall quality of an organization. He proposed that climate is comprised of four
dimensions: ecology, milieu, social system, and culture. It is noteworthy that school climate research owes much in theory, instrumentation, and methodology to earlier work in both business and university contexts. According to Schneider & Barlette (1968), educators and psychologists were preoccupied with measuring the influence of personality characteristics on behavior. However, businesses were concerned with structural characteristics that affect behavior.

Several researchers have looked at the relationship between school climate and student achievement. The findings of the research of the 1970’s and 1980’s suggest a distinct link between school climate and student achievement (Gonder, 1994). Studies regarding school climate have been done across different grade levels utilizing a variety of conceptualizations for climate. However, most of the studies do not look at the relationship of school climate to the individual level of student achievement. Therefore, there is a lack of information on the relationship between school climate and individual student achievement. The purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between school climate and the individual achievement of students.
In the review of the literature, I begin with a discussion of the manner in which the literature review was conducted. Then, I expound upon the conflicting views of the contributions of schools to achievement. I also look specifically at the studies that suggest that school climate affects achievement. I then look at the research done on different conceptualizations for climate concluding with the research that uses the Tagiurian typology.

I expound upon the conflicting views of the contributions of schools to achievement to illustrate the historical search for an explanation of factors that affect student achievement. This notion (school contributions to achievement) becomes very important after the differences in the achievement levels of students were noted. I look at school climate in relationship to student achievement. School climate is the focus of the study; it is this variable that I focus on as one possible explanation for the achievement levels of students.

School climate has been conceptualized several ways. I present two different conceptualizations (from the conceptualization that I use) to illustrate that alternatives exist. The first conceptualization also gives support to the historical argument that we have searched a long time for an explanation for differences
in achievement. I then look at the research that has been done utilizing each of the dimensions of the Tagiurian typology. I draw the definition for the study from this typology, and I attempt to illustrate that many studies have been done regarding climate and achievement. But research gives support [specifically Anderson (1982) and Owaga and Miskel (1988)] to the view that there is a lack of research on the perspective of climate that is used in this study. Furthermore, Anderson (1982) supports the definition of climate used in this study. In the literature review, I also look specifically at the research done in rural schools (sample selection involves rural schools).

Conducting the Literature Review

In conducting the literature review, I followed the suggestions of Borg and Gall (1989). I decided that school climate, student achievement, and school climate and student achievement are the key word phrases that I would use to locate information. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is the first source that I pursued. I did title searches on school climate and student achievement. I used the same phrases to look for relevant sources in the Dissertation Abstracts International. I also used the Education Index to locate information. Frequently, articles and books referenced sources that I found to be relevant and
helpful; therefore, I was able to locate some sources from within other sources. This happened very frequently.

The Historical Debate over the Contributions of Schools to Student Achievement [Nonschool factors (race, gender, socioeconomic status) and School factors]

As early as the 19th century, practitioners began to observe the differences in the achievement levels of students (Madaus, 1980). This difference prompted Horace Mann and other practitioners to search for an explanation for the differences in the achievement levels of students.

As previously mentioned, research depicts conflicting views of the contributions of schools to student achievement. Some researchers suggest that nonschool factors are most responsible for student achievement while other researchers suggest that school factors are the greatest contributors. Jencks and colleagues (1972) believe that it is difficult to identify specific school characteristics that influence achievement. They also report that genes explain about 45% of the variance in achievement of Americans on tests; the environment explains 35% of the variance; and the tendency of environmentally advantaged families to have genetically advantaged children explain the remaining 20%. The implication is that genes and
environmental factors are solely responsible for the achievement levels of students.

The findings of some researchers support this notion that nonschool factors play the greatest explanatory role in the achievement of students. Mayeske & Beaton (1975) found that the impact of family background exceeds that of school factors. Ethnicity and socioeconomic status were identified as components of family background. Coleman et al. (1966) also argued that family background is of great importance to achievement. In addition, the relationship of family background to achievement does not diminish over the years.

In the search for an explanation of the differences in the achievement levels of students, several researchers have also explored the relationship between socioeconomic status and student achievement. Coleman et al. (1966) found socioeconomic factors to bear a strong relationship to academic achievement. When socioeconomic factors are statistically controlled, it appeared as though schools accounted for little or none of the differences in pupil achievement. Coleman et al. (1966) concluded that schools bring little influence on a child’s achievement that is independent of his/her background and general social context. Mayeske and Beaton (1975)
make a similar argument regarding the relationship of socioeconomic status to student achievement. They found socioeconomic status to play a much greater role than family structure.

Caldas (1993) also examined the factors that affect student achievement looking specifically at Louisiana's public schools. He discovered that in addition to socioeconomic status, race strongly predicts student achievement. He also noted that the discrepancy between white and African-American students' achievement increased with grade level. Similar findings were reported in a study by the governor's office in South Carolina (1992). These researchers suggest that there are differences in achievement due to race as well as gender. Arnold (1995) suggests differences due to race and gender.

The findings of Madaus et al. (1980) also suggest that nonschool factors are the biggest contributors to student achievement. They believed that when home background variables (race, gender, socioeconomic status) are controlled, school characteristics and resources like per pupil expenditure, teacher expenditure, number of books in a school library, the presence of a science lab, curricular differences, and a host of similar variables appear to make little difference in student measured levels of achievement.
Both Madaus et al. (1980) and Brookover et al. (1979) point out the belief of some researchers that schools are not important since they contribute little or nothing to scholastic achievement. In addition, the suggestions of Madaus et al. (1980), and findings of Mayeske and Beaton (1975), and Coleman et al. (1966) support the notion that schools contribute little or nothing to scholastic achievement.

Some researchers contend that schools do contribute to student achievement, and the findings of some studies support this contention. Brookover et al. (1979) suggest that schools as social systems offer an explanation of differences in student achievement. They believe that members of the school as a social system become socialized to behave by acquired interaction with other members of the social unit. The social inputs of a school include the student body composition and other personal inputs. These inputs affect the social structure of the school and the social climate of the school which in turn affects academic achievement.

In the second phase of the Louisiana School Effectiveness study, Teddlie & Stringfield (1993) also found a relationship between the school as a social system and achievement. School effects explained 8 to 15% of the variance in the individual level of student
achievement. School effects also predicted 13% of the individual level of student achievement.

Although the conclusion of Coleman and colleagues (1966) is that schools have little or no influence on students, they did suggest that the educational background and aspirations of the other students in the school related directly to pupil achievement. The findings of McDill and Risby (1973) are also consistent with the arguments of both Brookover et al. (1979) and Coleman et al. (1966). McDill and Risby (1973) suggest that much of the variance in academic achievement for high school students is explained by academic norms and expectations which characterize the student body.

Several other studies researchers have found school factors to affect achievement. Madaus et al. (1980) suggest that the quality of teaching is related to student achievement; they suggest that the ability of the teacher has an effect on achievement. In a random selection of 20 urban elementary schools involving 10,000 students, Lezotte, Lawrence, & Passalocquer (1978) controlled for social class, and found that school buildings impact upon student achievement.

Historically, researchers have explored the contributions of schools to student outcomes: specifically achievement. More recent literature --
that is, studies done during the late 1970's to the present-- tend to suggest that schools and school factors do contribute to student achievement. Furthermore, a variety of school factors/characteristics have been found to affect student achievement. The school as a social system, the educational background and aspiration of other students, and academic norms of the student body are characteristics of schools that researchers have found to affect student achievement (Brookover et al., 1979, Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; Coleman, 1966; McDill & Risby, 1973). Two school factors (quality of teaching and school building impacts) have also been identified as affecting achievement.

Climate and Achievement (Different Conceptualization and Attempted Links of these Conceptualizations to Student Achievement)

Climate is a very broad term, and it is rather vague. Many studies have been done utilizing a variety of conceptualizations for climate. According to Hoy and Miskel (1991), the conceptualization of Halpin and Croft (1963) is probably the most well known. They began mapping the organizational climate of schools when they observed that (1) schools differ markedly in their feel, (2) the concept of morale did not provide an index of this feel, (3) "ideal" principals who are assigned to schools where improvement is needed are immobilized by the faculty, and (4) the topic of
organizational climate is generating interest. They also devised an instrument called the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) to identify important aspects of teacher-teacher and teacher-principal interactions. In addition, they identified six basic school climates ranging from open to closed: open, autonomous, controlled, familiar, paternal, and closed.

Hoy and Miskel (1991) examined the findings of researchers regarding the openness of climates of schools to achievement. They report that open climates in schools (schools with high degrees of thrust and esprit and low engagement) have not shown a consistent positive relationship with student achievement. They suggest that schools with the most positive attributes do not necessarily have the highest levels of student achievement.

The findings of Flagg (1964) are consistent with the suggestions of Hoy and Miskel (1991). In a study of ten elementary schools in New Jersey, Flagg found school size, principal characteristics, and turnover to be related to achievement. However, climate types (the profiles of Halpin and Croft (1962) were found to be unrelated to achievement. McPartland and Epstein (1975) report some slightly different findings regarding climate types. In a combination of
elementary, middle, and high schools in Maryland, they found that school openness accounts for some of the variance in achievement. They also discovered that open climates tended (nonsignificantly) to be positively related to achievement for high socioeconomic students and negatively related for low. Therefore, the majority of the research done that utilizes the conceptualization of Halpin and Croft (1962) suggests that the type of climate (open to closed) does not or slightly affects student achievement.

Other researchers have defined and conceptualized climate differently. Both Stern (1970) and Steinhoff (1965) built their ideas on the work of Lewin (1935) and Murray (1935). Lewin and Murray suggest that human behavior is the result of the relationship between the environment and an individual. Murray developed the notion of environmental presses. Environmental presses is a condition of the external situation that corresponds to internal personality needs. He further noted that when individual needs and environmental presses are congruent, behavior will occur. Murray identified 30 basic needs that individuals seek to satisfy with 30 corresponding environmental presses. The Organizational Climate Index (OCI) is used to determine the press of a school. According to Owaga
and Miskel (1988), attempts to link climate to achievement utilizing this conceptualization have resulted in inconsistent findings.

Other conceptualizations exist; however, according to Owaga and Miskel (1988), there is confusion in educational literature as to what climate is. Researchers have considered everything from physical facilities to socioeconomic status of students and the quality of administration and teachers. Anderson (1982, p. 376) said that

"the field of climate research in many ways is reminiscent of the seven blind men who gave seven different descriptions of the elephant based on the one part each could touch, and who each claimed to posses the definitive image of an elephant."

This study focuses on the cultural component of the Tagurian typology, an area of focus that is lacking in research.

Several conceptualizations of climate exist. The conceptualizations of Halpin and Croft (1963) and Stern (1970) and Steinof (1965) have been discussed. Researchers have used these conceptualizations as the basis for climate, and they have attempted to link climate (as defined by these conceptualizations) to achievement. No significant links have been made between student achievement and climate utilizing the conceptualizations of both Halpin and Croft (1963) and Stern (1970) & Steinof (1965). Anderson (1982) suggests
that some researchers have failed to link climate to student achievement because there is inconsistency in the methodology that is used. Anderson (1982) goes on to say that this inconsistency may be in the definition of climate, the instrumentation, the sample selection, and/or the variables.

Research on the Conceptualization of the Tagiurian Typology (Attempts to Link Each Dimension to Achievement)

Attempts to Link Ecology

Several studies have their basis from one of the four dimensions in the Tagiurian typology (ecology, milieu, social systems and culture). Researchers have attempted to link each one of the four dimensions of the typology with student achievement (Tagiuri, 1968). Ecology variables include building characteristics and school size. In a longitudinal study of 12 secondary schools, Rutter et al. (1979) reported no relationship existed between age of the building and student outcomes including achievement, attendance, behavior, or delinquency.

However, Rutter et al. (1979) and the researchers who conducted the Phi Delta Kappa (1980) study found that the decoration and care of schools and classrooms were associated with high student achievement. In addition, Rutter et al. (1979) suggest that neither class size nor school size had effects on any student
outcomes. School size was also found to relate negatively to academic outcomes in a study by the New York State Department of Education (1976). In fact, most of the studies that have attempted to link ecology variables to student achievement have been unsuccessful.

Attempts to Link Milieu

Researchers have also considered the effects of milieu characteristics of the Tagiurian typology on student achievement. Milieu factors include both student and teacher characteristics. Rutter et al. (1979) found that neither the checking of record books nor the mean hours of preparation were associated with student outcomes. In addition, McDill and Risby (1973) found no relationship between mean annual teacher salary with either achievement or aspiration among high school students. However, the same researchers did find that the percent of teachers possessing greater than a bachelor’s degree was significantly related to both the achievement and plans of students.

The findings of two studies, Brookover and Lezotte (1979) and Ellett et al. (1979), do suggest that a significant relationship exists between teacher morale with both student achievement and attendance. In addition, the researchers who conducted the Phi Delta Kappa Study (1980) also found positive teacher student
relationships to be associated with academic achievement. Therefore, some milieu characteristics like checking of record books (teachers), teacher salaries, and the number of hours of teacher preparation have been found to be unrelated to student achievement. Researchers have found some milieu characteristics like the degree level of the teacher, teacher morale, and student relationships with teachers to be related to student achievement.

**Attempts to Link Social Systems**

According to Owaga and Miskel (1988), extensive research has been done in an attempt to link climate to achievement using the social system dimension of climate. As previously cited, Brookover (1979) discovered that schools as a social system offer an explanation to the variance in the academic achievement of students. Teddlie and Stringfield (1993) replicated the Brookover study and found similar results. However, Anderson suggests that findings in this area are conflicting, and it is difficult to make comparisons because of the diversity of constructs measured and the difference in how they are operationalized.

**Attempts to Link Culture**

The final dimension of the Tagiurian typology is the cultural dimension. Researchers have attempted to
link the cultural dimension to student achievement as well. Of course, the cultural dimension includes the beliefs, values, and basic cognitive structures that characterize an organization. According to Owaga and Miskel (1988), researchers have found elements of the cultural dimension to influence student achievement. Brookover and Lezotte (1979) found that the expectations that teachers hold for the academic performance of students affects achievement. The commitment of teachers to improving students' academic performance has also been found in several studies to affect academic achievement (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Phi Delta Kappa, 1980).

Both Anderson (1982) and Owaga and Miskel (1988) suggest that this dimension of the Tagiurian typology is the one in which not much research has been done in an attempt to link the dimension to student achievement. This notion served as additional support for this study. There is a lack of research on the relationship of climate to the individual achievement level of students, and there is a lack of research attempting to link climate (from the Tagiurian cultural dimension) to student achievement.

Research on Rural Schools

Teddlie (1994) and DeYounger (1987) suggest that only a handful of studies have examined school effects
in rural schools. The primary concentration of school research studies in the United States has primarily been in urban schools. According to Lomotey and Swanson (1989), American schools range in their degree of complexity. At one end of the continuum, there are rural schools that serve the country sides and villages. Urban schools that serve in central cities of large metropolitan areas are at the other end of the continuum, and middle-sized suburban schools are in the middle of the continuum.

Each of the three types of schools are unique in terms of the overall school and district size, diversity of student populations, pupil achievement, achievement evaluation, discipline, leadership and decision making, and curriculum and staff. Each school type also face problems. However, suburban schools seem to have relatively few problems with respect to academic achievement, discipline, and teacher quality when compared to urban and rural schools (Lomotey & Swanson, 1989).

In general, rural schools are characterized by scarcer resources than urban schools (Buttram & Carlson, 1983). Rural schools also have smaller student bodies and faculties that are more likely to be cohesive (Lomotey & Swanson, 1990). Conklin and Olson (1988) argue that with regard to size and homogeneity, rural
schools may have many beneficial results. They (1988) suggest that it is easier to develop consensual faculty goals, and it is easier to solicit parental involvement.

Disagreement exists in the literature regarding the advantages/benefits of rural schools. Conklin and Obson (1988) suggest that the size of rural schools is an advantage. Yet, Lomotey and Swanson (1989) suggest that curricular offerings of rural schools are limited, and it is difficult to attract professionals to rural areas. In addition, Lomotey and Swanson (1989) point out that researchers have viewed rural schools as being inefficient and expensive. Rural schools are also referred to as one of the weak links of American educational system, and rural schools face serious concerns.

Summary of Literature Review

A historical debate over the contribution of schools to students exist. Basically, the more recent literature (late 70's to the present) suggest that schools do contribute to student achievement. The Coleman Report is most frequently cited as the document that raised doubts in the minds of researchers, practitioners, etc - suggesting that schools made little or no contribution to student achievement. After studies confirmed that schools do contribute to
student achievement, researchers then explored which factors/characteristics of schools contribute to achievement.

As early as 1963, school climate was explored as a possible contributor to student achievement. Climate has been viewed from many different perspectives, and many studies have been done utilizing the different conceptualizations of climate. Halpin and Croft (1963) and Stein (1970) and Steinof (1965) are among the researchers who have proposed conceptualizations.

Tagiuri (1968) also conceptualized school climate. He views climate as a four dimensional construct. The four dimensions are: ecology, milieu, social system, and culture. Researchers have also attempted to study each individual dimension in relationship to climate. In this study, I link the cultural dimension of the Tagiurian typology (which is referred to as social climate) to student achievement. I also briefly discuss the limited research done in rural schools.

Conceptual Framework

This research has its primary basis in the theoretical framework of Brookover et al. (1979). The theory underlying this research is that the academic achievement of students is primarily a function of the school social structure and the social climate of a school. Social climate is dependent on the perceptions
of students, teachers, and principals. Tagiuri (1968) says that climate is internal and members of an organization experience it. Therefore, members of a school define its climate. Tagiuri also says that behavior is influenced by climate. Students will behave based on their interpretations of the expected behavior that others believe they should have. I hypothesize that different schools have different sets of expectations for their students, and students give different meanings to and respond differently to the expectations that others have for them. The meanings and interpretations that others have may be affected by the structure of the school. As a result of the student perceptions of the expectations, the achievement is affected.

I hypothesized that the differences in the social climate in a school with the possible intervention of school structure explains differences in the individual achievement level of students within schools and in different schools. School climate and school structure share a direct relationship because each has effects on one another. Research also supports the notion that there are greater differences in the variances in achievement within schools than across schools. This notion gives strength to the suggestion that students
give different interpretations/meanings to the expectations of others within schools.

There is little research from which a theoretical model can be built. Social climate which is the cultural component of the Tagiurian taxonomy (concerned with the belief systems, values, and structure) is determined by members of the school. The students will give meaning and interpret what is expected of them. The social structure of the school will influence or play a role in the interpretations of students. The social structure of the school includes the demographic variables of the students and staff in the school, and in many instances the school has no control over such variables. The social climate will possibly interact with the social structure which in turn will affect student achievement. Many other factors possibly affect both social climate as well as achievement; however, I am not focusing on these variables in this study.

Theoretical Model

Principal Climate -> Social Climate
Teacher Climate -> Social Climate
Student Climate -> Social Climate -> Interpret/ Give meaning

-> -> -> -> -> -> -> -> Student Achievement
Independent Variable: Principal Climate

Principal Climate is one of the four indicators of social climate. It is the perceptions of the principal regarding the norms and expectations in the school. Norms tend to be expressed by the common beliefs regarding appropriate forms of behavior for members of the school. The definition of both norms and expectations involves appropriate behavior expressed by others in the school. Of course, appropriate behavior is related to the composition of membership in a school. The variables that determine principal climate include: parent concern and expectations for the quality of education; the principal's efforts to improve; principal and parent evaluation of present school quality; and the principal's present expectations and evaluation of students (Brookover et al., 1979).

Independent Variable: Teacher Climate

A second indicator of social climate is teacher climate. Teacher climate is the perception of the teachers regarding the norms and expectations in the school. The previous discussion of norms and expectations is also relevant for teacher climate. The variables that determine teacher climate include: ability, evaluation, expectations and quality of education for college; teacher present evaluation and
expectation for high school completion; teacher-student commitment to improve; teacher perception of the principal's expectation; and teacher academic futility (Brookover et al., 1979).

**Independent Variable: Student Climate**

The final indicator of social climate is student climate. According to Brookover et al. (1979), the principal, teachers, and students are the most relevant participants in the school; therefore, it is assumed that the principal, teachers, and students are the better informants concerning the norms and expectations. Student climate is the perceptions of the students regarding the norms and expectations. The variables that determine student climate include: student sense of academic futility; student perceived future evaluation and expectation; student perceived present evaluation and expectations; student perception of teacher push and teacher norms; and student academic norms.

**Independent Variable: Social Climate**

According to Anderson (1982), climate is a very broad term that is rather difficult to define with only a few "unifying threads." However, most researchers do agree that each school possesses a unique climate (Kalis, 1980; Owens, 1970; Sinclair, 1970). Cheal (1990) says that throughout various research
disciplines a consistent argument is made regarding climate. That is, climate is an abstract, individual perception made about an organization on a group or individual basis.

Several climate typologies have been proposed. Moos (1974) and Insel and Moss (1974) devised a categorization of the human environment. They call their delineation of the human environment social ecology. There are six components in their typology including: (1) climate and psychosocial characteristics (human interactions with physical and social dimension of the environment); (2) ecological factors (geographical, meteorological, architectural); (3) behavioral setting (having material and behavioral components); (4) organizational structure (size and span of control); (5) average personal characteristics of individuals within the environment (age, ability, socioeconomic status); and (6) the functional dimensions of specific situations (environmental reinforcing contingencies that maintain particular behaviors). According to Anderson (1982), Moos' (1974) conceptualization of the human environment is rather similar to Renato Tagiuri's (1968). However, Tagiuri's system is preferable to Moos's because it reflects a growing consensus of many researchers that school climate includes the total environmental quality
within a school. Climate is not one of a set of dimensions but it is a broad construct.

Tagiurian Climate Typology

Renato Tagiuri (1968) developed an organizational climate taxonomy which defined an organization's total climate or environment "as consisting of four dimensions: (1) its ecology (the physical and material aspects); (2) its milieu (the social dimension concerned with the presence of persons and groups); (3) its social system (the social dimension concerned with the patterned relationships of persons and groups); and (4) its culture (the social dimension concerned with belief systems, values, cognitive structure, and meaning). Anderson (1982) combined the Tagiurian climate taxonomy with the school effectiveness literature of Brookover et al. (1979) to form a broadened casual model presenting "...all possible interactions among the dimensions of the environment as they affect student outcomes both directly and as mediated by school climate" (p.405). Anderson further states that ecology and milieu variables are easily measurable; however, these are inadequate measures of climate that seldom link to student outcomes. More researchers tend to move away from ecology and milieu toward the social system and cultural dimension of climate because constructs are
more abstract. In addition, Tagiuri (1968) believes that in principle all four dimensions of his typology make a difference to behavior; however, it is not unuseful to consider all four dimensions.

Due to methodological and conceptual problems found in the attempt to define climate, I focus in the study on the social climate of schools which is the cultural dimension of the Tagiurian typology, specifically, the belief systems, values, cognitive structures and meanings. Of course, the social climate is determined by the perceptions of the students, teachers, and principal within the school.

Independent Variable: School Structure

School structure involves many factors. The student enrollment, racial composition of student body and faculty, gender of students and faculty, and socioeconomic status of faculty and students are components of the structure of the school. The previously named components are often factors which members of the school cannot control. There are other components of the school structure that may possibly be enhanced by members of the school. It was not my intent in the study to measure all school structure variables. Other possible indicators of school structure include: parental involvement in schools, differentiations among student programs, open and
closed classroom organization, time allocation, and staff satisfaction with school structure. However, socioeconomic economic status, gender, and race were considered as social structure the analysis.

**Dependant Variable: Achievement**

The traditional purpose of schools was to educate children so they could live productive lives as citizens. Two early presidents, Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, were advocates of education for democratic citizenship. Theorists Horace Mann and John Dewey also championed the same cause. As time progressed, concerns of our politicians and practitioners shifted. We are presently concerned about readiness, the dropout rate, functional literacy among adults, school technology, the supply of teachers, and a work force that can compete in a global market (Wragge, 1992).

In her book *The Schoolhome*, Martin (1992) gives some startling data concerning the changes in the traditional home and society. She also alludes to the fact that the schools are reflections of society. It is suggested that as society shifts, schools shift. Obviously, schools have more concerns in the present. Yet, it has traditionally been expected for schools to benefit the child. Today, schools are expected to develop the "total child". That is, schools should
provide the opportunities so that the child may develop intellectually, emotionally, psychologically, and physically.

It is methodologically difficult to determine the extent of the developments, and it is frequently difficult to determine if the developments are taking place. Psychologists theorize as to how and when this growth should take place but there are no absolutes. In an attempt to minimize the effects of some of the potential methodological problems in this study, I focused on the achievement of students as the benefit/output that is produced by schools. Schools should be providing many other benefits and services to children in addition to achievement gains.

Hoy and Miskel (1991) view student achievement as one of the four multiple indicators of goal attainment. This perspective has its basis in the research on effective schools. In an attempt to determine how effective schools are, a theoretical formulation was developed that has four dimensions of effectiveness. They are: adaption, goal attainment, integration, and latency. One of the indicators of goal attainment (a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize) is achievement. Bidwell and Kasarder (1975) say that schools may have many goals (one of which is definitely academic achievement, a
cognitive outcome of schools). Determining achievement levels of students is more practical when compared to attempting to determine noncognitive outcomes of schools, and standardized test scores are most often used as an indicator of achievement. According to Hoy and Miskel (1991), student achievement is an important indicator of goal attainment. Furthermore, many suggest that the intrinsic value of student achievement is determined by standardized tests.

Much debate has occurred over the use of standardized tests as an indicator of student achievement. However, Madaus et al. (1980) say that some important educational outcomes can and must be set, and these standards cannot be forever avoided. Some argue that standardized tests do not adequately sample the full range of cognitive objectives that schools foster (Smith, 1972). Madaus et al. (1980) suggest that some question the validity of standardized tests. However, the Louisiana State Department of Education (1993) suggest that Louisiana Education and Assessment Program (LEAP) tests measure what they purport to measure, and there is consistency in the measurements over time. Furthermore, Madaus et al. (1980) believe that the use of standardized tests is generally understandable. The fact must be accepted that part of the problem in developing better measures
of student achievement is directly related to the present structure of schools. Tests cannot measure all that students are taught. In addition, some notions that students grasps are not measurable.

Student achievement in this study is the verbal and mathematical ability that the school helps to foster within the child. Verbal ability refers to the knowledge and understanding of words. Mathematical ability refers to the ability to use numbers in operations as well as to conceptualize the relationship between figures and form. Creative ability refers to being able to develop unique ideals.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

There are conflicting views in the literature regarding the relationship of schools to students. Researchers have looked for an explanation for many years for the differences in the achievement levels of students. Since the 1970's, more attention has been given to school climate and its relationship to achievement. Gonder (1994) suggests that a positive relationship exists between school climate and achievement; however, the literature is lacking on the relationship between school climate and the individual achievement levels of students.

Design

To address the problem in the study, I employed mixed methodology. According to Patton(1990), the use of mixed methodology strengthens a study. Researchers in the past tended to do quantitative studies only. He (1990) gives several reasons why researchers in the past used quantitative studies. The following are among the reasons: (1) qualitative methods were not well defined, (2) research sponsors were unwilling to sponsor qualitative studies, (3) journals were unwilling to report qualitative studies, and (4) academic programs did not encourage qualitative research. More researchers are at least beginning to
incorporate qualitative research into studies. Disenchantment with quantitative results, the need for numbers to be associated with codes, and more use of mixed methodology are among the reasons for the incorporation of qualitative methodology into more recent research.

Goetz and LeCompte (1982) present a dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative research. Furthermore, other researchers have compared/contrasted qualitative and quantitative research. One of the major differences between the two strategies is that qualitative research begins with a fact, and it ends with a theory. On the other hand, quantitative begins with the theory and ends with a fact. Each method has advantages. Qualitative methods permit the evaluator to study selected issues in depth. Typically, a wealth of information is produced with an increased understanding of the cases and situations studied. In quantitative research, it is possible to measure the reactions of a great many people to a limited set of questions. Thus, great statistical aggregation of data is gained, and a generalizable set of findings are obtained. Patton (1990) says that both methods can be employed in a study; the two are not mutually exclusive, and utilizing both methods will strengthen the study.
Quantitative Research Design

According to Borg and Gall (1989), most quantitative studies may be classified as one of two types: descriptive studies and studies aimed at discovering causal relationships. The objective of descriptive studies is to determine "what is". Description is an important goal of educational research; however, most studies involve determining causal relationships between variables.

Borg and Gall (1989) also say that different causal designs exist. They include: causal comparative method, correlational studies, and experimental research. The causal comparative method is aimed at the discovery of possible causes for the phenomenon being studied by comparing subjects in whom a characteristic is present with similar subjects in whom it is absent or present to a lesser degree. This method can only be used to explore causal relationships, not to confirm them. Experimental research design is the most powerful research design for identifying causal relationships. It is ideally suited to establishing causal relationships if proper controls are used. The key feature of experimental research is that a treatment variable is manipulated.

In this study, the correlational studies model is used. An attempt is made to discover or clarify
relationships through the use of correlational coefficients. The following illustrates the nature of the relationship that I explore: A->B<-C. (A is social climate; C is school structure; B is student achievement.)

Multiple regression is the statistical tool that is used. As implied by the nature of the causal relationship and theoretical framework, the following also illustrates the relationship: Student Achievement = Social climate + School Structure (SES + Race + Gender). I found student sense of academic futility to be the most consistent predictor of achievement; therefore, student sense of academic futility is used as social climate.

The Brookover (1979) teacher, principal, and student surveys are used to gain the quantitative data. The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program scores are used as a measure of achievement. Therefore, it is not essential to construct questions and test the items for validity and reliability. The validity and reliability of the Brookover instruments have been established and the findings will be presented.

Quantitative Sampling

The problem and hypothesis in the study focus on the individual achievement levels of students. The guiding framework for sample selection is primarily on
the basis of within school variance as opposed to across and between school variance. Research also suggests that more variance exists within schools than across schools on achievement (Madaus, 1980).

I considered using simple random selection in choosing the schools for the study. However, I decided to base the sample on criteria like demographics, size, and other characteristics of the schools (imposing the sample to be selected in a way to assure certain subgroups in populations participate).

In determining the schools for the study, I looked at school districts that are geographically in south eastern Louisiana. I then looked for the schools that were classified as rural by the Louisiana State Department of Education (LSDE). The community types are classified as rural, an area with 2,500 or fewer residents; a town, an area with at least 2,500 residents and not contiguous to any city or urban area; a city, an area with at least 25,000 residents and not a metropolitan core city or urban fringe area; an urban fringe, an area with at least 2,500 residents and closely settled area contiguous to a metropolitan city; or a metropolitan core city, which is an area with at least 25,000 residents and is a social and economic hub area.
Utilizing the LSDE, I then obtained information from the regional service centers regarding the academic climate (LEAP passage rate of students and ACT scores). I also obtained the size of the schools from the 95-96 School Directory (Bulletin 1462) and the racial composition of the schools. I divided the schools into two categories – rural black; rural white (51% being the dividing line). In each category, I then used the median or as close to the median as possible for sample selection.

The school selection is based on community type – rural, school size, and academic level (LEAP passage rate). I attempted to select schools that were as similar as possible in terms of the previously mentioned characteristics. Of course, two of the schools are rural white, and two are rural black (different along racial lines). In addition, the populations of the schools range from 426 - 565. They were all rather close to the state's average in terms of LEAP passage rate. In each of the two categories, the racial composition is as close to the median as possible (from the rural schools considered). Of course, I also accounted for school size and academic level.

The target population includes high school juniors, high school teachers, and high school
principals. In both high schools, all juniors, teachers, and the principal were surveyed. The problem addressed in the study is basically an issue to be addressed in a kindergarten to twelve grade school. I decided to use juniors because I anticipated that they should be among the students with the least trouble reading and understanding the surveys. I also chose the juniors in an attempt to minimize a potential limitation of the study with obtaining the most recent LEAP scores available to match the perception of students data (LEAP scores are based on April 1995; perceptions are based on November 1995 due to constraints). In addition, it was assumed that these students would be best suited for the qualitative data collection as well. That is, I thought they would be the students that would add the least biases, etc.

Quantitative Instruments

Brookover Instruments: Student, Teacher, Principal Questionnaires

There are four instruments that were used in the study along with an additional measure. Three of the instruments are from the Brookover et al. (1979) social climate study. Collectively, these instruments give a measure of social climate. The principal, teacher, and student climate questionnaires are 69, 88, and 72 item multiple choice surveys respectively (See Appendices A,
B, and C respectively). The student questionnaire measures the perception of students regarding: sense of academic futility; future evaluation and expectations; present evaluation and expectations; perceptions of teacher norms; and academic norms. The range of scores on the student questionnaire is 43 - 215. The teacher questionnaire measures the perception of teachers regarding: ability, evaluation, and quality of education for their students; present evaluation and expectations for high school completion; teacher-student commitment to improve; perceptions of principal expectations; and academic futility. The range of scores for the teacher questionnaire is 43 - 215. The principal questionnaire measures the perception of principals regarding: parent concerns and expectations for the quality of education; efforts to improve evaluation of present school quality; and present evaluation and expectations of students. The range of scores for the principal questionnaire is 18 - 95. Each perception variable has various items on each questionnaire to serve as measures. For instance, there are 12 items on the student questionnaire to measure student sense of academic futility. The reliability and validity of these instruments have been established which will be discussed in detailed.
LEAP

The fourth instrument is the Louisiana Education and Assessment Program (LEAP) which is used as a measure of student achievement. LEAP is a standardized test that is generally completed by the 11th grade. Students take the math and verbal portions in the 10th grade, and the science and social studies portions are taken in the 11th grade. Students are allowed to take the test as many times as necessary; however, students in the State of Louisiana attending a public school must successfully pass all portions in order to graduate. Students must also successfully complete the 23 Carnegie graduation units required by the state. LEAP is also administered at some elementary grade levels (3rd, 5th, and 7th grades); these students must pass the test to progress to the next grade level.

LEAP consists of four parts (mathematics, science, social studies, and English/verbal). Each area requires the students to master specific skills according to the Louisiana State Department of Education (1989). The mathematics skills include: fractions and operations; decimal numbers and operations; percent, ratio, and proportions; measurement; geometry; graphs, probability, and statistics; pre-algebra; and specific algebra skills. The science skills include: biology/general science;
chemistry/physical science; physics/physical science; earth and space science/general science; and the scientific method. The social studies skills include: history of the United States; civics; and free enterprise. The English/verbal skills include: vocabulary; comprehension; composition; mechanics; sentence structure; word usage; and study skills. Scaled scores for the LEAP range from 0 to 99. Each scale is preceded by the number of the grade level test. Therefore, scores for the 10th grade range from 1000 to 1099, and scores for the 11th grade range from 1100 to 1199. In the study, the English/verbal and math scores are used.

SES

Whether children receive free lunch, receive it as reduced price lunch or pay full price served as a proxy for socioeconomic status. The assumption is that students receiving free/reduce lunch are in the lower socioeconomic status. Students who are paying full price are in at least the mid-income level; middle class. Although neighborhood, home, and census tract data are sometimes used in educational research as proxies for socioeconomic status, parental income and occupational indexes are most frequently as proxies for socioeconomic status (White, 1992).
Reliability and Validity

There are four quantitative instruments. The principal climate, teacher climate, and student climate questionnaires are all from the Brookover study. The LEAP test scores were also used. According to Greenwood Publishing Company, the reliability and validity coefficients of all three Brookover instruments range from .75 to .85. The company also indicated that this reliability is valid in high schools; the initial instrument was administered in elementary schools. Reliability is the stability of measuring devices, and validity is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure (Borg & Gall, 1989). It is an important attribute of studies that the instruments used have high reliability and validity. Instruments with high reliability will yield similar scores for the same individuals during different time frames; instruments with low reliability will yield very different scores. Instruments with high validity are measuring what the researcher expects them to be measuring.

According to the Louisiana State Department of Education (1993), the reliability measures for each test for the LEAP have coefficients above .85. The department also reports high criterion and construct validity (coefficients ranging from .7 to .8). Limited
data is available on the reliability of the measure of socioeconomic status; however, Walberg and Fowler (1987) point out that in most educational research, socioeconomic status most often is proxied by parental income, education, or occupational indexes. Lunch prices tend to be reflective of parental income.

Quantitative Data Collection

I started the quantitative data collection by calling principals in the four schools to receive their consent and support. I explained to the principals the purpose of the study and the process involved with the study (sampling the 11th graders, teachers, and principal). Initially, I planned to contact superintendents by letters then by follow-up phone calls. I decided to contact the principals by telephone, and three of the principals consented without hesitation. One of the principals sought the advice from a superior at the central office. However, the principal did not give me any feedback; therefore, I contacted another administrator who agreed without hesitation. This administrator appeared really interested in the study, and he felt that he could learn something about his school.

The LEAP scores (that did not contain names of the students) were obtained from the Bureau of Pupil Accountability from the LSDE. I filled out a request
form that stated the purpose of my study, and I submitted a mini-proposal. The mini-proposal consisted of a background, problem statement, and a brief description of sample selection along with how the data (LEAP scores) would be used. I then asked the principals for their help.

Quantitative Data Analysis

In the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics or summary statistics is reported to describe the populations of the schools. The primary purpose of reporting the descriptive statistics is to indicate the average scores of the sample. The means, medians and standard deviations are also reported.

Multiple regression is the statistical tool that is utilized in the study. There are four instruments as well. The three Brookover et al. (1979) instruments collectively (principal, teacher, and student climates) give a measure of social climate. The primary use of the principal and teacher surveys is to give a measure of social climate; this information was used in the qualitative section. The LEAP scores are used as a measure of achievement. Utilizing multiple regression, the multiple correlational coefficients given allow for the determination of the strength of the relationship between individual student achievement with social climate and school structure. The assumption with the
regression analysis is that social climate and school structure (socioeconomic status, race and gender) are predictor variables. Achievement is the criterion variable. The following is the regression equation:

\[ \text{Achievement} = \text{climate} (\text{student sense of academic futility}) + \text{socioeconomic status} + \text{race} + \text{gender}. \]

The correlation also allowed me to determine which social climate factor (5 student variables) has the strongest relationship with student achievement. In addition, it was determined if social climate had a stronger relationship with student achievement as compared to specific school structure variables (race, gender, socioeconomic status). These findings are discussed in terms of the target population as well as the general population (Borg and Gall, 1989). I compare/contrast the findings of the schools as previously alluded to.

Quantitative Limitations

Because achievement is a very difficult concept to measure, the concept itself is difficult in terms of defining and interpreting. Madaus (1980) suggests that much of the problem in defining and measuring achievement rests with the structure of our schools. No standardized test measures all that a child has achieved for given time periods.
An additional limitation of the study is due to financial and time constraints. The LEAP scores are based on the achievement of students a few months prior to the perception data. In an attempt to minimize the limitation, the student questionnaires were administered to 11th graders who completed the LEAP test in April 1995 as opposed to seniors who completed the test in April 1994. Although the perceptions of students may have changed slightly, I do not believe that there were significant achievement gains.

Qualitative Research Design

According to Goetz and LeCompte (1982), the most common data collecting strategies for qualitative researchers are observations, interviews, researcher designed instruments, and content analysis of human artifacts. The data for the qualitative portion of the study were collected through observations and interviews. Each of the collecting strategies has subdivisions by which more specific strategies may be developed.

Patton (1990) says that there are four possible roles that a researcher may take on as an observer. They are: complete participant, participant as observer, observer as participant, and complete participant. Patton (1990) goes on to say that these roles (the extent of participation of the observer)
constitute the first and most fundamental distinction that differentiates observational strategies. The extent of participation is a continuum from complete emersion in the setting as a full participant to complete separation from the situation as a spectator.

For the purposes of the study, I felt that it was most appropriate for me to take on the role of observer-participant. The use of this strategy requires minimum interaction with participants in an attempt to focus on the stream of events. In addition, the researcher is detached, neutral, and an unobtrusive observer. An advantage of using the observer participant strategy is that much information is gained from the informants. The use of this method also allows for fewer researcher biases to intervene because the researcher is not familiar and indoctrinated in the environment. Patton (1990) does caution that the role of the researcher may change as the researcher becomes more familiar with the environment. I often participated in the schools by assisting students with assignments, monitoring classes for teachers, and holding duty.

Observations and interviews were conducted in the same schools where quantitative data were collected. The characteristics that Spradley recommends to consider in locating a social scene were considered.
They include: (1) simplicity (single place where all involved in same or similar activity), (2) accessibility (easy to get into), (3) unobtrusive, (4) permissibility (free entrance to do observations), (5) frequently occurring activities (there are frequently occurring activities in the environment), and (6) participation is good to experience directly. Spradley’s Directional Research Sequence (DRS) was used to guide me through the observations.

Spradley’s Directional Sequence (DRS)

A modified Spradley’s Directional Research Sequence (DRS) approach was used to guide the observations. I spent six days in each school and the equivalent of one day with each student (two hours per day for three days). I chose to do my observations in that manner so that I would have time each day after the observations to conduct my analysis and develop questions for the next step. Grand tour and mini tour observations were conducted. Descriptive questions guided my direction in both grand tour and mini tour observations. The purpose of grand tour observations was to gain a general idea of what was happening in the setting.

According to Spradley, mini tour questions are identical to grand tour questions except that mini tour questions deal with smaller units of experience. The
researcher begins to focus in more detail. I attempted to do domain analysis (which was pre-determined -one of the reasons why I refer to the method as modified Spradley) to guide further observational questions. I checked to determine if my domains were appropriate during the initial observations.

The domains were high, middle, and low perceivers (according to the perceptions from the Brookover student social climate questionnaire). High perceivers are the students in each school with the highest perceptions; their scores are above the mean on the Brookover student social climate questionnaire. Middle perceivers are the students in each school with perceptions at or near the mean, and low perceivers are the students in each school with perceptions below the mean. These students possess the lowest perceptions in the school.

I used the domain analysis to search for patterns in my data. The semantic relationship for the domains is "a kind of". The included terms define/describe the cover term. Fortunately, I quickly saw that my data fell into domains thus setting up the taxonomic and componential analysis. The taxonomic analysis shows the relationship of all included terms, and it allows the ethnographer to discover cultural domains.
Contrast questions are used to find differences that exist among the included terms in a domain. In the taxonomic analysis as I searched for similarities among the terms, I looked for cultural meanings. Spradley's principle of cultural meaning is determined in part by how categories inside a domain contrast with one another (Spradley, 1979).

I used the standardized open-ended interviews because of the strengths of this method which are discussed. In the standardized open ended interview, the exact wording and sequence of questions are determined in advance. All interviewees are asked the same basic questions in the same order. Questions are worded in a completely open ended format. There are several necessary strengths of using the standardized open ended interview for the purposes of this study. Since respondents answer the same questions, there is great comparability of responses. In addition, data is complete for each person on the topics addressed in the interview. This method also reduced interviewer effects because several interviewees were used. Additional strengths include the researcher can see and review the instruments used in the evaluation, and this method facilitates organization and analysis of the data obtained.
Because questions and the sequence of questions are predetermined, some of the "naturalness" of the interviewing is lost. There is little flexibility in relating the interview to specific, particular individuals and circumstances. In addition, there is an imposed limit to the relevancy of questions and answers.

Using a variety of data collection strategies together allows the evaluator-observer to build on the strengths of each type of data collection and minimize the weakness of a single approach. Observations provide a check on information gathered in interviews. In addition, interviews permit the observer to go beyond external behavior to explore the internal states of persons who have been observed. According to Patton (1990), a multi method triangulation approach increases both validity and reliability of evaluation data.

Qualitative Sampling Technique

Observations and interviews were conducted in four schools where quantitative data were gained. In locating key informants for the interviews, the following guidelines were considered: (1) persons who are thoroughly involved with the environment, (2) persons currently involved, (3) social scene unfamiliar to researcher, (4) adequate time (one hour long
interviews: six to seven total hours), and (5) nonanalytical as possible. The qualitative data sampling is purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling selects information-rich cases for in-depth study. The specific type of purposeful sampling that was used is criterion sampling. According to Patton (1990), criterion sampling involves the picking of cases that meet a criterion. For the purposes of this study, the subjects were selected based on their scores on the Brookover student questionnaires.

I observed and interviewed a total of six students in each school. Prior to conducting the observations and interviews, I administered the Brookover school social climate questionnaire and scored the results by hand. In each school, I noted the range of scores and placed students into three categories based on their scores (high, middle, low). I then observed and interviewed two students from each category.

Qualitative Instruments

According to Patton (1990), the researcher is the instrument in qualitative inquiry. The researcher conducts the interviews and the observations. Patton (1990) gives four types of interviews that may be conducted. They are: informal conversational interview, interview guide approach, standardized open-
ended interview, and closed fixed responses. The standardized open-ended interview was used. The researcher took on the role of an observer-participant in conducting the observations. Reliability and validity to a great extent are dependent on the skill, competence, and rigor of the person doing the fieldwork. Systematic and rigorous observations involve far more than just looking around. Skillful interviewing involves far more than just asking questions. Generating credible and useful findings through qualitative methods requires discipline, knowledge, training, practice, creativity and hard work. However, Patton (1990) does suggest that both reliability and validity in qualitative research are strengthened when more than one strategy is used.

Reliability and Validity

Interviewing and observations have limits as instruments. Furthermore, the reliability and validity of qualitative data depend to a great extent on the methodological skills, sensitivity, and integrity of the researcher. The generation of useful and credible qualitative findings through observations, interviews, and content analysis requires discipline, knowledge, practice, creativity, training, time and hard work (Patton, 1990).
Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data were collected through the use of observations and interviews. I conformed to all school policies through the course of the data collection. I attempted to use Spradley's DRS to guide the observations, and I used the standardized-open ended interview technique. I did six days of observations in each school (I followed three students for two class periods three days; I saw each student in each class on the schedule in three days) and I interviewed six subjects. All data gained from observations and interviews were dated and recorded as field notes. These data were used in the data analysis.

Qualitative Data Analysis

As previously discussed, two types of qualitative data were obtained in the study. Qualitative data were gained through observations and interviews. Spradley's DRS was used as a guiding framework to conduct interviews. Following the grand tour and mini tour observations, I attempted to do domain analysis. It is from this point that the researcher may have to "abandon" Spradley's DRS in the data collection and analysis stage. However, the DRS remained appropriate; therefore, I progressed through domain analysis, focus observations, and the other stages in attempting to gain data to be analyzed.
The standardized-open ended interview technique was used. All subjects interviewed were asked the same questions. According to Patton (1990), this technique allows for great comparability of data. Lincoln and Guba's (1985) unitizing and categorizing was used to analyze the data obtained from the interviews. The step by step procedure recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985) was followed. The findings of the data analysis are reported along with content analysis of the schools and subjects in which the research is conducted. Descriptions of each school and administrator are given along with the descriptions of the individual students who were observed and interviewed.

Limitations of Qualitative

According to Patton (1990), both interviewing and observing as methodologies have limitations. The following are among the limitations of observations: (1) there is the possibility that the observer may affect the situation being observed, (2) program staff and participants may behave in some atypical manner when they are being observed, (3) selective perception of the data may distort the data, (4) the observer can only focus on external behavior; that is, the observer cannot see what is happening inside people. Patton goes on to say that interviews provide a limited source of data. Participants can only report perceptions and
perspectives on what has happened. The perceptions and perspectives reported by participants are subject to distortion due to personal biases, anger, anxiety, politics, and simple lack of awareness.
CHAPTER 4: QUANTITATIVE FINDINGS

Introduction

A sequence of recommended steps were followed to select the schools for the study. The results of the steps led to schools with specific characteristics. Four rural high schools are included in the study. They had similar student enrollments, and the scores of the students in each of the schools were at or near the state's average in passage rate of LEAP. The schools were different along racial lines. Schools A and D were predominately black, and Schools B and C were predominately white.

The principal and teachers were surveyed regarding their perceptions of the school social climate using the Brookover (1979) principal and teacher questionnaires respectively. These perceptions are reported in the case studies in Chapter 5. The four hypotheses target the high school juniors.

I chose high school juniors in an attempt to minimize differences in the times of data collection and the LEAP scores. The LEAP scores are the results of the April 1995 tests, and the perception data (Brookover instrument) was collected in November of 1995. The time differences would be greater if I would have selected seniors. I chose to focus on the upperclassmen in schools because they are theoretically
the most mature, and they are most likely to be the
students who have been in attendance the longest.

A total of 234 students were surveyed. In School
A, 35 of the 65 juniors were surveyed representing 54%
of the junior population. In School B, 36 of the 56
juniors were surveyed representing 64% of the junior
population. One hundred and two of the 105 juniors in
School C were surveyed representing 97% of the junior
population, and in School D, 61 of the 87 juniors were
surveyed representing 70% of the junior population.

Various circumstances in the schools hampered
100% participation. The school with the smallest
percentage reporting is School A where 30 students were
not surveyed. In School B, 20 of the students were not
surveyed. Only 3 of the juniors were not surveyed in
School C, and 16 were not surveyed in School D. 69
students were "lost;" therefore, 80% of the target
population was sampled. According to Borg and Gall
(1990,) most researcher experience some "loss," in
sampling, and 80% is a good representation of the
target population.

The problem addressed in the study was the lack of
data regarding the effects of school social climate on
the individual achievement levels of students. The
primary hypothesis was that there is a statistically
significant relationship between the school social
climate and the individual achievement of students. The focus of the secondary hypotheses is on the traditional factors that have been found to affect achievement including race, gender, and socioeconomic status. I anticipated that I would determine which of these variables (school social climate, race, gender, or socioeconomic status) plays the greatest role in the determination of student achievement.

The quantitative approach was designed to test the four hypotheses; a multiple regression procedure was employed. The data are presented in the following sections: means and standard deviations, correlation coefficients, and the results of the regression analysis.

Means and Standard Deviations

Means and standard deviations for the five variables are given in Table 4.1. The high school juniors report that school social climate has a mean of 96.5. The possible range for school social climate is 43 - 215. The mean is below the midpoint of 129. The range of scores for student sense of academic futility is 12 - 55 (the mean is 32). Student achievement has a mean of 1049. The possible range for student achievement is from 1000 to 1099. Student achievement is very close to the average mean. The average mean is 1049.5.
Table 4.1
Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic (Race)</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Social Climate/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Sense of Academic Futility (SSAF)</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student achievement scores were standardized in order to reduce differences in the standard deviations. Students have rather low perceptions of their schools. Yet, their achievement levels are fair to moderate. Coleman et al. (1966) suggest that achievement is more closely related to nonschool factors.

Correlation Coefficients

The correlation matrix for the dependent variable, individual student achievement and four independent variables is shown in Table 4.2. The relatively low correlations indicate that the independent variables generally are not strong predictors of individual student achievement. The following correlations are significant at the p<.05 level: socioeconomic status and race, socioeconomic status and school social climate, and race and school social climate.
Table 4.2
Correlation Coefficients for Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-.1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC/SSAF</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .0001

I also conceptualized that one particular component of school social climate (student academic norms, student sense of academic futility, student perceived present evaluation, student perceived future evaluation and expectations, and student perception of teacher push and teacher norms) could have a stronger relationship with achievement. Student sense of academic futility was found to be the most consistent predictor of student achievement. The results are displayed in table 4.3.

Table 4.3
Correlations of Variables of School Social Climate and Individual Student Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPPE</th>
<th>SPTP</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>SSAF</th>
<th>SFEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACH</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations
ACH-Achievement
SPPE-Student Perceived Present Evaluation
SAN-Student Academic Norms
SSAF-Student Sense of Academic Futility
SFEE-Student Perceived Future Evaluation
However, the correlations are relatively low; none of the school social climate variables share significant relationships with individual student achievement.

Tests of Hypotheses

Multiple regression analysis was used to test the four hypotheses. Multiple regression is a method of analyzing the collective and separate contributions of the independent variables. Stepwise regression analysis of the dependent variable, individual student achievement of high school juniors, shows that all variables are significant at the .15 level; however, only race entered the model.

Table 4.4
Stepwise Regression Results with Individual Student Achievement as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Partial R Squared</th>
<th>Model R</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Race</td>
<td>.0136</td>
<td>.0136</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA analysis was conducted to further test the significance of the relationship among the variables. ANOVA results (see table 4.5) and parameter estimates (see table 4.6) indicate that there is only a slight relationship between the variables.

Table 4.5
ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2100.96</td>
<td>527.8</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>134994</td>
<td>61.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6
Parameter Estimates

| Variables | DF | Parameters | St. Error | Prob.>|1 |
|-----------|----|------------|-----------|-------|
| Int       | 1  | 992.4      | 3.8       | .0001 |
| SSC /SSAF | 1  | .1         | 14.3      | .4798 |
| Race      | 1  | 5.5        | 1.5       | .0003 |
| SES       | 1  | -0.9       | 1.4       | .5256 |
| Gender    | 1  | 3.2        | 1.1       | .0028 |

The following is the following multiple regression equation: Student Achievement = 992.4 + 5.5 race + 3.17 gender + -.907 SES + .09 social climate (student sense of academic futility).

Hypothesis 1: The results of the stepwise regression indicate that school social climate is a marginal predictor of individual student achievement; however, school social climate is not a significant predictor of individual student achievement. School social climate did not enter the stepwise regression.

Hypothesis 2: The results of the analysis indicate that there is a relationship between the socioeconomic status of a student and individual achievement; however, the relationship was not significant enough to enter the stepwise regression analysis.

Hypothesis 3: The results of the analysis indicate that there is a relationship between the gender of a student and individual achievement; however, the relationship is not significant because gender did not enter the stepwise regression analysis.
Hypothesis 4: The results of the analysis indicate that there is a relationship between the race of a student and the individual achievement of a student. The regression equation is significant. Race did enter the stepwise regression analysis.

Summary of Chapter 4

Multiple regression analysis was used to focus on the four hypotheses using LEAP scores as a measure of individual student achievement. The results of the analysis indicate that each one of the four independent variables - school social climate (student sense of academic futility), socioeconomic status, gender and ethnicity share slight relationships with student achievement. Ethnicity was found to share the strongest relationship explaining 1.4% of the variance.
CHAPTER 5: QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

Introduction

In Chapter 4, the results of the statistical tests regarding the hypotheses of social climate, race, gender, and socioeconomic status of student achievement were reported. In this chapter, I examine these variables from the perspective of observations and interviews of students (who scored high, middle, and low) on the Brookover student social climate survey. Four schools were studied, and four case studies are reported looking specifically at six students in each school.

In each case study, a description of the school, its location, its administrator, perception of the administrator regarding school social climate, perception of the teachers regarding school social climate, and general characteristics are reported. I then look specifically at six students in each school (2 high perceivers, 2 middle perceivers, and 2 low perceivers). I describe the students, their class schedule and class interaction, and social interaction (data obtained from the observations). I also describe the perceptions of the students (data obtained from interviews). I then report the domain, taxonomic, and componential analysis. I also give a summary of the findings from each school. The findings of the
unitizing and categorizing are also reported in the summary. Finally, I present a cross-case analysis on the questions from the interview. I observe the response of the questions from the perspective of domains (high, middle, and low perceivers) in each school.

School A

School A was the larger of two public high schools in the district with an enrollment of 410 students. The racial composition of the school was 89.3% black and 11.7% white. During the observations, I noticed that the students were well behaved on the halls, in the cafeteria, and outside. The students made very little noise as they changed classes.

School A was roughly 45 miles from Louisiana State University (LSU). Leaving LSU's campus and traveling west on one of the most popular interstates, I exited the interstate about 15 miles west and travel north. As I traveled further north, the road becomes more and more hilly. There were several small communities that I noticed prior to arriving in the area of School A. In addition, I also noticed that many of the homes in the area were surrounded by at least two acres of land. In some areas along the route, there were many trees, and the soil was reddish in color.
I surveyed Mr. A, the principal of School A, regarding his perception of the social climate of School A. Mr. A's perception of School A was five points below the midpoint of the mean (indicative of a middle perceiver). I noticed that on the survey he responded that he was "somewhat happy" about the assignment to School A, and he was "somewhat happy" with School A.

There were 30 faculty members at School A, and 25 (83.3% of the total faculty) completed the survey regarding their perception of School A. According to the report card for School A prepared by the Louisiana State Department of Education, 66% of the faculty had a master's degree or better. The perception of the teachers in School A regarding the social climate of School A was about ten points below the midpoint of the mean which indicate that the perceptions of the teachers were about average (they were about middle perceivers, in the middle of the score distribution).

School A sat directly off the main road in the area. It was a three-story building. The gymnasium was on the first floor of the building; the principal's office was on the second floor through a set of double doors; the cafeteria was also on the second floor; classrooms were on the first, second, and third floors. Pictures of the previous graduating classes were
visible along the walls adjacent to the principal's office.

The principal, Mr. A, was a black male in his mid 50's. He had worked at School A for 21 years; however, Mr. A had been principal for 13 years. On my first visit to his office, it appeared rather neat and orderly. The mission statement on the wall captured my attention. It said,

"School A's faculty, staff, and unified community are committed to providing all students with an educational environment needed to develop the skills and attitudes that will enable them to lead productive lives and to become positive contributors to their community."

On my first visit to the school, I also noticed that the principal had a paddle on his desk. I inquired about corporal punishment. I asked Mr. A if corporal punishment was allowed in his school. He confirmed that it was, and he added that the parents wanted their kids to be disciplined.

There were about 65 juniors in school A, and the school report card indicated that the school was at, near, or above the state's average in passage rate of LEAP in all subjects. The students tended to have rather diverse perceptions regarding the climate of the school. Wren and Rose were the low perceivers;
Chad and Geo were the middle perceivers; and Dana and Rolando were the high perceivers.

Wren (Low Perceiver)

Wren was a 16 year old black female student who was about 5' 3" tall and was rather petite. She dressed stylishly. On the first day of the observations, she wore blue jeans, a checkered shirt, and boots with a pony tail in her hair. I also noticed that Wren wore make-up; during class, she would periodically look in a mirror that she took out of her purse. She carried her books from class to class in a backpack.

The following was Wren's schedule of classes: American History, Introduction to Business, Home Economics, English III, Business Math, Administrative Office, and Physical Education. Most of her classes are vocational in nature. During the observations, I noticed that she was among the first students to enter class, and she sat in the front of the class. Wren also appeared to be attentive as well as prepared for class. She had her books and necessary materials for each class. However, I did note that she did not have her home assignment for one of her classes. Wren had a habit of packing her books at least five minutes prior to the ringing of the bell in each class.
Wren had a 2.5 grade point average, and she indicated that she wanted to go to the army or some branch of the military upon completion of high school. She was affiliated with School A’s Jr ROTC. However, she had not obtained a lot of stripes or promotions. She said that she did not always try her best because it “sometimes seems not to matter.”

During class, Wren did not initiate conversations. She only talked to students who asked her questions. She was usually a quiet individual. I did observe that she attempted to help other students. In Home Economics, she helped a student with a sewing project. Wren helped a student to find an answer in American History. Between most of her classes, she waited for this particular black female, and they walked together. During lunch or breaks, she was with this same student.

Wren scored lower than most juniors in School A on the survey. However, she did indicate to me that she liked School A, and she felt that the goals of the school were academic in nature. She said that she got along or spoke to most students at the school as well as the teachers. Wren said that most “teachers try to help you the best that they can.” The one thing that she wanted to change about School A is to make a longer lunch period and shorter classes.
Rose (Low Perceiver)

Rose was a 16 year old black female student who was about five feet tall. She was rather stocky, and she dressed rather conservatively. On the first day of the observations, she was wearing pants, a multi-colored shirt, tennis shoes, and a wind-jacket. She had short hair that she wore down, and she did not appear to be a very neat individual.

The following was Rose's schedule of classes: Physical Education, Algebra II, American History, Physical Science, English III, Geometry, and English II. Her courses were college preparatory in nature; however, it is noteworthy that she was enrolled in English II and English III as well as two mathematics classes. It may be assumed that Rose did not pass English II the previous school year. In several of her classes, she arrived after the tardy bell had sounded, and she had no explanation for her tardiness. Like Wren, she sat in the front of most of her classes; however, Rose seemed to be unprepared as well as inattentive.

Rose had to borrow a textbook from her Physical Science teacher. After borrowing the book, she still seemed to be off-task. She frequently turned around at her desk and talked to the students behind her. In one of her classes, Rose took out fingernail polish and
polished her fingernails. She also complained about the assignments in most classes. "Do we have to do it, I am only doing Chapter 8, not 9." She was also always chewing gum.

I thought it was rather noteworthy that Rose frequently volunteered to help the teacher. In science, she requested to pass out the folders. In English III, she requested to pick up the assignment. Rose appeared to be off-task during class. Yet, she tended to be helpful to the teacher.

Rose had a 2.0 grade point average, and she indicated that she was uncertain about what she would do when she completed high school. She said that she had to find something interesting/not boring. She further indicated that she was really not considering college.

Rose was rather talkative during class. In the middle of class, she would "strike up" a conversation with a student. In addition, she was always yelling across the hall to get someone's attention. During lunch, Rose talked with a group of black female students. They did go to the library for a part of the lunch period on one of the days of the observations. However, they appeared to be talking rather than studying or reading.
Like Wren, Rose was among the students who scored lowest on the survey. She indicated that she did not like School A; she preferred the junior high school, and she would have preferred to be at the other high school in the district. Rose said that School A had a "bunch of losing teams." She believed that academics was stressed because the school did so poorly in competitive sports. In addition, she said that the teachers were boring. Yet, Rose felt it was important to do the best academically but she did not because she got "off track" a lot. "You know, fighting and stuff." In addition, she said that she would change everything about the school.

Chad (Middle Perceiver)

Chad was a 16 year old black male student who was about 5' 7" tall and was rather slim. He had a brownish complexion with a low hair cut. He dressed rather stylishly. On the first day of the observations, Chad wore jeans, a polo shirt, and Nike tennis shoes. I thought that it was rather peculiar that he was wearing a short sleeve shirt with no jacket because it was rather cold on that particular day. He also wore a small earring in each ear, and he had a gold tooth in the front of his mouth.

The following was Chad's schedule of classes: American History, English III, Basic Wood Work,
Physical Education, Environmental Science, and Business Mathematics. Most of his elective courses were rather vocational in nature. It is also noteworthy that he was enrolled in two English courses; I think that it is safe to assume that Chad also failed English II the previous school year.

Chad tended to be among the last students to arrive in class, and he was inattentive. He kept his head down for at least half of the class period in several of his classes. I also noticed that he carried his second hour books with him to first hour, and he did not have books and material for first hour. On the day that I observed Chad in Physical Education, he did not dress out. In addition, when his head was up in class, he did not volunteer to give answers. He sat slouched in his desks, and he appeared to be staring.

Chad had a 3.0 grade point average, and he indicated that he would like to attend a vocational school after high school. He was uncertain as to which trade he would pursue. However, he indicated (which was also confirmed by the observations) that he liked doing things with his hands. Chad seemed the most attentive in his Wood Works course.

Chad seemed quiet and passive. He rarely initiated a conversation. He only talked to student who asked him questions. Chad tended to "hang" (be
around) with a group of black males for lunch. The group seemed to talk a lot; but he still remained rather reserved and quiet.

Chad was among the students who ranked in the middle on the survey, and he indicated that School A was okay. He said that the emphasis of School A was on academics most of the times but sometimes "we get a little carried away with sports." He also said that the teachers were okay, and sometimes they were helpful; however, he found that some of them are boring. He said that it was not essential for one to do their best academically especially if you are not going to college. He further stated that the one thing that he would change was to add more vocational courses and allow students to enroll in as many vocational courses as they desired.

Geo (Middle Perceiver)

Geo was a 16 year old white male student who was about 5' 2" tall with a rather unique hair cut. The front of his golden brown hair was long, and the back was faded. On the first day of the observations, he was wearing his ROTC uniform. The medium frame junior looked militant in his uniform carrying his backpack.

The following was Geo's schedule: ROTC, English III, Geography, World History, Physics, Algebra II, and Physical Education. His schedule was college
preparatory in nature. The puzzling notion regarding Geo's schedule was the fact that he was enrolled in two history courses. Geo was taking World History which is more college preparatory in nature as compared to Geography. In most of his classes, he was among the first of the students to arrive. He came to class prepared; he had all his materials. Prior to the class beginning, I noticed that he organized his materials. He also seemed attentive as well as responsive to the teachers' questions and class discussions. He tended to confirm the answers of his teachers. I also noticed that Geo was very inquisitive as to why notions are true especially in physics and mathematics.

Geo had a 3.0 grade point average, and he indicated that he planned to go to college and then to the military or vice versa. It appeared as if he wanted to take advantage of the money that was provided by the military for college. I noticed that he had many honor pins on his military uniform.

Geo seemed to be a "mixer," a people's person. He talked to many students in class as well as in the halls. He initiated conversations, and he also helped other students in the class. Geo illustrated the correct procedure to obtain the answers. I also noted several times that he liked to joke. One of the teachers said that there would be a test later during
the week, and he said, "yes, a test of the American broadcasting system." Upon entering one class, Geo asked the teacher, "we do not have to do any learning today, huh?"

Geo was among the students who possessed a middle level perception according to the survey. During the interview, he indicated that he liked School A, and he felt that academics were stressed. He also felt that most students got along but groups of students tended to "hang" with groups of students. Geo felt that the teachers were helpful and did what they could to promote learning. He felt that doing one's best academically was important because it plays a major role in the future. Geo also said that he could not think of things that he would desire to change in School A.

Dana (High Perceiver)

Dana was a 16 year old white female student who was about 5' 5" tall. She was rather pump, and she dressed rather conservatively. On the first day of the observations, she wore a two-piece outfit with socks and tennis shoes. Dana also wore make-up, and she wore her long blond hair in a pony tail. Like many of the students at School A, she carried a backpack.

The following was Dana's schedule of classes: American History, Keyboarding, ROTC, English III,
Physics, Algebra II, and World History. With the exception of ROTC and Keyboarding, her schedule was college preparatory in nature. I noticed that Dana was among the first students to arrive in class. Dana also sat toward the front of the room, and she was also rather attentive. In American History, she volunteered to read, and her pronunciation was very clear. She also articulated very well. Dana volunteered to answer questions in most of her classes. The only class that she did not participate in was Keyboarding. I learned that she was caught up with her work; therefore, her keyboarding teacher allowed her to study for an Algebra test.

Dana had a 3.5 grade point average, and she indicated that she wanted to go to college upon completion of high school. She was a member of the ROTC and the library club. She did not indicate that she had future interest in the military. However, Dana mentioned to another student that she received a promotion in ROTC on one of the days of the observations.

Dana appeared to get along well with white as well as black students. She talked with a diverse population of students in class, on the hall, and outside. She also appeared to be jolly all the time; that is, Dana was always cheerful. She was also one of
the students who was rather inquisitive about my purpose for being at School A. She frequently wanted me to come to classes where she was.

Dana was one of the students who scored highest on the survey. She indicated that she liked School A. In addition, she felt that School A was to a great extent what you made of it. If you want the school to stress, academics, "you make it!" If you want your teachers to be helpful, "you make them helpful." If you want to get along with others, "you assert yourself." Dana also felt that it was very important to do one's best academically. The one thing that she would change about the school was class scheduling. She said sometimes there was not enough time in one class and too much time in another class.

Rolando (High perceiver)

Rolando was a 16 year old black female who was about 5 feet tall, and she was petite. She wore eyeglasses and a pony tail in her shoulder length hair; and she dressed rather conservatively. On the first day of the observations, Rolando had on jeans, a checkered shirt, and a windbreaker. Like most students at School A, she carried a backpack.

Rolando's schedule was as follows: Chemistry, American History, French I, English III, Adult Responsibility, Physical Education, and Administrative
Supervision. With the exception of Adult Responsibility and Administrative Supervision, Rolando's schedule was college preparatory in nature. She was one of the first students to arrive in class. Rolando sat near the front of the room, and she appeared to be attentive. She seldomly volunteered to respond but her teachers called upon her, and she always gave the correct/appropriate answer. She came to class prepared with her books and necessary material. Rolando helped her peers when they ask for her assistance.

Rolando had a 4.0 grade point average, and she indicated that she wanted like to attend college immediately after high school. She said that she would like to become a nurse. She also indicated that she liked kids; she wanted to have a family some day.

Rolando seemed rather quiet. She talked primarily to students when they inquired about the lessons. Her classroom behavior seemed to be rather consistent in the hall and outside. Rolando sat in class quietly until it began. During her free periods, she was with a group of black female students; however, she remained rather quiet and reserved.

Rolando was among the students who scored highest on the survey. However, during the interview, she did not seem enthusiastic. She said that school was okay,
and she believed academics was stressed but not enough. Rolando said that the teachers were okay but sometimes class time was wasted in an attempt to keep the disruptive students from being discipline problems. She also felt that it was very important to try one's best to get the most out of school. The one thing that she would change about School A was the disruptive students ("putting them in detention or something)."

Findings: Spradley's DRS

Domain Analysis

The initial day of observations consisted of a lot of descriptives. However, I quickly became more focused and looked for semantic relationships of the domains that were derived. The following is the semantic relationship that I utilized in my analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Term</th>
<th>Semantic relationship</th>
<th>Cover Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>&quot;is a kind of&quot;</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Additional semantic relationships are in Appendix D).

I identified characteristics that the two high perceivers shared, two middle perceivers shared, as well as the two low perceivers. The two high perceivers had a relatively high grade point average (3.5 and 4.0). In addition, they both seemed to be
attentive and prepared in each class. Both students also wanted to attend college, and their schedules were college preparatory in nature. The two middle perceivers had the exact same grade point average, 3.0. The middle perceivers expressed an interest in another institution, not college. It is noteworthy that one of the middle perceivers seemed more like a high perceiver in terms of scheduling and goals. The two low perceivers had relatively the same grade point averages, and they did not express an interest in pursuing a college career.

**Taxonomic Analysis**

The high perceivers were in the group that I identified as sharing the most in common; however, the members were different along social lines. One was a talker, and the other was not. The middle perceivers were different regarding their goals for life and characteristics in school. The low perceivers were also different regarding their goals for life (long-term goals). Therefore, I identified two types of high, middle, and low perceivers (The taxonomies are located in Appendix E).

**Componential Analysis**

I looked for contrasts by using selective observations which is the smallest focus that I used for the observations for the purposes of this study.
I began the steps of the compotential analysis which are looking for contrasts, sorting them out, grasping some together as dimensions of contrasts, and entering them in a paradigm. I asked questions like, how are the traders (the ambition of the student is trade school) different from the pursuers (desire to pursue college)? The dimensions of contrasts are: sex, race, grade point average (GPA), college ambition (CA), class interaction (in) [attentive (a), inattentive (I)], and social interaction (social.) See Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

Summary of School A

The students in School A shared similar characteristics and perceptions, and they possessed some diverse characteristics and perceptions. In the domain analysis, I identify characteristics

Table 5.1
Dimensions of Contrast Including Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrast</th>
<th>Social (Talker)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Achiever</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trader</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procrastinator</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
F-female, M-Male
B-Black, W-White
? - Undecided
Table 5.2
Dimensions of Contrast Excluding Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Talker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Perceivers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>4.0/3.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Perceivers</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B/W</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>No/?</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Perceivers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.5/2.0</td>
<td>No/?</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
- F - female
- M - male
- B - black
- W - white
- ? - Undecided

which the students shared. In the tables of dimensions of contrasts, I also identify characteristics which the students shared. Differences and similarities existed on the basis of sex, grade point averages, schedules, class room interaction, as well as social behavior. In School A, the principal, teachers, and students all had perceptions that were below the midpoint of the mean. It is noteworthy that the students tended to have perceptions which were lower than those of the teachers and principals. In School A, the principal had the most positive perception regarding the school social climate.

The results of the unitizing and categorizing of the interview data indicate the following: (1) five of the six students said that they liked School A or said that it was okay, (2) five of the six students indicated that for the most part academics was stressed and is the goal of the school, (3) five of the six
student indicated that the students got along well, (4) five of the six students indicated that the teachers try hard to prepare them for college and are encouraging, (5) five out of six students indicated that it was important to do your best academically, and (6) five out of six students indicated that they would change things regarding School A. These things included: scheduling, longer lunch periods, discipline changes, and complete environmental changes. I also learned in the interviews thoughts regarding the career goals of the students; only two of the six indicated that they would definitely like to attend college (one student indicated that she would major in nursing); two gave a definite no, and two were uncertain.

School B

School B was the smaller of two high schools in the district with about 462 students enrolled. Eighty-nine percent of School B's population was white. It was indicated to me and confirmed by the observations that white and black students tended to get along very well at School B. One thing that startled me during the observations at School B was a group of students who were singing. This group of students was sitting in the front of the gymnasium singing a song about love, and there appeared to be so much unity. I also felt that the students were very polite at School B.
School B was located roughly 62 miles east of Louisiana State University (LSU). Leaving LSU's campus and traveling east on one of the major interstates, I exited onto another interstate also traveling east. A third exit was made onto a third interstate traveling north. After exiting this interstate, I traveled for about 20 miles down a Louisiana highway before arriving at School B.

Like the community surroundings of School A, many of the homes in the area were surrounded by at least two acres of land. There were lots of trees and woody areas in the path to School B, and the school was located down a gravel road. The first building down the road was B Middle School; the next building was the cafeteria which was shared by B High and Middle Schools; the third building down the road was a church. Then, there was School B's gymnasium followed by the main building. The office was at the front of the main building, and the library and classrooms were also in the main building. Classes were also held in portable buildings which were all over the campus.

Mr. B., the principal of School B, had been the principal for 30 years. In fact, he said that he was instrumental in having the high school built after desegregation. Mr. B's first job was in another district where he coached football for three years.
Mr. B. then came to School B which was a K-12 school. Twenty six years ago, B High School was built.

Mr. B was a white male in his late 60’s. He consistently talked about the athletes that the school produced. Some had gone on to play professional football. He also expressed concerns regarding the athletic systems of the universities specifically LSU and Southeastern. Mr. B also seemed to have a high interest in School B. During my observations, I discovered that Mr. B lost a finger while building a stadium for School B. Furthermore, Mr. B also had great respect for his faculty as well as his students.

I surveyed Mr. B regarding his perception of the social climate of School B. Mr. B’s perception was about 9 points above the midpoint of the mean which indicated that Mr. B had a rather high perception of School B. I noticed on the questions regarding his assignment to School B that Mr. B indicated that he felt “very happy” about this assignment.

There were 25 teachers in School B, and 16 of these teachers were surveyed which represents 64% of the teacher population. The mean for the teacher’s perception in School B was only four points below the midpoint. This indicates that teachers had average perceptions (middle perceivers) regarding the social climate of School B. According to the report card for
School B prepared by the Louisiana State Department of Education, 64% of the faculty in School B had a master's degree or more than a Master's Degree. There were 36 juniors at School B. The students scored at, near, or above the state's average on passage rate of LEAP. Like School A, the students had rather diverse perceptions regarding the climate of School B. Walt and Benny were the low perceivers; Justy and Ben were the middle perceivers, and Jim and JoLisa were the high perceivers.

Walt (Low Perceiver)

Walt was a 16 year old white male who was about 5' 7", and he was rather slim. Walt has black hair, thick eye brows, and a mustage. On the first day of the observations, he wore jeans, a polo shirt, boots, and a starter jacket. Walt appeared rather jolly as he walked from class to class carrying his hat and sometimes wearing it.

Walt's schedule was as follows: English III, Business Mathematics, Agriculture III, Physical Education, American History, and Child Development. His schedule was vocational in nature. He participated in some classes from the back of the rooms (where he usually sat). Walt also frequently made facial expressions. During class, he talked a lot to peers around him.
In Child Development, Walt participated in the class's skit. He seemed enthusiastic. Yet, he was rather unresponsive in both English III and Business Mathematics. He did not dress out in Physical Education. Walt sat along the sideline most of the time. At one point, he took off his boots and laid on the floor. He also tended to be tardy or the last to enter class. In Walt's sixth hour class, he arrived tardy carrying no books, chewing gum, and carrying his hat.

Walt's average was a 2.8, and he seemed most interested in agriculture. Agriculture was one of the classes where he sat in the front of the room, and he seemed to be attentive. He indicated that he liked to go out into the field (meaning he liked to do work outside,) and he would like to study a similar curriculum at a vocational school. Walt was a member of School B's Future Farmers of America.

Walt talked a great deal to his peers. I noted that he talked rather loudly. I heard him describe to a female student how he was going to cut his hair. He said that he was going to cut it really low and bleach it. Walt's friends called him "smooth." I learned during the observations that his friends called him "smooth" because he tried to be smooth with the girls. He appeared to associate with the girls a lot during
the day. He hit them, and rubbed his fingers through their hair.

Walt was one of the students at School B who scored low on the survey. He indicated in the interview that School B was okay. He said that the goals of School B were primarily academic, and the teachers did encourage students to achieve. Walt also said that most of the students got along well at School B, and it was important to do one's best academically. The one thing that he would change about School B was the hours of attendance in school. "School is held too long."

Benny (Low Perceiver)

Benny was a 16 year old white male who was about 5' 5" tall, and he was rather slim. He had golden brown hair with a part down the middle of his hair. He also had a lot of acne on his face, and he dressed rather preppie. On the first day of the observations, Benny was wearing a white pull-over t-shirt, blue jeans, and black tennis shoes. Unlike many of the high school students at School A and School B, he did not carry a backpack. In addition, many of the boys in his school carried a hat; Benny did not carry a hat.

The following was Benny's schedule: English III, Physical Education, Agriculture III, Spanish I, Library Science, and American History. For the most part, his
schedule was vocational in nature. He seemed unprepared and inattentive in most of his classes. Benny arrived in his third hour class without books. Later during the period, he appeared to be doing his assignment. He was writing but he put his head down on the seat. In other classes, Benny slouched down in his desk, talked when the teacher was giving instructions, and ate candy.

Benny also appeared to like laughing and seeing his peers laugh. I could not hear what he was saying; however, he would say something to his classmates, and they would all laugh. In his last two class periods, he seemed more withdrawn. He isolated himself from the class.

Benny had a 3.2 grade-point average, and he indicated that he did not like School B. He wanted to get a job after graduating from high school. He said that he was only attending school because his parents want him to. When the principal learned that Benny was among the students who I wanted to observe, he said, "Benny is probably somewhere wandering around."

Benny displayed a mixture of social relations. He liked to make his peers laugh; he liked to talk; and sometimes he seemed withdrawn. He joked a lot in his classes as well as between classes. I did observe that Benny did not like to share. When his peers asked him
for something (candy or a pencil), he responded, "no." He tended to hang around a lot of guys during his free time.

Benny was one of the students at School B who scored low on the survey. As I previously mentioned, he did not like School B. In the interview, he said that he was unable to identify the goals of School B, and he said that he did not care what was stressed. Benny said that most of the students were cool; some of the teachers were okay; some were boring. He did not feel that it was essential to do his best academically. He also indicated that he would not change "nothing about School B, if I don't have to come here."

Justy (Middle Perceiver)

Justy was a 16 year old white male who was about 5' 7" tall, and he was rather slim. Like Benny, he had a lot of acne on his face. He wore a cap outside and between classes; however he had beautiful golden blond hair. Justy also had braces on his teeth, and he tended to keep his hand over his mouth. On the first day of the observations, he was wearing jeans, a t-shirt, and tennis shoes. Like Benny, he did not carry a backpack. I did notice that Justy was wearing a thick gold chain. His name was written on the chain in fancy subscripted letters.
The following was Justy's schedule: Algebra II, American History, Agriculture III, English III, Fine Arts, and Athletics. His schedule was college preparatory in nature with the exception of the Fine Arts and the Agriculture III. I did note that many of the boys at School B took Agriculture, and the teacher indicated that many of the boys took it because of the area in which the students resided. Justy appeared to be attentive in class. He brought books to each class, and he sat toward the front of the class.

Justy talked with each teacher briefly prior to the beginning of each class. He appeared to be writing his notes and looking in his different class textbooks throughout the day. As he finished a quiz in Algebra II, he took out his notebook and looked at some vocabulary terms. I later learned that Justy had another quiz for which he was preparing. I also noticed that he did not work until the end of class, and he talked to his peers. In most of his classes, he would stop working at least a few minutes prior to the end of the class.

Justy had a 3.2 grade point average, and he seemed to be a hard working student. He did most of what was expected of him in all of his classes. The Agriculture teacher mentioned to me that he was one of the students who was a candidate for the Cooperative education
The program allowed the students to work after school, and the student received three credit hours. Justy was also on the basketball team. I was unable to assess his athletic ability; however, he had an interest in playing basketball at the college level.

Justy appeared to be talkative. However, he did not talk a great deal in class to peers. He tended to respond to the questions of the teacher. During lunch and the changing of classes, Justy talked excessively. As I previously alluded to, he talked more to his peers at the end of class when he stopped working. He walked to the other side of the class to converse with some students near the end of Algebra. In Agriculture, Justy talked to students sitting next to him. He also talked more in class when the class was in small groups. In American History, the teacher divided the class into small groups, and Justy interacted and discussed a lot with the students.

Justy was one of the students in School B who scored average (around the middle of the scores in rank) on the survey. He indicated that he liked School B, and he felt that academics was stressed. He also said that the students got along very well, and the teachers maintained a good working relationship with the students. Justy said that it is important to do your best not only in academics but in "whatever you
are doing." The one thing that he would change about School B was the length of the class periods. He felt that they were much too long.

Ben (Middle Perceiver)

Ben was a 16 year old white male student who was rather slim, and he was about 5'8" tall. He had thick eyelashes and lots of molds on his face, arms, and hands. On the first day of the observations, he wore Guess Jeans, a Guess shirt, and tennis shoes. Like many of the boys at School B, Ben wore a cap. However, he also had a very neat haircut (a modern style called the fade).

The following was Ben's schedule of classes:
English III, American History, Physical Education, Agriculture III, Geometry, and Study Skills. With the exception of Agriculture, his schedule was college preparatory in nature. I was informed that in School B, students enrolled in Study Skills when they felt that they needed help preparing for their classes.

In most of his classes, Ben sat in the back of the room, and he seemed quiet and reserved. He appeared to be on task and paying attention. However, he did not bring all essential materials to class. Ben brought his books for each class but I observed that he seldomly had a notebook and a pen or pencil. In
addition, he did not volunteer to respond to the teacher's questions.

Ben had a 3.34 grade point average. He indicated that he did not plan to attend college; he felt that attending trade school would be more beneficial (especially for the area where he lived). Ben was a member of the School's Future Farmers of America. He indicated that he liked "farming and that sort of stuff."

Ben seemed reserved in class. He did not initiate conversations; when students asked him questions, he responded most of the time with a nod of the head or shrug of the shoulders. He interacted more with the students at lunch and in the hall. Ben definitely laughed more during lunch.

Like Justy, Ben was one of the students who scored around the middle in rank on the survey at School B. He said that he liked School B. He felt that academics was primarily stressed, and the goals of the school were academically centered. Ben said that most students got along well at School B, and students were encouraged to do their best. However, he said that he did not always put forth his best academically because he was lazy. He also felt that the teachers maintained an open door policy. Ben said that he "really doesn't know what I want to change about School B."
Jim (High Perceiver)

Jim was a 16 year old white male student who was about 5' 8" tall, and he was rather stocky. He was rather light in the face with short brown hair. On the first day of the observations, he was wearing jeans, a t-shirt, and Reebok tennis shoes. It was difficult for me to observe Jim wearing eyeglasses because he rarely wore them; he frequently took the eyeglasses off. Like many of the high school students, he carried a backpack. His backpack was filled to capacity.

Jim's schedule of classes was as follows: Algebra II, English III, Agriculture III, Spanish, Physical Education, and American History. Most of his courses were college preparatory in nature. He indicated that he was taking Spanish I & II to fulfill his foreign language requirements for admission to Louisiana State University. Jim appeared to be on task in class, and he was also responsive in class. Jim took his notes and looked to the board as the teacher was instructing. In Algebra II, he talked aloud the step-by-step procedure along with the teacher. As the teacher introduced the methods to solve a quadratic equation, Jim voiced his opinion regarding the most difficult method. Periodically in class, he held his hand on his head rubbing it.
Jim had a 3.5 grade point average. He had specific plans in terms of college. He wanted to attend Louisiana State University. In English III, the class worked and discussed the practice ACT (English portion). I heard Jim say that he had previously taken the test, and that the math section was the easiest part of the test.

Jim appeared to talk a great deal to students around him in all of his classes. He initiated conversations and appeared to enjoy conversing with his peers. He also talked to a diverse population of students (black, white, male, female). Jim also tried to help his classmates with their class work. He demonstrated how to solve problems, and he gave explanations for his answers.

Jim was one of the students at School B who scored rather high on the survey. He indicated that he liked School B, and he believed that academics were stressed but not nearly enough. He said that the students got along well, and the teachers encouraged students to achieve and to do their best academically. Jim felt that it is definitely important to do one's best academically; especially if one is going to college. The one thing that he would change about School B was that he would add more diverse course offerings (more college preparatory courses and challenging courses).
JoLisa (High Perceiver)

JoLisa was a 16 year old white female student who was about 5' 2". She had curly blond hair that she wore in a pony tail. JoLisa smiled frequently which made the braces on her teeth very noticeable. On the first day of the observations, she was wearing jeans, a t-shirt, and tennis shoes. The t-shirt had the words of the Christmas song, "Deck the Halls" written out in musical stanzas. I also noticed that JoLisa was wearing socks with Christmas designs in them.

The following was JoLisa's schedule of classes: Algebra II, English III, Advanced Band, Physical Education, Chemistry, and American History. Her schedule was college preparatory in nature. She seemed to be on task as well as attentive in all of her classes. JoLisa did not volunteer to give answers; however, when the teacher called upon her to respond, she would give the correct response. She also seemed prepared for class. That is, she had her books, notebooks, and a pen on her desk before class began. During class, JoLisa tended to keep her eyes in the direction of the teacher.

JoLisa had a 3.5 grade point average, and she indicated that she wanted to go to college. She was a member of School's Marching Band. She said that she
liked band, and she liked to go to marching festivals. The band teacher indicated JoLisa played first chair clarinet, and she was one of his hard working students.

JoLisa appeared to be rather quite and reserved. She would not initiate conversations but she would talk to students around her who conversed with her. She frowned at students who acted inappropriately in class. In one particular instance, a group of boys were talking excessively, and JoLisa told another female student that those boys are distracting the entire class.

Like Jim, JoLisa was one of the students in School B who scored highest on the survey. She indicated in the interview that she liked School B. In addition, she felt that academics was stressed; and the teachers encouraged students to achieve. JoLisa also indicated that she felt that the students got along okay, and the teachers and students shared "pretty good" relationships. In addition, she felt that it was very important to do one's best academically; this will prove helpful for the future. The one thing that she would change about School B was the disciplinary policy. JoLisa felt that students had "too many chances to make mistakes and to disrupt the learning of others." She liked classes to be orderly and quiet so that she could listen more closely to the teacher.
Findings: Spradley's DRS

Domain Analysis

I followed the same procedure in School B that I followed in School A in terms of observations and analysis. The initial observations consisted of descriptives. The next observations were more focused as I looked for semantic relationships of the domain analysis that I derived. The following is the semantic relationship that was very helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included term</th>
<th>Semantic relationship</th>
<th>Cover Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>&quot;Is a kind of&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Additional semantic relationships are in Appendix D)

I identified characteristics that each group of (high, middle, and low) perceivers shared. The low perceivers were enrolled in a vocational curriculum; they belonged to FHA; and they did not plan to attend college. The middle perceivers had a schedule that was college preparatory in nature; they were also members of FHA; and they both had relatively the same grade point average. Like those in School A, the high perceivers in School B seemed to be the most alike. They both had a 3.5 grade point average; they planned to attend a university with ideals of majors in mind.
after high school; they had college preparatory schedules; and they were both on task and responsive to the teachers' questioning and discussions in class.

**Taxonomic Analysis**

For each domain (high, middle, and low perceivers,) I identified two taxonomies. The low perceivers were different with regard to class participation and preparation for class. The middle perceivers were different with regard to participation in school sports and social relations (talking). The high perceivers were also different in terms of social relations (talking) as well as involvement in a school organization like band. (See Appendix F for the taxonomic analysis).

**Componential Analysis**

I looked for contrast by using selective observations which was the smallest focus that I used for observations for the purpose of this study. I began the steps of componential analysis which is looking for contrasts, sorting them out, grouping some together as dimensions of contrasts, and entering all this information into a paradigm. I asked questions like, "how is the participator different from the non-participator?" The dimensions of contrasts are: gender, race, grade point average (GPA), nature of schedule (Nature), class interaction (CI), social relations
(SR), and intentions to attend college (C). Tables 5.3 and 5.4 presents the dimensions by domains.

Table 5.3
Dimensions of Contrast Including Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrast</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Nature CI</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participator</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonathlete</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talker</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
M-Male, F-Female
W-White
CP-College Preparatory; V-vocational
P-Participates, NP-does not participate
T-Talker; NT-not a Talker

Table 5.4
Dimensions of Contrasts Excluding Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrast</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Nature CI</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2.8/3.2</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>P/NP</td>
<td>T/NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.2/3.3</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>P/NP</td>
<td>T/NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T/NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
M-male; F-female
W-White
CP-college preparatory; V-vocational
P-participates in class; NP-does not participate in class
T-talker; NT-not a talker

Summary of School B

The students in School B shared some perceptions as well as characteristics; however; they were different in many respects. The dimensions of contrast indicate some of the similarities and differences. I
identified similarities and differences with respect to sex, race, gender, grade point average, nature of schedule, class interaction, social relations, and college ambition. In School B, the perceptions of the students were lower in comparison to the perceptions of the teachers and principal. The perceptions of the teachers were about average (middle perceivers); however, the perception of Mr. B was high. The results of the unitizing and categorizing of the interview data in School B are as follows:

(1) five of the six students indicated that they liked School B or it was okay, (2) five of the six students felt that academics was stressed, (3) all of the students indicated that the students got along well or "pretty well," (4) five of the six students indicated that the students were encouraged to achieve, (5) all of the students indicated that the teachers were helpful and they maintained open door policies, (6) five of the six students indicated that it was important to do one's best academically, (7) four of the six students indicated that he/she would change something about School B; one student said he would not change anything if he did not have to come; another student indicated that he did not know what he would change about School B. The things that the students would change included: the hours of
attendance, length of class periods, course offerings, and disciplinary policies.

I asked the students a question regarding their goals. As indicated in the dimensions of contrasts, three of the students would like to attend college, and three of the students did not have plans to attend college. One of the students was specific about the college that he would like to attend; one of the students indicated that he would like to go to work immediately after completing college; and two of the students indicated that they would like to attend a vocational school.

School C

School C was one of eight high schools in its district with an enrollment of about 495 students. Eighty-nine percent of School C's student population was white. During my observations, I noticed that the students tended to get along very well. Like the students at School B, the students at School C were also very polite and respectful. The students at School C were not inquisitive regarding my purpose for the observations.

School C was roughly 30 miles east of Louisiana State University (LSU). I traveled two of the same interstates in the same direction that I traveled to arrive at School B. However, I exited the second
interstate after traveling roughly 10 miles onto a Louisiana Highway. I then traveled north for roughly 20 miles. School C was located in a small community. I only noticed one town along the Louisiana highway as I traveled to School C. Unlike the routes to School A and B, there were a few houses that were visible from the highway. Most of the houses were down roads and in subdivisions. I did notice about four subdivisions in route to the school. In addition, I also noticed a lot of stores and small businesses.

As I entered the community, there was a sign that says, "Welcome to Datsun." School C was located less than one mile down the street from the sign. Behind the sign, there was a graveyard. A church and a thrift store sat directly across the street, and the next building was the gymnasium of School C. A statue of the school's mascot sat in front of the main building.

The first room in the main building was the principal's office. The guidance office was across the hall, and there were several classrooms in the main building (a brick building.) There were also two additional buildings and three portable buildings which are all connected by walkways. The gymnasium was adjacent to the main building, and the stadium was behind the main building.
The principal of School C was a white male in his early 40's. Prior to becoming an administrator, the principal of School C, Mr. C., taught mathematics. He seemed to be a rather hard working administrator. He frequently observed classes and conversed with the students. One of the reasons that Mr. C agreed to allow School C to participate in the study was because he felt that he might learn something about his school.

I surveyed Mr. C regarding his perception of the social climate of School C. Mr. C scored several points below the midpoint of the mean; however, he responded that he was happy about his assignment at School C. Mr. C was classified as a middle perceiver based on his score.

There were 28 teachers at School C, and 20 of those teachers were surveyed representing 71% of the teacher population. According to the report card for School C produced by the Louisiana State Department of Education, 52% of the faculty in School C had master's degrees or better. The teachers in School C had average perceptions of the students; the perceptions were just below the midpoint of the mean.

There were about 105 juniors at School C, and the school report card indicates that School C was at or above the state's average in passage rate of LEAP in
all subjects. Like their peers in Schools A & B, the students tended to have rather diverse perceptions regarding the climate of School C. According to the survey results, Cheri and Erin were low perceivers; Krissie and Willy Jo were middle perceivers; and Sherrie and Linda were high perceivers.

Cheri (Low Perceiver)

Cheri was a 16 year old white female who was about 5’7” tall and had a medium frame. She had long golden blonde hair that she wore in a pony tail. On the first day of the observations, she was wearing jeans, a sweat shirt, tennis shoes, and a suede jacket. Like many of the high school students in School A, B, and C, Cheri carried her books in a backpack.

The following was Cheri’s schedule of courses: English III, Physical Education, Environmental Science, Geography, Study Skills, and Civics/Free Enterprise. She was in special education, and the special education teacher indicated that Cheri may have difficulty passing all components of the LEAP test due to her low reading ability. Her schedule was rather vocational in nature. During the observations, I noticed that Cheri had a planner that she wrote in as her teachers gave important due dates and test dates.

Cheri was among the first group of students to enter class, and she sat toward the back of the class.
in a slouched position. She seemed rather attentive in most of her classes. She also initiated conversations with her peers. I noticed that Cheri was talking to peers several times as class discussions were being held.

Cheri had a 2.3 grade point average, and she indicated that she would like to be a housewife. She said that she enjoyed cooking and cleaning, and she loved kids. She also indicated that she believed in a strong family structure. Cheri was not involved with extra-curricular activities but she indicated that she enjoyed attending sporting events.

Cheri was rather talkative. She appeared to enjoy being in conversation with her peers. I heard her discussing the fact that another student was pregnant. Cheri also discussed couples who were dating. I noticed that she tended to "hang" with the same group of girls during her free periods.

Cheri was among the students in School C who scored the lowest on the survey. However, she indicated that she liked School C, and she felt that academics was stressed. She said that her teachers were very helpful—especially the study skills teachers who worked with her to pass the LEAP test. Cheri said that it was very important to do your best academically; she indicated that she thought the
students got along well at School C, and the one thing that she would change was to allow more free time during the school day.

Erin (Low Perceiver)

Erin was a 16 year old white male student who was about 5' 7" tall with a medium frame. He had blue eyes with some acne on his face. His golden brown hair appeared short and neat. On the first day of the observations, Erin was wearing jeans, a polo shirt, converse tennis shoes, and a Letterman Jacket. He carried a backpack.

The following was Erin's schedule of classes: American History, Consumer Mathematics, Art I, English III, Environmental Science, and Physical Education. His schedule was vocational in nature. Although he tended to arrive late, he seemed to be on-task and responsive to the questions of the teachers. Yet, Erin seemed to be unprepared. In one of his classes, he did not have a pencil. In another class, he did not have his textbook. He also complained about the assignments that the teachers gave. "What is all this?" "When do we need to have this done by?" "No way!"

Erin had a 2.5 grade point average, and he said that he would like to go to college if he received a basketball scholarship. Erin was a forward on the basketball team, and he wore the number 8 on his
jersey. He thought that he was one of the best players on the team. Eric also said that he liked to run track but the basketball and track coaches did not want him participating in both sports because the seasons conflicted.

Erin seemed quiet except for when he was complaining about the assignments. However, he would not initiate conversations with his peers. He talked to them only when they asked him questions. During his free time, Erin tended to talk with the females on campus: all white females with long blond hair.

Like Cheri, Erin was one of the students that scored lower on the survey than the other juniors at School C. He felt that sometimes academics was stressed; sometimes athletics was stressed. He also indicated that teachers differed to an extent regarding their policy, etc. (Some maintained an open door policy; others did not). In addition, he felt that some teachers gave work that was unclear.

He also said that students tended to "hang" in groups. The popular students "hang" together; and other students "hang" together. Erin felt that it was not essential to do one's best academically. He said that there was "really smart, hard working people who did not make as much money as some not so smart people." He said that the one thing that he would
change about School C was the homework policy. Erin felt that teachers should not give homework on the weekend and on the nights when there were big sporting events.

Krissie (Middle Perceiver)

Krissie was a 16 year old white female student who was about 5' 3" tall with a medium body frame. She had long golden brown hair that she wore straight down her back with a band in the front. She also wore make-up. On the first day of the observations, Krissie wore jeans, a t-shirt, and some tennis shoes. The tennis shoes were black and shiny. Her rather large ear-rings also captured my attention. She carried a backpack.

The following was Krissie's schedule of classes: American History, Algebra II, Accounting, English III, Art II, and Chemistry. With the exception of the course Art II, her courses were college preparatory in nature. She displayed some rather diverse characteristics during the days. In some classes, Krissie was prepared and appeared attentive, and in other classes, she was unprepared and seemed inattentive. I noticed that she tended to stay more on-task at the beginning of the class periods, and she also seemed more attentive and prepared in the morning classes (especially the first two classeses.)
Krissie had a 3.5 grade point average, and she indicated that she wanted to be an accountant or a Realtor. She indicated that she liked working with numbers and found investments to be interesting. She was not involved in extra-curricular activities.

During the observations, I noticed that Krissie and another female student who attended most classes with her left their classes early. I also noticed that she carried the books of the other student as well as opened and selected books out of the locker for the student. I later learned that she volunteered to assist this student who was really not her friend but was an associate. This student had a serious operation that left her impaired. Krissie spent a lot of her time assisting this student.

Krissie was one of the students in School C who ranked in the middle in terms of scores on the survey. In the interview, she indicated that she did not like School C, and that academics were stressed sometimes. In addition, she indicated that some teachers were encouraging and maintained an open door policy; others were not. Krissie felt that it was very important to do one’s best academically because doing one’s best will be helpful for future studies. The one thing that she desired to change about School C was to make it more of a warm, friendly, and caring environment.
Willy Joe (Middle Perceiver)

Willy Joe was a 16 year old female white student who was about 5' 9" tall and was rather chunky. I was surprised because this particular female student's name seemed more like a boy's name for American culture. She had long black hair, and she wore glasses. On the first day of the observations, Willy Joe wore jeans, a t-shirt, and boots that resembled cowboy boots.

The following was Willy Joe's schedule of courses: Biology, English III, American History, Art I, Study Skills, and Consumer Mathematics. I was informed by the Study Skills teacher that she was a special education student. She was one of the special education students at School C who was working on a high school diploma, and she had not had difficulty passing sections of the LEAP test. Willy Joe tended to sit in the back of her classes. She appeared to be paying attention. Yet, she consistently made jokes. In Biology, she joked about the meaning of XX. She said that XX means that both parents are strikes, and the baby will probably be the third strike. Then, the whole team is out. In Art I, Willy Joe joked about cards that they were making. She told a male student that his snowman looked like a snow woman. She appeared to enjoy joking and seeing the other students laugh. However, she appeared prepared for class.
Willie Jo's grade point average was a 2.0. She indicated that she would probably go to a vocational school upon completion of high school. She said that she was uncertain as to the curriculum she would follow. Willy Joe did indicate that she liked to do things with her hands. She was in the Art Club at School.

Willy Joe seemed to enjoy seeing her peers laugh. She appeared to like interaction with her peers. She sought the attention of the peers by calling their name or making a noise. Willy Joe got around the campus. She appeared rather mobile. Willy Joe associated with groups of girls as well as groups of boys.

Like Krissie, Willy Joe was one of the students who scored in the middle on the survey. She indicated that School C was okay, and most of the time academics were stressed. She also felt that the teachers were helpful and encouraging. Willy Joe indicated that she got along with all of the students but everyone did not get along well. She said that she was not sure that it was important to do the best academically but she "guesses it is because your record sort of follows you." The one thing that she would change about School C was to make more students socialize with each other. She said that students did not talk to each other.
Sherrie (High Perceiver)

Sherrie was a 16 year old white female student who was about 5' 5" tall and had a medium frame. Although she had a smooth complexion, she wore make-up. She had long black hair that she wore straight down her shoulders. On the first day of the observations, Sherrie was wearing jeans, a t-shirt, boots, and a lettermen jacket.

The following was Sherrie's schedule: Advanced Mathematics, French II, Physics, American History, English III, and Physical Education. Her schedule was college preparatory in nature. In class, she appeared to be attentive and responsive to the questions of the teachers as well as to class discussions. However, Sherrie did seem hesitant to respond in some classes.

Sherrie had a 3.8 grade point average. She appeared to be dedicated to her studies and indicated that she would like to pursue a medical field in college. She was a member of the "Eaglelettes" (dancing squad). Sherrie said that she liked dancing; it was fun. Sherrie was also a member of School C's Beta club.

Sherrie tended to be very helpful to students. In advanced math, she picked up calculators for the entire group. She attempted to help students with their work as well. I also noticed that Sherrie was rather soft
spoken and seemed rather friendly. When I was in French class with her, she asked if I could speak French. After I responded, "a little." She said, "you're in the same boat with us." I also observed that the Eaglettes tended to "hang" together.

Sherrie was one of the students at School C who scored highest on the survey. She indicated that School C was okay, and sometimes academics were stressed. She also felt that students were encouraged to do well academically by the teachers and the administration. Sherrie said that the teachers were helpful and understanding and the students got along okay. She also felt that it was important to do well academically in preparation for the future. The one thing that she felt that should change in School C was the guidance policy. Sherrie said that the guidance department tended to work more with students in the upper grades, and she would have preferred to have more help in the 9th and 10th grade.

Linda (High Perceiver)

Linda was a 16 year old white female student who was about 5' 2" tall. She was rather petite and seemed rather flexible. During classes, she was able to bend her legs in several positions. Linda had straight blonde hair, and she wore make-up. Linda also wore eyeglasses but she only wore them at specific times
(like when she had to look at the chalkboard). On the first day of the observations, she wore jeans, a t-shirt, and Nike/Air Jordan tennis shoes. Linda also wore a lettermen jacket and carried a book bag.

The following was Linda's schedule of classes: Advanced Mathematics, French II, Physics, American History, English III, and Physical Education. Her schedule was identical to Sherrie's; it was also college preparatory in nature. In most of her classes, she appeared to be rather attentive and on-task. In advanced math when the class worked in small groups, Linda appeared concerned about finishing the assignment on time. In fact, she watched the time remaining and reminded her peers of the time. She also seemed prepared in each class, having all the essential class materials.

Linda had a 4.0 grade point average, and she indicated that she wanted to go to college. She was uncertain about the field of study; however, she did indicate that it would probably be a math or science related field. Like Sherrie, Linda was a member of the Beta Club. Linda was on the cheerleading squad at School C.

Linda appeared to be a people person. She initiated conversations with her peers. I noticed that she spoke to many of the students, and she seemed to
have a jolly disposition most of the time. Linda also attempted to help students when they asked her to, but unlike Sherrie, she did not voluntarily help.

Linda was one the students at School C who scored highest on the survey. She indicated in the interview that she liked the students at School C, and she felt that the students got along okay; however, she did not really like School C. Linda said that the teachers were okay; but there was always room for improvement. She felt that students were not always encouraged to achieve, and it was very important that students do their best academically. She said that it would have taken her a lot of time to devise a list regarding the things that she wished to change about School C; however, she would not elaborate.

Findings: Spradley's DRS

*Domain Analysis*

The initial day of observation of students consisted of lots of descriptives. However, the next observations were more focused as I looked for semantic relationships of the domains that I derived. The following is the semantic relationship that helped:

- Included Term: High
- Semantic Relationship: "is a kind of"
- Cover Term: student

(See Appendix D for additional relationships.)
I identified characteristics that were shared by each group (high, middle, and low perceivers). The high perceivers were alike in many ways. They both had a relatively high grade point average; they were both white females; they are both attentive in class; and they shared schedules which were college preparatory in nature. The middle perceivers were white females. The low perceivers had similar grade point averages (2.3 and 2.5). They were both white, and they were both attentive in class.

**Taxonomic Analysis**

As in Schools A & B, the high perceivers in School C were most alike but they were different along the lines of organizational affiliation and social interactions. The middle perceivers were also different along social lines. The middle perceivers were also different with respect to grade point average, class schedules, class interactions, and college interests. The low perceivers were different genders, possessed different schedules, and had different social interactions. (See Appendix G for taxonomic analysis).

**Componential Analysis**

I looked for contrasts by using selective observations which was the smallest focus that I used for the observations for the purposes of this study.
Thus, I began the step by step procedure of componential analysis which is looking for contrasts, sorting them out, grouping some together as dimensions of contrasts, and entering all this information into a paradigm. I asked questions like, "How is the basketball player different from the talker?" The dimensions of contrasts are gender, race, grade point average (GPA), college ambition (CA), nature of schedule (nature), social interaction (social), and class interaction (CI) [attentive (a), inattentive (I)]. See Tables 5.5 and 5.6.

Summary of School C

The students that I observed and interviewed in School C tend to share some perceptions and characteristics; however, I also identified characteristics and perceptions that were different among the students. The tables of the dimensions of contrasts are indicative of several differences and similarities among the students. Of course, some of the similarities of the students are identified in the domain analysis. In School C, the perceptions of the students, teachers, and the principal seemed to be around the same; they could be classified as middle perceivers. The following are the results of the unitizing and categorizing (obtained from the interview data): (1) only three of the six students indicated
Table 5.5
Dimensions of Contrast Including Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrasts</th>
<th>CPA</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleader</td>
<td>F  W  4.0  CP  A  Yes</td>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaglelette</td>
<td>F  W  3.8  CP  A  Yes</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noninvolver</td>
<td>F  W  3.5  CP  A/I  Yes</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>F  W  2.0  SE  A  No</td>
<td>Joker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talker</td>
<td>F  W  2.3  SE  A  No</td>
<td>Talker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Talker</td>
<td>M  W  2.5  SE  A  No/Yes</td>
<td>Notalker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
F-Female, M-Male
B-Black, W-White
CP-College Preparatory, V-Vocational, SE-Special Education

Table 5.6
Dimensions of Contrast Excluding Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrasts</th>
<th>CPA</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F  W  4.0/3.8 CP  A  Yes</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F  W  3.5/2.0 CP/SE  A  No</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M  W  2.3/2.5 SE/V  A  No/Yes</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
F-Female; M-Male
W-White
CP-College Preparatory; SE-Special Education; V-Vocational
A-attentive
Mix-two or more social interactions are displayed by the domain.

that they liked School C or it was okay, (2) four of the six indicated that the goals were academic, and academics were stressed, (3) four of the six students indicated that the students got along well; two of the students alluded to the fact that groups of students tended to "hang" together, (4) all of the students agreed that, for the most part, students were
encouraged to achieve, (5) five of the six students indicated that the teachers were helpful and maintained open door policies, (6) five of the six students felt that it was important to do one's best academically, and (7) all students indicated that there were factors that they would change about School C. The factors included: additional free time during the school day, different homework policies, environmental changes (caring), additional student socialization, and adjustments in guidance procedures.

I also obtained information regarding career goals and ambitions of students. Four of the six students indicated that they planned to attend college or expressed an interest in going to college, and two of the students did not express an interest in going to college. Two of the students had an idea of a college major that they would like to pursue.

School D

School D was the smaller of two high schools in the district with an enrollment of about 588 students. Sixty percent of School D's student population was black, and 40% was white. During my observations, I noticed that students tended to get along very well along racial lines. White and black students talked and intermingled in the classrooms, on the halls, and in the cafeteria.
School D was roughly 45 miles southeast of Louisiana State University (LSU). School D was closer to a smaller institution, Nicholls State University. Traveling from LSU to School D, I journeyed east for roughly 25 miles on a popular Louisiana interstate. I then exited the interstate and travel south. A right turn was made onto a Louisiana Highway that leads to a bridge (standing over the Mississippi River). After crossing the bridge, a left turn is made onto the Louisiana Highway that leads to School D. In the vicinity of School D, there were several sugar cane fields and sugar cane mills. There were also several plants along the road. However, more residential areas were visible the closer one got to School D.

School D sat directly off a Louisiana highway. There was a tennis court in the front of the school, and about an acre of land. As I entered the two story main building, I noticed the large display of the School's Mascot. Like School A, there were also pictures of previous graduating classes along the wall. The office was the first room of the two story building. The two gymnasiums and the science building were located behind the two story building, and the cafeteria and the auditorium were adjacent to the two-story building.
The principal of School D, Mrs. D, was a black woman in her late 40's/early 50's. She taught business for 25 years prior to becoming an assistant principal. She assumed the role of acting principal during the 1994-95 school term after the principal, Mr. D, had a stroke. Unfortunately, Mr. D died three days prior to the beginning of the 1995-96 school year. Mrs. D was appointed principal by the board.

Mrs. D. seemed to get along well with both the faculty and students. I noticed how she conversed with the students and made herself visible at lunch and in between classes. I also surveyed Mrs. D regarding her perception of the social climate of School D. Based on her score, Mrs D was a middle perceiver. I noticed that she responded that she was "somewhat happy" about her assignment to School D.

There were 30 teachers in School D. Sixteen of those teachers were surveyed which represents 53.3% of the teachers in the school. The perception of the teachers in School D was near the midpoint of the mean which is indicative of the fact that the teachers were middle perceivers. That is, that they had an average perception regarding the social climate of School D.

There were about 87 juniors at School D, and they had rather diverse perceptions regarding the climate of School D. The students were also at, near, or above
the state's average in terms of passage rate of LEAP. The low perceivers were Chase and Scotch; the middle perceivers were Shanda and Rost; the high perceivers were KyLim and May.

Chase (Low Perceiver)

Chase was a 16 year old black male student who was about 5' 8" tall and was rather slim. He had a light brown complexion and black hair. On the first day of the observations, he was wearing jeans, a polo shirt, and tennis shoes. Chase also wore a starter jacket. Like most high school students in Schools A, B, C, & D, he carried his books in a backpack.

The following was Chase's schedule of classes: Business Mathematics, English III, American History, Environmental Science, Typing II, Industrial Art, and Physical Education. His schedule was vocational in nature. During the observations, I noted that he arrived late for class, and he sat in the back of the room. Chase appeared to be attentive most of the time. However, he did not volunteer to give an answer but he gave a response when teachers called upon him. He was frequently unprepared at the beginning of class; as class progressed, he took out the necessary material. Chase also seemed off-task at times.

Chase had a 2.8 grade point average, and he was a member of School D's basketball team. He indicated
that he would like to attend a branch of the military upon completion of high school; he had begun to prepare for that endeavor by taking one of the military entrance tests. Chase was not affiliated with any other school organizations.

Chase was rather talkative. He initiated conversations while class was in progress, and the topics (basketball games, practice, dances after school) that he discussed were not relevant to class discussions. He tended to "hang" with a group of black boys. This particular group of boys was always talking rather loudly in the halls as well as outside during the lunch period. During the lunch period, I noticed for several days that they stood behind the main building.

Chase was among the students who scored lowest on the survey. In the interview, he indicated that School D was okay, and the students got along okay; "sometimes we fight but most of the time we get along fine." He believed that academics were stressed sometimes, and most of the teachers encouraged students to achieve. Chase also indicated that most of the teachers were helpful, and they maintained an open door policy. He felt that it was important to do one's best academically; however, he said that he did not always do the best because he was somewhat lazy. The
one thing that Chase desired to change about School D was "to add more break time during the day."

Scotch (Low Perceiver)

Scotch was a 17 year old white male student who was about 5' 7" tall and was rather slim. He had rather smooth skin with dark brown hair. On the first day of the observations, he wore jeans, a polo shirt, and tennis shoes. Scotch also carried a backpack.

The following was Scotch's schedule: Applied Algebra II, Geography, Environmental Science, English III, Resource, Physical Education, and Home Economics. I learned during the observations that he was a Special Education student who was mainstreamed. Most of his courses were selected by his resource teachers, along with his parents, to aid him in meeting the graduation requirements. The resource teachers indicated that they tried to select courses which were of the least possible difficulty.

Scotch tended to be among the first students to arrive in class, and he sat near the middle of the classroom. He seemed rather quiet and reserved in class. He seldomly responded to the questions of the teacher. However, it seemed as if Scotch was attentive, and he appeared to be on task.

Scotch had a 2.0 grade point average, and he indicated that he would like to go to a vocational
school upon completion of high school because he did not feel that he could "handle" college. He said that he would like to go to college but he felt inadequate. He was not affiliated with any school organizations.

Scotch seemed rather quiet and reserved most of the time. He did not socialize much. During his free moments, he was in the resource room. He appeared to be reading or writing. Scotch would only talk to students who initiated conversations with him. He also seemed soft spoken.

Like Chase, Scotch was among the students who scored lowest on the survey in School D. He said that he did not really like school; he said, "I used to like school more when I was at the junior high." Scotch felt that academics and sports were stressed at School D, and the goals were centered around being sports champions. He said that students were sometimes encouraged to achieve, and he felt that his resource teachers were the most encouraging and helpful to him. He did indicate that he felt that it was important to do the best academically but sometimes "my best is not good enough." The one thing that Scotch desired to change was to make all of his teachers as helpful as his resource teachers. "Some teachers are just not patient with me, and they don't understand that I don't understand."
Shanda (Middle Perceiver)

Shanda was a 16 year old black female student who was about 5’ 2" tall and was rather petite. She had shoulder length hair that she wore in a pony tail. She also had a rather light, smooth complexion. On the first day of the observations, Shanda was wearing a wind suit with tennis shoes. She carried her books in a backpack.

The following was Shanda's schedule of courses: Advanced Mathematics, English III, American History, Chemistry, Home Economics, Adult Responsibility, and Physical Education. With the exception of the Home Economics and Adult Responsibility, her schedule was college preparatory in nature. She was usually among the first few students to arrive in class, and she sat in the front of the classroom. Shanda appeared to be attentive in class. She would volunteer to give responses that were frequently correct. In addition, she seemed to be on task. When teachers gave an assignment, Shanda appeared to get busy immediately working on the assignment.

Shanda had a 3.3 grade point average. She indicated that she planned to attend college majoring in nursing. She had an aunt who was a nurse; she indicated that her aunt was a role model for her, and this was one of the reasons she wanted to pursue
nursing. She was a member of School D's pep squad and tennis team.

Shanda was a very soft spoken mild mannered student. She seemed quiet and reserved. Like Scotch, she would not initiate conversations. Shanda only talked when students asked her questions. She conversated with one other black female student most of the time. I did notice that she was one of the only respondents who visited the library; (the other student was Rosie in School A.) After Shanda ate lunch, she went directly to the library. She appeared to be reading a short story on her visits.

Shanda was among the students in School D who scored or ranked in the middle of the distribution of scores on the survey. She indicated that School D was okay, and academics were primarily stressed; the goals were more academic in nature as well. She also said that only some of the teachers were helpful and maintained an open door policy, and she believed that sometimes students were encouraged to achieve.

Shanda also mentioned that some groups of students tended to get along with only other members of this specific groups; she elaborated on the groups. She said that "the cheerleaders get along with each other; the pep squad get along with each; the dance squad gets along with each other; however, there is very little
intermingling across groups." The one thing that she would change about School D was in reference to the previously discussed idea. She felt that some groups of students received special treatment, and some groups were in her opinion treated better by teachers because they were a part of the special groups. Shanda indicated that the beta club members and cheerleaders were in the groups that were treated best.

Rost (Middle Perceiver)

Rost was a 16 year old white male who was about 5' 6" tall with a medium frame body. He had smooth skin with dark black hair. On the first day of the observations, he wore jeans, a polo shirt, tennis shoes, and a lettermen jacket. Rost carried his books in a backpack.

The following was Rost's schedule of course: Advanced Mathematics, American History, Chemistry, English III, Accounting II, French II, and Physical Education. His schedule was college preparatory in nature. In most of his classes, he sat in the front of the class, and he seemed prepared for class. Rost had his books, notebooks, and writing utensils for each class. However, he appeared to be staring in some of his classes. In several classes, teachers called upon him to respond, and he was unable to respond. I also
noticed that Rost tended to hold conversations with his peers around him as class was being conducted.

Rost had a 3.5 grade point average, and he indicated that he would like to attend Nicholls State University. He was uncertain of the major that he would pursue. He did say that one of the reasons he wanted to attend Nicholls was because his sister was presently in attendance there, and she helped him with his homework when he did not understand it. Rost was a member of School D's tennis team as well as Beta club.

Rost generally was not an initiator of conversations; however, he talked a lot when people initiated the conversation. He conversed a lot with two male white students who went to several classes with him. At lunch, Rost, along with these two male students, played racketball in the gymnasium. There was also a female student who played racketball with the males.

Like Shanda, Rost was one of the students at School D who scored in the middle of the distribution of scores on the survey. He indicated that School D was okay, and sometimes academics were stressed; Rost further indicated that sometimes students were encouraged to achieve. Rost also felt that most teachers were helpful and encouraging. He gave a similar response to Shanda in reference to the
relationships of students. He said that groups of students tended to get along well with groups of students. Rost felt that it was important to do the best academically in high school for one's future. He suggested the same change as Chase as an improvement to School D. He said that one thing that he desired to change was to add free periods.

KyLim (High Perceiver)

KyLim was a 16 year old white female student who was about 5' 6" tall with a medium frame body. She had shoulder length golden brown hair. On the first day of the observations, she wore pants, a shirt, and dress shoes. KyLim also carried her books in a backpack.

The following was KyLim's schedule of courses: Advanced Mathematics, English III, American History, Chemistry, French II, Computer Science, and Physical Education. Her schedule was college preparatory in nature. She was among the first group of students to arrive in class, and she sat in the front of the class. KyLim also appeared to be on task at all times and prepared for class. She had her books, notebooks, and writing utensils in all classes. I did notice that she did not volunteer to give answers; however, when her teachers called upon her, she gave the correct responses.
KyLim had a 4.0 grade point average, and she indicated that she would like to attend college majoring in a medical field. She was a member of School D's cheerleading squad and beta club. She was also a member of the student council. One of the major tasks that I observed the student council performing was tutoring. Members of the student council tutored students before school and during the lunch period on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

KyLim seemed rather quiet and reserved especially in class. I noticed that she conversed with a group of white female students during lunch. They ate chips and drank coke; some of the students (KyLim included) ate out of lunch boxes. They sat on the ground behind the main building of the school. KyLim talked a little; she smiled most of the time and remained quiet.

KyLim was one of the students at School D who scored highest on the survey. She indicated that she did not really like School D; a lot of her friends attended a private school in another parish. However, KyLim did feel that the goals of the school were primarily centered around academics. In addition, she believed that the teachers were helpful, and they encouraged students to achieve. She indicated that most of the students got along okay at School D. KyLim also felt that it was very important to do your best in
high school in preparation for college. The one thing that she would change about School D was the seven periods. She says that "although students are allowed to take more courses, the classes are too short sometimes, especially Advanced Mathematics."

May (High Perceiver)

May was a 16 year old black female student who was rather petite and was 5’ 2” tall. She had shoulder length black hair and very smooth light-colored skin. I noticed that she spoke rather softly. On the first day of the observations, May wore a jogging suit with tennis shoes. She carried a backpack for her books.

May's schedule was as follows: Advanced Mathematics, English III, American History, Chemistry, Accounting I, Computer Science, and Physical Education. Her schedule was rather similar to KyLim’s schedule; it was also college preparatory in nature. She sat in the front of the class, and she appeared to be attentive and on-tasks. May did not hesitate to give a response; she was rather responsive to the questions of her teachers as well as class discussions. She also appeared to be prepared for class with all her materials (textbooks, notebooks, and writing utensils).

May had a 3.8 grade point average. She indicated that she would like to attend college and major in nursing. She was a member of School D’s dancing squad,
the volleyball team, and beta club. Like KyLim, May was also a member of the student council.

May tended to spend her free time with other members of the dancing squad. I was able to see the other members of the squad because they practiced during physical education. The dance squad had bake sales at the school on two of the days of the observations. May spent the entire lunch period selling snacks. She also spent some of her free time tutoring with the other student council members.

Like KyLim, May was one of the students at School D who scored highest on the survey. She indicated that School D was okay. She felt that academics were stressed, and the goals were centered primarily around academics. May believed that students were encouraged to achieve, and the teachers were very helpful. She shared the philosophy of KyLim regarding doing the best academically. She believed that it was very important to do the best academically in preparation for college. May said that the students got along okay at School D. She felt that more time should be allowed for clubs and organizations to meet.

Findings: Spradley's DRS

Domain Analysis

A similar procedure was followed in School D (as in School A, B, and C) to guide the observations and
analysis. The initial observations of the students consisted of many of descriptives. However, the next observations were more focused as I looked for semantic relationships of the domains that were derived. The following is the semantic relationship that was helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Term</th>
<th>Semantic relationship</th>
<th>Cover Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>&quot;is a kind of&quot;</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Appendix D for additional semantic relationships).

I noted the characteristics that each domain shared (high, middle, and low perceivers). The high perceivers were both girls and shared grade point average (relatively high), college interests, nature of schedule, and class interactions. The middle perceivers possessed a similar grade point average (3.5, 3.3), shared college interest and schedule, and shared social characteristics. They were also affiliated with the same school sports team. Gender and class interaction were characteristics that the low perceivers shared.

**Taxonomic Analysis**

I noted differences within each group. The high perceivers were of different races, and they were affiliated with different school organizations. The
middle perceivers were also of different races. They demonstrated different class interaction characteristics as well. The low perceivers were of different races and had different college interests. The low perceivers also demonstrated different social characteristics (See Appendix J for taxonomic analysis of School D).

Componential Analysis

I looked for contrasts by using selective observations which are the smallest focus that I used for observations for the purposes of this study. I began the steps of componential analysis which are looking for contrasts, sorting them out, grouping some together as dimensions of contrasts, and entering them onto a paradigm. I asked questions like, “how is the basketball player different from the non athlete?” The dimensions of contrast are: sex, race, grade point average (GPA), college ambition (CA), nature of schedule (nature), class interaction (CI) [attentive (A), inattentive (I)], extracurricular activities (EX), and social interactions (social).

Summary of School D

The students in School D shared similar characteristics and perceptions as well as some diverse characteristics and perceptions. In the domain analysis, I identify some characteristics which the
students shared. In the tables of the dimensions of contrasts, I also identified some characteristics which the students shared; however, differences of the students are also identified. In School D, all except one of the students that were interviewed and observed were the same age. I identified differences and similarities on the basis of sex, race, grade point average, college ambition, class interaction, involvement in extracurricular activities, and social interactions. In School D, the perceptions of the principal, teachers, and students tended to be relatively the same; the perceptions were about average. I thought it noteworthy that the same statement was made with regard to the perceptions of

Table 5.7
Dimensions of Contrast Including Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrasts</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleader</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Notalker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attender</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Notalker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonAttender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>I/?</td>
<td>Talker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mil V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Talker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonAthlete</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No SE</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Notalker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
F-Female, M-Male
B-Black, W-White
Mil-Military
CP-College Preparatory
V-Vocational
SE-Special Education
Notalker-not talkative
Talker-Talkative
Table 5.8

Dimensions of Contrast Excluding Taxonomic Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Dimensions of Contrasts</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Race GPA Ex CA Nature CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>F B/W High Yes Yes CP A</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>M/F B/W Mid Yes Yes CP I</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>M B/W 2-2.8 No No V/SE A</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of abbreviations:
F-Female; M-Male
B-Black; W-White
Mil-Military
CP-College Preparatory; V-vocational; SE-Special Education
Mix-talker and nontalker or a combination of characteristics.

of the principal, teachers, and students tended to be relatively the same; the perceptions were about average. I thought it noteworthy that the same statement was made with regard to the perceptions of the principal, students and teachers in School C. The following are the results of the unitizing and categorizing in School D (data obtained from interviewing): (1) four of the six students indicated that School D was okay, and two students indicated that they did not like School D, (2) all of the students indicated that academics were stressed or at least sometimes stressed; two student said that academics were sometimes stressed; one student said that academics were primarily stressed; and one student said that academics and sports were stressed, (3) six of the six students said that the students got along okay; two of the students indicated that groups of students tended to get along better; (4) three of the six students indicated that students were sometimes encouraged to
achieve; the other three said that students were definitely encouraged to achieve, (5) three students indicated that most teachers were helpful; two students indicated that some teachers were helpful; one student indicated that the resource teacher was the most helpful, (6) all of the students indicated that it was important to do one's best academically; three of the students gave as a reason - the future (two specifically mentioning preparation for college), and (7) all of the students indicated ideas that they would change about School D; two of the students mentioned that it was essential to have more free periods.

I also obtained information regarding the goals and ambitions of the students. Four of the six students indicated that they would like to go to college upon completion of high school. Three of the four students indicated a possible major, and one of the four students indicated a college that he/she would like to attend. The two students that did not express an interest in college expressed an interest in another institution. One of the students expressed an interest in the military and the other in a vocational school.

Summary of Chapter 5

Case studies are presented of six students in each school. Two students in each school were high perceivers; two students in each school were middle
perceivers; and two students in each school were low perceivers. In each case, a domain, taxonomic, and componential analysis is reported along with the results of the unitizing and categorizing. The perceptions of the teachers and principals are also reported. I also compared the perceptions of the principals and teachers with the perceptions of the students. In the domain analysis, the characteristics that the students shared are reported. In the taxonomic analysis, diversities of the students are reported. In the tables of contrasts, similarities as well as differences are illustrated.

In School A, the high perceivers were two girls - one white and one black. They also had high grade point averages (GPA). The middle perceivers were boys with a 3.0 GPA. One of the middle perceivers was black, and one was white. The low perceivers were black girls with rather low GPA's. In School B, the high perceivers were white - one boy, one girl with a 3.5 GPA. The middle perceivers were white males with a 3.2 GPA. The low perceivers were white boys with diverse GPA's. In School C, the high perceivers were two white girls with high GPA's. The middle perceivers were two white girls with diverse GPA's, and the low perceivers were two white girls with a 2.5 GPA's. In School D, the high perceivers were two females- one white, one black. They had a 4.0 GPA. Although the middle perceivers were different
along racial as well as gender lines, they possessed above average GPA's. The low perceivers were two boys of different races with rather diverse GPA's. Table 5.9 presents these findings.

In Schools A, B, C, and D, the one idea that is evident is that the high perceivers tended to have more similarities in the specific areas reported in the case studies (as compared to the middle and low perceivers). The middle and low perceivers had characteristics common (which is discussed in each domain analysis and illustrated by the dimensions of contrast - looking specifically at the tables with the taxonomies presented). The high perceivers tended to have relatively high grade point averages, college ambitions, and positive classroom attributes (prepared for class, attentive, etc). There tends to be more overlapping in the middle perceiver domains. That is, it was not uncommon for a low perceiver and a middle perceiver to be more alike that two low perceivers or two middle perceivers.

Across schools, the high perceivers also tended to be female (almost an equal racial mix). The one dimension that seemed very diverse within schools and across schools is social interactions. Students tended to display social interactions that were not representative of a specific domain.
Table 5.9
Qualitative Findings in Schools A, B, C, and D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>4.0/3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>B/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>2.5/2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-Case Analysis

Patton (1990) suggests that when the focus of a study is primarily on individuals, it is appropriate to begin with individual cases prior to doing cross-case analysis. The problem statement, along with the purpose, indicates that individual students are the focus of this study. In Chapter 5, individual case studies are presented looking at four schools generally (specifically observing the students). A case is written for each person observed and interviewed.

Patton (1990) says that case study and cross-case analyses are not mutually exclusive. However, cross-case analysis involves grouping together answers to common questions from different people. Patton (1990) goes on
to say that case studies and cross-case analyses are frequently used together in studies, and the use of both methods strengthens the quality of the analysis.

I observed the responses of the 24 subjects (six in each of the four schools) to the questions from the interview by the domains (high, middle, and low perceivers). I also classified the responses as being positive or negative responses. The questions from the interviews are: Do you like School's A, B, C, or D? Do you feel it is important to do your best academically? Why? What are the goals of your school? (What is stressed?) Do students get along well at your school? Are students encouraged to achieve by teachers? Are there notions you would like to change in your school? Do teachers maintain open door policies? What do you plan to do upon graduation from high school?

Question 1

The responses to the first questions are grouped in the following categories: yes (I like School A, B, C, or D,) okay (School is okay,) and no (I dislike School A, B, C, or D). "Yes" is the most positive response, and "okay" is also a positive response.

Table 5.10 presents the types of responses for each domain. Six of the high perceivers across Schools A, B, C, and D indicated that they liked their particular schools or said that their schools were okay. The middle
perceivers had the highest score (seven indicating that they liked their schools or their schools were okay). Only five of the low perceivers said that they liked their schools or said that their schools were okay. In addition, only two gave "yes," as a response indicating that they liked their schools. However, the most frequent response across schools and domains was, "School A, B, C, or D is okay." Eighteen students (75% of the students) said that they liked their schools or their schools were okay.

Question 2

The categories for the responses are "yes" (I think it is important, and I do my best;) "yes, but" (I think it is important but I do not do the best;) no (I do not think it is important;) and not sure (I am not sure if it is important.) The more positive responses are in columns one and two ("yes, I do," "yes, but I do not.")

Table 5. 11 presents the number of responses in each category for the specific domains. Totals are also presented for each response category. Across domains and schools, the most frequent response was, "yes, it is important to do the best academically, and I attempt to do the best." In addition, all of the high perceivers felt that it was important to do the best academically. This notion strengthens a finding of the unitizing and categorizing. I discovered that the high perceivers
domain shared the most characteristics. The agreement of the high perceivers on this notion is an additional characteristic that they shared. I thought it noteworthy that six of the students who responded, "yes" to this question felt that it was important because of the future - college preparation.

Table 5.10
Cross-Case Analysis: Responses Liking the School in Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11
Cross-case Analysis: Response on Academic Necessity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes, but</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 3

The responses are: "academics or primarily academics,""academics or sometimes academics," "sports" and " ?, unaware of what is stressed." The most positive response is "academics or primarily academics" and then "academics or sometimes academics."
The high, middle, and low perceivers tended to suggest that academics were the goals of their particular schools, and academics were stressed. Of the students observed and surveyed, 92% said that academics were stressed at least sometimes. Only two low perceivers indicated that other notions were stressed. One low perceiver said that sports were stressed, and the other low perceiver said that he was uncertain as to what was stressed. Eight students suggest that academics were only stressed sometimes. Table 5.12 gives the frequencies of responses.

Question 4

The responses are grouped into the following categories: yes (they get along well,) okay (they get along okay,) particular groups (particular groups of students get along well,) and no (students do not get along well.) The most positive response is in column one followed by column two. Particular groups and no are the negative responses.

The eight high perceivers indicated that students got along well or they got along okay in their schools. Five middle perceivers said that students got along well or okay in their schools. Only one middle perceiver suggested that students did not get along well, and two said that particular groups of students tended to get along well. Four of the low perceivers said that
students got along well; two said that students got along okay. The most frequent responses (see table 5.13) was that "students get along well" followed by "students get along okay."

Table 5.12
Cross Case Analysis: Responses Regarding the Goals of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13
Cross-Case Analysis: Responses How Student Get Along

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Particular Groups</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5

The responses are categorized as: yes, no, and uncertain. Student responses were grouped in the yes category if they respond, "yes," "for the most part," or "most of the time." Student responses were placed in the no category if the students responded, "no," and students who said that they were unsure of a response were placed in the uncertain category.
Most of the students across domains in schools indicated that they were encouraged to achieve by their teachers. Table 5.14 presents the number of the responses for each domain. Seventy-nine percent of the interviewees felt that they were encouraged to achieve by their teachers. Only two high perceivers and three low perceivers indicated otherwise. All of the middle perceivers responded, "yes". This was the only question where the middle perceivers had the greatest number of positive responses.

Question 6

The responses that students gave to question 6 were very diverse across domains in schools. However, I grouped the responses into the following categories based on the kinds of changes recommended: scheduling, discipline, environment, uncertain (students said that they did not know the type of changes, and miscellaneous changes). Responses like "flexible scheduling," "more diverse college preparatory courses," "more time for classes to meet," "add vocational course," and "longer lunch periods" are grouped in the scheduling category. All of these responses suggested that changes be made with respect to some scheduling -- adding courses, changing times, etc.

Responses are grouped in the discipline category because they related to a disagreement with a discipline
procedure or policy. "Students get by with too much" and "they have too many chances" are examples of the responses regarding a need to make disciplinary changes. Another category for the responses is environment. Responses like "a need for more talkative people," "eliminate special group treatment," and "a more warm and friendly environment" are in the environment category. All of these responses related to a need for positive interactions in schools.

Some students suggested that they were uncertain about what changes should be made. These responses are grouped in the uncertain category. The final category is miscellaneous changes. Responses are grouped in this category because they tended to be unrelated. Most of these responses were rather diverse. They include responses like: "guidance departmental changes," "an extensive detailed list of changes," "change everything," and "do homework on certain days." Table 5.15 illustrates that the most frequent change desired was in reference to scheduling. Eleven of the 24 students suggested that they would like some type of change in reference to scheduling.

Question 7

I grouped the responses to Question 7 into three categories: yes (teachers maintain an open door policy; they are very helpful,) some (some teachers maintain an
open door policy,) and no (teachers do not maintain an open door policy.)

Table 5.14
Cross-Case: Responses Encouragement of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15
Cross-Case Analysis: Response Regarding Changes Students Would Like to Make in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanings of Abbreviations:
Sch.-Scheduling
Dis.-Discipline
Env.-Environment

Nineteen of the 24 interviewees indicated that their teachers maintained an open door policy. Table 5.16 presents these data. That is, they felt that their teachers were very helpful regarding class assignments and other things. All of the high perceivers indicated that their teachers were helpful, and all middle perceivers indicated that they were helpful or at least some teachers were helpful. Only half of the low perceivers indicated that their
teachers were helpful. A low perceiver said that he wished that all of his teachers were as helpful as his resource teachers.

Question 8

The responses to question eight are categorized into the following groups: college, military, vocational/trade school, job, housewife, and uncertain.

All high perceivers indicated that they would attend college after graduating from high school. Some of the high perceivers also had a chosen field of study. Two middle perceivers also indicated that they would attend college; three indicated that they would like to attend a vocational or trade school. However, the low perceivers expressed the most diverse plans for the future. One desired to go to college; two desired to go to the military; two wanted to attend a vocational school; one wanted a job; one desires to be a housewife; and one was uncertain regarding future plans. Table 5.17 presents these data.

Summary of Cross-Case Analysis

In tables 5.9, 5.10, and 5.11, 5.12, 5.13, and 5.15, the first column is considered the most positive responses; the second column is considered to be positive also; the third column of responses and other columns thereafter represent negative responses. The high perceivers and middle perceivers tended to give
more positive responses as compared to the low perceivers. On the questions regarding liking their schools and the necessity to do the best academically, most of the high and middle perceivers responded positively (there answers in the first and second column of the tables.) On question 7, all of the high perceivers indicated that their teachers maintained an open door policy or they were helpful. Most of the middle perceivers also indicated that their teachers were helpful. In addition, all of the high perceivers

Table 5.16
Cross-Case Analysis: Responses Regarding Teachers Maintaining an Open Door Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17
Cross-Case Analysis: Responses Regarding Plans After High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Mil</th>
<th>Voc/Trade</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>HW</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indicated that they planned to go to college, and most of the middle perceivers indicated that they would go
to college or a vocational school. Therefore, most of the high and middle perceivers tended to have educational goals.

On questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 in the cross case analysis, the high perceivers had the highest (or tied) number of positive responses followed by the middle perceivers (responses in the first column). Question 5 (regarding the encouragement of students to succeed) is the only question where the middle perceivers had a greater number of positive responses. On question 3, the high, middle, and low perceivers tended to agree that the goals of their schools were academic in nature. Only two low perceivers indicated otherwise. I did not view the responses to question 6 as being positive or negative. The high perceivers tended to be more in agreement on what they desire to change regarding their schools. The cross-case analysis and the Spradley analysis tend to reinforce each other. The findings of both analyses indicate that high perceivers tended to be more alike than in other domains, and the high perceivers tended to have more positive attributes (in reference to the observations and interview questions.)
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

I designed this study to explore the relationship between school social climate and individual student achievement. There has been a historical search to explain factors that play the greatest explanatory role in student achievement. The findings of some studies suggest that school factors have very little to do with the achievement of students while the findings of other research studies indicate that school factors play the greatest explanatory role in student achievement.

School social climate tends to be more intangible while race, gender, and socioeconomic status tend to relate to the structure of the school. However, they are nonschool variables because these characteristics are already embedded in a child prior to their arrival at a particular school.

Although researchers have done many studies attempting to link various factors to student achievement, few researchers have looked at the achievement of individual students. It is crucial to look at individual students in every aspect of our schools because individuals have different needs that must be addressed.

This study has four independent variables - school social climate, race, gender, and socioeconomic status,
and one dependent variable - individual student achievement. Race, gender, and socioeconomic status are very important factors because students have very little control over them, and must adjust to the environments of their schools regardless of their specific characteristics. Martin (1992) describes the race, gender, and socioeconomic status of students as a part of the "baggage" that students carry with them to school.

School social climate (the perceptions of the students regarding their schools) is very important. Psychology teaches us that student perceptions can influence behaviors as well as interactions. Therefore, it is important for students to have positive perceptions so that they may be involved in positive behaviors and interactions. Behavior as well as certain interactions may affect student achievement. Of course, individual student achievement is important because it is one of the goals of schooling. It is the one measure that we have of academic development in students.

I addressed four research hypotheses in this study. Hypothesis 1 focuses on the relationship between school social climate and individual student achievement. Hypothesis 2 focuses on the relationship between race and individual student achievement.
Hypothesis 3 focuses on the relationship between gender and individual student achievement, and hypothesis 4 focuses on the relationship between socioeconomic status and individual student achievement. I hypothesized that school social climate, race, gender, and socioeconomic status share relationships with individual student achievement.

In this study, I approached the problem through a mixed methodology using both quantitative and qualitative techniques. The quantitative method allowed the data to be gathered from a large sample of students in Schools A, B, C, and D, while the qualitative method provided a more in-depth study of individual students in Schools A, B, C, and D.

Summary of Findings

Quantitative Findings

The quantitative results of this study, based on the survey of 2 high school juniors, show that race is the greatest predictor of individual student achievement using LEAP scores as a measure of individual student achievement. School social climate determined by student sense of academic futility, gender, and socioeconomic status were also found to contribute; however, these contributions were not very significant.
Using LEAP scores as the measure of individual student achievement, 1.4% of the variance is explained by race. The parameter estimates indicate that positive relationships exist for each of the independent variables except socioeconomic status. The following is the resulting multiple regression equation using the beta weights: Student achievement = 992.7 + 5.5 race + 3.17 gender + 0.9 SES + 0.09 SSC (SSAF).

Nine hundred and ninety-two is the intercept. This intercept represents the lowest possible score for achievement based on the analysis. This indicates that no other variables have entered the study, and very little error has entered the regression equation. In addition, 7.6 units of an unknown variable is explaining achievement (a variable not accounted for in this study). This unknown variable is also sharing an inverse relationship with student achievement.

**Qualitative Findings**

Observations and interviews were conducted in the four schools where high school juniors were surveyed (Schools A, B, C, and D). The data from the case studies were analyzed through the use of within case and cross-case analysis techniques. In each of the four schools, six students were observed and interviewed. The students were compared and contrasted on the basis of class schedules and interactions,
social interactions, perceptions of school, as well as other notions that are presented in the Spradley and cross-case analyses.

In each school, I discovered that the perceptions of the students as well as some other characteristics were diverse. There were also characteristics that were shared by individuals. I identified some of the characteristics that were alike or different on the basis of the domain. In School A, the two high perceivers were females - one black and one white with relatively the same grade point average (GPA). The middle perceivers were also of the same race but they were males with an above average GPA. The low perceivers were two black females with average GPA's.

In School B, the high perceivers were white but one was a male and one was a female with the same GPA. The middle perceivers were both white females with relatively the same GPA; the low perceivers were both African American males and possessed relatively the same GPA. In School C, the high perceivers were both white females with relatively the same GPA's. The middle perceivers were also two white females; however, the GPA's were rather different. The low perceivers were white females with the exact same GPA. In School D, the high perceivers were two females with high GPA's. One was white, and one was black. The middle
perceivers were a white male and a black female with the same GPA. The low perceivers were boys - one white and one black, with rather different GPA's.

Across schools and domains, the high perceivers tended to be the group that share the most characteristics. This was recognized in the Spradley analysis as well as in the cross-case analysis. The high perceivers tended to respond more positively to the interview questions, and they were the group of students in schools with the highest perceptions regarding the school social climate (student academic norms, student sense of academic futility, future evaluation and expectations, perceived present evaluation and expectation, and perception of teacher push and norms).

Across schools, the high perceivers that were interviewed and observed tended to be white females with high grade-point averages (3.5 and 4.0) and LEAP scores that were above the mean. These students also expressed the greatest interest in college; some identified specific fields of study as well as specific universities that they would like to attend. These students were also at least in the middle group (not eating free lunch /middle income level) in terms of economic status. I thought it noteworthy that across
schools and domains, students were most different on the basis of social interactions.

Qualitative Research as Confirmation for Quantitative Findings

The qualitative findings support the quantitative findings and also provide clarifications and details (Patton, 1990). The quantitative findings indicate that school social climate, race, gender, and socioeconomic status share a slight relationship with individual student achievement. Race was the greatest predictor of student achievement using the LEAP scores as a measure of achievement. The qualitative results generally suggest that relationships exist with school social climate and individual student achievement, gender and individual student achievement, race and achievement, and socioeconomic status and achievement.

Although I am unable to statistically measure or give a correlation to the qualitative findings, patterns indicate that the relationships exist. The students with the highest perceptions in schools tended to be females, with high grade point averages in at least the middle range (social class) in terms of socioeconomic status. Therefore, there is a direct relationship with these variables - perception (school social climate,) race, gender, socioeconomic status and individual student achievement. The middle perceivers tended to be white with relatively the same grade point
averages. Therefore, a positive relationship exists with race and grade point average (individual student achievement). The low perceivers were of diverse races and genders; yet, they have the lowest grade point averages and the lowest perceptions regarding school social climate. Therefore, a direct relationship exists between school social climate and achievement.

Additional Depth from Qualitative Research

The qualitative findings support the quantitative findings and tend to add additional insight. I observed the responses from the interview questions and the observations on the rank of the perceptions of the students (high, middle, and low perceivers). Patterns in the data helped to confirm relationships and provide additional information.

Most high and middle perceivers tended to respond positively to the interview questions and demonstrated good class behavior (attentive, and responsive in class). Low perceivers tended to respond more negatively to the interview questions, and they demonstrated less positive behaviors in class. The quantitative data analyses suggest that relationships exist with achievement and school social climate, race, gender, and socioeconomic status. The qualitative data give in depth confirmation with specifics of students classified as high perceivers (students with the
highest perceptions in schools). White females are the students across schools who tend to possess the highest perception; they possess the highest grade point averages; and they are in at least the middle income level in terms of socioeconomic status. Therefore, the specific race, gender, grade point average, and socioeconomic status of students in domains are made known through the qualitative analysis. The quantitative analysis tells me that relationships exist; through the qualitative analysis, I grasp an understanding of specific characteristics of students.

The low perceivers in each school tended to be representative of the racial differences in each school. In Schools A and D, the two predominantly black high schools, the low perceivers were black. Three of the four low perceivers in Schools B and C were white. Schools B and C are the predominantly white schools. Therefore, the low perceivers in each school are representative of the majority population of the schools. This was not the case with respect to the high and middle perceivers. Across schools, low perceivers obviously share the lowest perception of the school and represent the majority population of the school. This notion may explain the uniqueness of each school with respect to the student populations and student perceptions.
I previously alluded to the notion that students across schools and domains were most different with regard to social relations/interactions. I observed that no patterns existed with respect to domains (high, middle, and low perceivers). Therefore, it may be assumed that perception and student achievement did not share a relationship with the social interactions of students. Some high perceivers and high achievers were talkers and mixers, and some were not. Similar notions were also true regarding middle and low perceivers.

The qualitative analyses also add insight to the differences within schools regarding the perceptions of the students, teachers, and the principal. In School's A, C, and D the principal, teachers, and students have relatively the same perceptions. In School's A and C, the principal, teachers, and students are middle perceivers. The principal, teachers, and students in School A are low perceivers. The principal in School A does possess a higher perception than the teachers when using the mean. In School B, the principal has a high perception; the teachers have a middle perception; and the students have a low perception. This data support the conceptual framework.

The Findings and Relations to the Literature

The quantitative findings indicate that only slight relationships exist with individual student
achievement and school social climate, race, gender, and socioeconomic status. Although I am unable to quantify the significance, patterns in the qualitative data indicate that relationships also exist. The results of the study support some of the findings of previous studies. In the multiple regression analyses, race was found to share the stronger relationships with individual student achievement. Arnold's (1995) findings were similar. He found that the differences in achievement were primarily due to race and gender. The governor's office in South Carolina also reported that differences in student achievement are due to race and gender.

The findings of the study do not support the notion that socioeconomic status bears a strong relationship with student achievement. Socioeconomic status bears a relationship but not a strong relationship. Coleman et al. (1966) and Mayeske et al. (1975) suggested that socioeconomic status bears a strong relationship with academic achievement. Furthermore, Coleman et al. (1966) discovered that schools accounted for little or none of the differences in student achievement when socioeconomic status was statistically controlled.

According to Ogawa and Miskel (1988), few or no research studies have been done linking school social
climate (as defined by the cultural component of the Taguirian typology) to individual student achievement. Therefore, the findings of this study provide a basis for further research. I suggest that a marginal relationship exists between school social climate and individual student achievement.

In much of the previous literature [Coleman et al. (1966) and Brookover et al. (1979)] race, socioeconomic status, and gender have been found to correlate significantly with student achievement. This was not the case in the first analysis. Therefore, I conducted a second correlation analysis. In the second analysis, I used the LEAP scores individually. That is, I did not average the language arts, mathematics, and written composition scores as a measure of achievement. I entered each score separately - achievement 1, achievement 2, achievement 3 respectively. The results of this analysis illustrate that language arts and mathematics share a strong correlation with race. In addition, gender and language arts and socioeconomic status and language arts share a strong correlation. Grade point average also correlated significantly with gender (See Appendix I).

In summary, several findings of this study support the findings of previous studies. Race, socioeconomic status, and gender are traditional factors that have
been found to affect student achievement. Although the relationships are slight, the findings of this study support the results of previous studies. Several of the findings of previous studies suggest that socioeconomic status bears a strong relationship with individual student achievement. However, the findings of this study do not suggest a strong relationship between individual student achievement and socioeconomic status. Walberg and Fowler (1987) provide a possible explanation as to why a marginal relationship exists with achievement and socioeconomic status in this study. They (1987) suggest that the association of socioeconomic status is larger when "aggregated units such as schools, districts, and states rather than individual children are not analyzed" (p. 5). In this study, the unit of analysis is individual children.

Conclusions and Discussions

The qualitative and quantitative results show that positive relationships exist with individual student achievement and school social climate (student sense of academic futility,) race, gender, and socioeconomic status. The qualitative results indicate that patterns exist across domains (which is primarily across specific classifications of perceptions) with respect to achievement, race, socioeconomic status, and gender.
This reinforces or is consistent with the findings of the statistics. In the multiple regression equation, the parameter estimates are positive (with the exception of socioeconomic status) and illustrate that the independent variables [(race, gender, school social climate (student sense of academic futility)] share a relationship with individual student achievement.

Apart from the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis, a dominant theme emerged from this study of school social climate and individual student achievement in rural high schools. The qualitative findings are indicative of the fact that schools and students shared many characteristics; however, there are characteristics that are unique to each school; there are also characteristics about individual students that distinguish them from each other. Individuality of schools and individuality of students was a consistent "emerging theme."

The results of this study give meaning to several factors. All the independent variables play a role in the individual achievement levels of students. However, there is a variable or variables that is/are not accounted for in this study that plays/play a tremendous explanatory role in the individual achievement levels of students. Other studies have indicated that each of the variables studied play a
role in student achievement; the big difference is that
I have found these variables to play a slight role, and
I have focused on the role with respect to the
individual achievement levels of students.

This study does not give the "big explanatory
variable in student achievement". The findings support
the contention that it is difficult to link a variable
or variables to student achievement. I think that it
also stresses the need to look at schools and students
on an individual basis. Perhaps, the greatest
predictor of student achievement is different on an
individual basis.

The sample for the study was restricted to rural
schools in southeastern Louisiana. Rural, urban, and
suburban are the three basic types of school
environments. Researchers tend to conduct studies
focusing on one school type, and the findings apply to
the specific school environments. In addition,
researchers (DeYounger, 1987; Conklin & Obson, 1988)
suggest that rural schools possess certain
characteristics regardless of the geographic location
within the United States. Therefore, the findings of
this study apply to rural schools in the country.

Recommendations for Further Study

One of the major themes of the study is that
only slight relationships exist with the independent
variables studied and individual student achievement. This study does support the conceptual framework - each school has a unique climate. Students interpret and give meanings based on their perceptions of the climate (this is supported by the qualitative analysis). Students will act and interact based on the interpretations. Individuality is stressed in the results of the study with respect to the schools as well as with respect to individual students.

The practical implication that the study raises is the need for educators and practitioners to address the individuality of students in schools specifically in classrooms. Madeline Hunter (1979) supports this idea with her theory on learning. She states that each child should be provided the opportunity to learn in his/her on preferred learning style. Humanists also support the view with their belief that individual students should be provided with care, love, and compassion in schools.

The theories of Hunter and the humanists became evident in classrooms. I recognized that in some instances one dominant teaching methodology was being used throughout an entire school. Therefore, it is almost impossible that each child is being provided with the notions that Hunter suggests because students posses different learning styles. Some of the students
that I observed had their heads down in class which gives possible support to Hunter's notion. In some of the interviews, students also suggested a need for human elements in schools. The following were among the comments, "I wish teachers were more helpful," "special groups are treated better," and "I wish that all teachers were as helpful as my resource teachers."

I am not suggesting that the stressing of individuality in schools will solve all of the problems and/or concerns; however, these notions seemed most evident in the study. Furthermore, the views of Hunter and the humanists are only two methods by which individuality may be addressed.

The practical implication of the need to stress individuality of students provides a basis for theoretical implications. Many of our theorists discuss their theories in relation to average or means of students. More attention should be given to individualization. This may be difficult to accomplish; however, a starting point may be to look more closely at how individual students learn and interact. The qualitative analysis - observing individual students illustrates this notion well. Another generalization for theorists is that caution should be taken in attempts to generalize findings of means to individuals.
I think that several additional adjustments may be useful in attempting to gain further insight regarding the hypotheses in this study. The basis for selecting schools is primarily useful (Schools were all rural, about the same size, racially different, and at or near the state's average in passage rate of LEAP). However, it would be useful to survey the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th graders in each school (to gain a broader insight of perceptions in schools). The Likert-type Brookover survey is appropriate. I think it would also be useful to do distinct analyses with respect to individual schools with students as the unit of analysis. Observations and interviews could also be conducted on the basis of the scores of the students.

Additional research should be done regarding the use of multiple regression as the statistical tool, and case studies would remain the method for reporting qualitative data. It may be more practical for future researchers to focus the analysis on individual schools as opposed to utilizing some larger unit of analysis.

In this study, I have identified some factors that are important in schools with respect to achievement and emphasized the need of individuality (look at schools as individual schools and students as individual students). The problem area is with the necessity to address the needs of individual students.
Dramatic improvements can be made in school if we begin to concentrate attention on the individuality of each school and the individual needs of each student. The first step toward reformation is recognition of the fact that we tend to generalize too much; then individual schools must plan to address the individual needs of their students based on the characteristics of student populations which includes the race, gender, socioeconomic status, and achievement level of individual students. Plans in each school should take into consideration the unique student populations and the diversity of needs in particular schools. Students must also be encouraged to do well; they must be encouraged to achieve.
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APPENDIX A: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: We are trying to learn more about students and their work in schools. We would therefore like you to respond as honestly as possible to the following questions.

1. Name ______________________
   Please answer the following questions by writing the number of the best answer in the front of the question.
   _____2. How old were you on your last birthday?
       1. 16  2. 17  3. 18  4. 19
   _____3. Are you a female or male?
       1. female  2. male
   _____4. What grade are you in?
       1. 11th  2. Special education
   5. Please write your homeroom's teacher's name.
       ______________________
   6. Please write the name of your school.
       ______________________
   _____7. How many years have you been at this school?
       1. Less than one year  2. One year  3. Two years  4. Three years  5. Four years
   8. What type of work does your father do? (Give Brief description.)
       ______________________
   9. If you could go as far as you wanted to in school, how far would you like to go.
       1. Finish high school  2. Go to college  3. Finish college  4. Obtain a master's  5. Obtain more than a master's
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10. Sometimes what you want to happen is not what will happen. How far do you think you will go in school?
   1. Finish high school
   2. Go to college for a while
   3. Finish college
   4. Obtain a master's
   5. Obtain more than a master's

11. How many students in this school try hard to get a good grade?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most of them
   3. Half of them
   4. Some of them
   5. Almost none

12. How many students in this school will work hard to get a better grade on their weekly tests than their friends do?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most of them
   3. Half of them
   4. Some of them
   5. Almost none

13. How many students in this school do not care if they get bad grades?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most of them
   3. Half of them
   4. Some of them
   5. Almost none

14. How many students in this school do more studying for weekly tests than they have to?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most of them
   3. Half of them
   4. Some of them
   5. Almost none

15. If most of the students here could go as far as they wanted in school, how far would they go?
   1. Finish high school
   2. Go to college
   3. Finish college
   4. Obtain a master's
   5. Obtain above master's
16. How important is it to you to be a good student?
   1. Very important
   2. Important
   3. Somewhat important
   4. Not very important
   5. Not important at all

17. How important do most of the students in the 12th grade feel it is to do well in school?
   1. They feel it is very important.
   2. They feel it is important.
   3. They feel it is somewhat important.
   4. They feel it is not very important.
   5. They feel it is not important at all.

18. How important do you think most of the students in this school feel it is to do well in school?
   1. They feel it is very important.
   2. They feel it is important.
   3. They feel it is somewhat important.
   4. They feel it is not very important.
   5. They feel it is not important at all.

19. How many students in the 11th grade think reading is a fun thing to do and read even when they do not have to?
   1. Almost none of them
   2. Most of them
   3. About half of them
   4. Some of them
   5. None of them

20. How many students in this school make fun or tease students who get good grades?
   1. Almost all of them
   2. Most of them
   3. About half
   4. Some of them
   5. None of them

21. How many students do not do as well as they could do because they are afraid others will not like them?
   1. Almost all of them
   2. Most of them
   3. About half
   4. Some of them
   5. None of them
22. How many students do not do as well as they could do because they are afraid their friends will not like them?
1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. About half
4. Some of them
5. None of them

23. How many students in this school would study hard if their work was not graded by teachers?
1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. About half
4. Some of them
5. None of them

24. People like me will not have much of a chance to do what we want to in life.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

25. People like me will never do well in school even though we try hard.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

26. I can do well in school if I work hard.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

27. In this school, students like me do not have luck.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

28. You have to be lucky to get good grades in this school.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree
29. Think or your friends. Do you think you can do school work better, the same or poorer than your friends?
1. Better than them
2. Better than most
3. About half
4. Poorer than most
5. Poorer than all

30. Think of the students in your classes. Do you think you can do school work better?
1. Better than them
2. Better than most
3. About half
4. Poorer than most
5. Poorer than all

31. When you finish high school, how do you think you will rank?
1. One of the best
2. Better than most
3. Same as most
4. Below most
5. One of the worst

32. Do you think you could finish college?
1. Yes, for sure
2. Yes, probably
3. Maybe
4. No, probably not
5. No, for sure

33. If you went to college, do you think you would be one of the best, same, or below most of the students?
1. One of the best
2. Better than most
3. Same as most
4. Below most
5. One of the worst

34. If you want to be a doctor or a teacher, you need more than four years of college. Do you think you can do that?
1. Yes, for sure
2. Yes, probably
3. Maybe
4. No, probably not
5. No, for sure
35. Forget how your teachers mark your work. How good do you think your own work is?
1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Average
4. Below Average
5. Poor

36. What kind of grades do you think you really can get if you try?
1. Mostly A's
2. Mostly B's
3. Mostly C's
4. Mostly D's
5. Mostly F's

37. How far do you think your best friend believes you will go in school?
1. Finish high school
2. Attend college
3. Finish college
4. Obtain a master's
5. Obtain above a master's

38. Of the teachers that you know in this school, how many tell students to try hard to do better on tests?
1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. Half of them
4. Some of them
5. Almost none

39. How many teachers in this school tell students to try and get better grades than their classmates?
1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. Half of them
4. Some of them
5. Almost none

40. Of the teachers that you know in this school, how many do not care if the students get bad grades?
1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. Half of them
4. Some of them
5. Almost none
41. Of the teachers that you know in this school, how many tell students to do extra work so that they can get better grades?

1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. Half of them
4. Some of them
5. Almost none of them

42. Of the teachers that you know in this school, how many make the students work too hard?

1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. Half of them
4. Some of them
5. Almost none

43. Of the teachers that you know in this school, how many do not care how hard the students work as long as he passes?

1. Almost all of them
2. Most of them
3. Half of them
4. Some of them
5. Almost none

44. How far do you think the teacher you like the best believes you will go in school?

1. Finish high school
2. Attend college
3. Finish college
4. Obtain a Master's
5. Obtain above a Master's

45. How good of a student does the teacher you like the best expect you to be in school?

1. One of the best
2. Better than most
3. Same as most
4. Not as good as most
5. One of the worst

46. Think of your teacher, would your teacher say you can do school work better, the same or poorer than other people your age?

1. Better than all of them
2. Better than most of them
3. Same as most
4. Poorer than most
5. Poorer than all of them
47. Would your teacher say that your grades would be with the best, same as most or below most of the students when you graduate from high school?
   1. One of the best
   2. Better than most
   3. Same as most
   4. Poorer than most
   5. One of the worst

48. How often do teachers in this school try to help students who do badly on their school work?
   1. They always try to help.
   2. They usually try to help.
   3. They sometimes try.
   4. They seldom try to help.
   5. They never try to help.

49. Compared to students in other schools, how much do students in this school learn?
   1. They learn a lot more.
   2. They learn a little more.
   3. They learn about the same.
   4. They learn a little less.
   5. They learn a lot less.

50. Compared to students from other schools, how well will most of the students in this school do in college?
   1. They will be among the best.
   2. They will be better than most.
   3. They will do about the same.
   4. They will do poorer than most.
   5. Among the worst.

51. How important is it to teachers in this school that their students learn their school work?
   1. It is most important.
   2. It is very important.
   3. It is somewhat important.
   4. It is not very important.
   5. It is not important at all.
52. Think about the teachers you know in this school. Do you think the teachers in this school care more, or less than teachers in other schools about whether or not their students learn their school work?
1. Teachers care a lot more
2. Teachers care a little more.
3. There is no difference.
4. Teachers care a little less.
5. Teachers care a lot less.

53. Does your teacher think you could finish college?
1. Yes, for sure
2. Yes, probably
3. Maybe
4. Probably not
5. No, for sure

54. Remember you need more than four years of college to be a teacher or doctor. Does your teacher think you could do that?
1. Yes, for sure
2. Yes, probably
3. Maybe
4. Probably not
5. No, for sure

55. How far do you think your parents believe you will go in school?
1. Finish high school
2. Attend college
3. Finish college
4. Obtain a master's
5. Obtain above a master's

56. How good of a student do your parents expect you to be in school?
1. One of the best
2. Better than most
3. Same as most
4. Not as good
5. One of the worst

57. Think of your parents. Do your parents say you can do school work better, the same, or poorer than your friends?
1. Better than them
2. Better than most of them
3. Same as most of them
4. Poorer than most of them
5. Poorer than all of them
58. Would your parents say that your grades would be with the best, same as most or below most of the students?
1. One of the best
2. Better than most
3. Same as most
4. Not as good as most
5. One of the worst

59. Do your parents think you could finish college?
1. Yes, for sure
2. Yes, probably
3. Maybe
4. No, probably not
5. No, for sure

60. Remember, you need more than four years of college to be a teacher or doctor. Do your parents think you can do that?
1. Yes, for sure
2. Yes, probably
3. Maybe
4. No, probably not
5. No, for sure

61. I can talk to other students while I work.
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

62. In class, I can move about the room without asking the teacher.
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

63. In class, I have the same seat and I must sit next to the same students.
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never
64. When I am working on a lesson, the other students in class are working on the same lesson.
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

65. In most of my classes, the teacher tells me what I must work on; I have no choice.
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

66. In class, the teacher stands in the front of the room and works with the class as a whole.
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

67. If your teacher gave you a hard assignment, would you rather figure out how to do it by yourself or would you want your teacher to tell you how to do it?
1. I almost always prefer figuring it out for myself.
2. I usually prefer figuring it out.
3. Sometimes I prefer figuring it out.
4. I usually like the teacher to tell me.
5. I always like the teacher to tell me.

68. When your teachers give you difficult assignments, do they usually give you too much help or not enough?
1. They almost give too much help.
2. They usually give too much help.
3. They give just enough help.
4. They usually do not give enough help.
5. They almost never give enough help.
69. Suppose you had some free time and wanted to do something fun but all your friends were busy and could not spend time with you. Do you think you could find something fun to do along?
1. Yes, it would be easy
2. Yes, it I tried hard
3. Maybe
4. No, probably not
5. No, it is never fun to be alone

70. Sometimes we are faced with a problem that at first seems difficult for us to handle. When this happens, how often do you try to solve the problem all by yourself instead of asking someone for help?
1. Always
2. Most of the time
3. Sometimes
4. Not very often
5. Never

71. Some people enjoy solving problems or making decisions all by themselves, other people do not enjoy it. Do you like to solve problems all by yourself?
1. I almost always like to
2. I usually like to
3. I like to sometimes
4. I usually do not like to
5. I almost never like to

72. Write your cumulative GPA.

73. Write your race in the blank.
APPENDIX B: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: The information which you give us on this questionnaire is completely confidential. No one will see your answers except the members of the research staff. Reports will be made with aggregate data, and no one person will be identified with his or her data. Do not respond to any question that you feel is too "personal" or that you for any other reason prefer to leave unanswered. Write the number of the selection in the blank provided.

Name ____________________

Please write the name of this school.

___3. Are you male or female?
   1. Male  2. Female

___4. What is your race or ethnic group?
   1. Black
   2. Chicano
   3. Other Spanish speaking
   4. Native American
   5. White

___5. How long have you taught at this school?
   1. This is my first year
   2. One to four years
   3. Five to nine years
   4. Ten or more years

___6. How long have you taught at this school?
   1. This is my first year
   2. One to four years
   3. Five to nine years
   4. Ten or more years

___7. What grade level(s) are you teaching?
   1. 9th
   2. 10th
   3. 11th
   4. 12th
   5. Combinations of Grade levels
8. How much formal preparation do you have?
   1. Less than a Bachelor's degree
   2. Bachelor's degree
   3. Some graduate work; less than Master's degree
   4. Master's degree
   5. More than Master's; not a Doctorate
   6. Doctorate

9. How did you feel about your assignment to this school before arriving?
   1. Very happy
   2. Somewhat happy
   3. No feelings one way or the other
   4. Somewhat unhappy
   5. Very unhappy

10. Which best describes the students in your classes?
    1. All children of professional and white collar
    2. Most children of professional and white collar
    3. Children from a general cross section or society
    4. Mostly children of professional and white collar
    5. All children of factory and blue collar workers
    6. Children of rural families

11. If you had your choice of school settings, which would you select from among the following?
    1. All children of professional and white collar
    2. Most children of professional and white collar
    3. Children from a general cross section or society
    4. Mostly children of professional and white collar
    5. All children of factory and blue collar workers
    6. Children of rural families
12. What kind of school do you prefer to work in as far as racial composition is concerned?
   1. All children of professional and white collar
   2. Most children of professional and white collar
   3. A school that has about half white and half non-white students
   4. A mostly non-white school but with some white students
   5. A school with all non-white students
   6. I have no preference

13. In your judgements, what is the general reputation of this school among teachers outside the school?
   1. Among the best
   2. Better than average
   3. About average
   4. Below average
   5. A poor school

14. If you had to choose a single one, which of the following sources of information do you think best predicts a pupil's success or failure in higher education?
   1. Teacher recommendations
   2. Group or individual intelligence test
   3. Other standardized test scores
   4. School grades
   5. Other

15. In general, how are students in the same grade level assigned to different classes?
   1. Homogeneous grouping according to ability
   2. Homogeneous by ability in some classes
   3. Heterogeneous grouping to ability
   4. Random grouping
   5. No intentional grouping
   6. Other indicate __________

16. In general, how do you group the students within classes?
   1. Homogenous grouping according to ability in all
   2. Homogenous grouping according to ability in some
   3. Heterogeneous gouging according to ability
   4. Random grouping
   5. No intentional grouping
17. How important do you think standardized intelligence test scores of your students are?
   1. Very important
   2. Somewhat important
   3. Not very important
   4. Not important at all
   5. We do not give intelligence tests in this school

18. How often do you refer to or consider the I.Q. test scores of your students when you plan their work?
   1. Very often
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Never

19. On the average, what level of achievement can be expected students in this school?
   1. Much above national norm
   2. Slightly above national norm
   3. Approximately at national norm
   4. Slightly below national norm
   5. Much below national norm

20. On the average, what level of achievement can be expected of the students in your class?
   1. Much above national norm
   2. Slightly above national norm
   3. Approximately at national norm
   4. Slightly below national norm

21. What percent of the students in this school do you expect of the students?
   1. 90% or more
   2. 70% to 89%
   3. 50% to 69%
   4. 30% to 49%
   5. Less than 30%

22. What percent of the students in this class do you expect to complete high school?
   1. 90% or more
   2. 70% to 89%
   3. 50% to 69%
   4. 30% to 49%
   5. Less than 30%
23. What percent of the students in this class do you expect to attend college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

24. What percent of students in your school do you expect to attend college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

25. What percent of the students in the school do you expect to complete college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

26. What percent of students in your class do you expect to complete college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

27. How many students in this school are capable of getting mostly A's and B's?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

28. How many of the students in your class are capable of getting mostly A's and B's?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%
29. How would you rate the academic ability of the students in this school compared to other schools?
1. Ability is much higher
2. Ability is somewhat higher
3. Ability is the same
4. Ability is somewhat lower
5. Ability is much lower

30. What percent of the students in this school would you say want to complete high school?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

31. What percent of the students in your class would you say want to complete high school?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

32. What percent of the students in this school would you say want to complete college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

33. What percent of the students in your class would you say want to go to college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

34. How much do you enjoy teaching in this school?
1. Very much
2. Much
3. Average
4. Little
5. Not at all
35. If someone were to offer you an interesting and secure nonteaching job for $1,000 more a year, how seriously would you consider taking the job?
   1. Very serious
   2. Somewhat serious
   3. Not very serious
   4. Not at all

36. If someone were to offer you an interesting and secure nonteaching job for $3,000 more a year, how seriously would you consider taking the job?
   1. Very serious
   2. Somewhat serious
   3. Not very serious
   4. Not at all

37. What percent of the students in this school do you think the principal expects to complete high school?
   1. 90% or more
   2. 70% to 89%
   3. 50% to 69%
   4. 30% to 49%
   5. Less than 30%

38. What percent of the students in this school do you think the principal expects to attend college?
   1. 90% or more
   2. 70% to 89%
   3. 50% to 69%
   4. 30% to 49%
   5. Less than 30%

39. What percent of the students in this school do you think the principal expects to complete college?
   1. 90% or more
   2. 70% to 89%
   3. 50% to 69%
   4. 30% to 49%
   5. Less than 30%
40. How many students in this school do you think the principal believe are capable of getting A's and B's?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

41. How do you think your principal rates the academic ability of the students in this school compared to others?
1. Much better
2. Somewhat better
3. The same
4. Somewhat lower
5. Much lower

42. Completion of high school is a realistic goal which you set for what percentage of your students?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

43. Completion of college is a realistic goal which you set for what percentage of your students?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% to 89%
3. 50% to 69%
4. 30% to 49%
5. Less than 30%

44. How often do you stress to your students the necessity of a post high school education for a good job?
1. Very often
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never
45. Do you encourage your students who do not have sufficient economic resources to aspire to go to college?
1. Always
2. Usually
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

46. Do you encourage your students who do not have sufficient academic ability to aspire to go to college?
1. Always
2. Usually
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

47. How many teachers in this school feel that all their students should be taught to read well and master other academic subjects, even though some students may not appear to be interested?
1. Almost all
2. Most
3. Half
4. Some
5. Almost none

48. It would be unfair for teachers in this school to insist on a higher level of achievement from students than they now seem capable of achieving?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

49. If I think a student is not able to do some school work, I should not try to push him very hard.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
50. I am generally very careful not to push students to a level of frustration.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Not sure
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree

51. How many teachers encourage students to seek extra school work so that the students can get better grades?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

52. How many students in this school try hard to improve on previous work?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

53. How many students in your class try hard to improve on previous work?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

54. How many students in this school will try hard to do better school work than their friends do?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

55. How many students in your class will try hard to do better school work than their classmates?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none
56. How many students in your school will try hard to do better school work than their classmates?
1. Almost all
2. Most
3. About half
4. Some
5. Almost none

57. How many students in your class are content to do less than they should?
1. Almost all
2. Most
3. About Half
4. Some
5. Almost none

58. How many students in this school will seek extra work so that they can get better grades?
1. Almost all
2. Most
3. About half
4. Some
5. Almost none

59. How many students in your class will seek extra work so that they can get better grades?
1. Almost all
2. Most
3. About half
4. Some
5. Almost none

60. The parents of the students in this school regard this school as a "babysitting" agency.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

61. The parents of students in this school are deeply concerned their children receive a top quality education.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
62. How many of the parents of students in this school expect their children to complete high school?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

63. How many of the parents of students in this school expect their children to complete college?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

64. How many of the parents of students in this school do not care if their children complete college?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

65. How many of the parents of students in this school want feedback from the principal and teachers on how their children are doing in school?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

66. For each of the following aspects of your job, please indicate in the first column how important it is for your job satisfaction and in the second column, how well satisfied you are with that aspect of the job.
   The following are the selections for A - L:
   I  1. Very important  II.  1. Very satisfied
      2. Important            2. Satisfied
      3. Somewhat important  3. Somewhat
      4. Unimportant         4. Dissatisfied
      5. Very unimportant    5. Very dissatisfied
67. Administrative duties, counseling, handling of discipline problems, etc, are all time consuming activities that teachers must assume in addition to their teaching responsibilities. Approximately what percentage of a typical day is spent with these activities?

%Parent teacher contracts
%Conferring with individual students about academics
%Conferring with individual students about behavior
%Classroom or small group instruction
%Establishing and maintaining order in classroom
%Administrative duties (record keeping)
%Time between lessons
100%Total

69. How successful would you say your school has been with regard to development in areas A-C? The following are the selections:
1. Very successful
2. Successful
3. Somewhat
4. Not very
5. Very unsuccessful
A. Teaching of academic skills
B. Enhancing of social skills
C. Personal growth and development
70. How responsible do you feel for a student’s academic achievement?
1. Very responsible
2. Responsible
3. Somewhat responsible
4. Not very responsible
5. Not responsible at all

71. To what extent do you think that teaching methods affect student achievement?
1. They have a great effect.
2. They have a substantial effect.
3. They have some effect.
4. They do not have much effect.
5. They have no effect.

72. To what extent do you think teachers' attitude toward their students affect their students' achievement?
1. They have a great effect.
2. They have a substantial effect.
3. They have some effect.
4. They do not have much effect.
5. They have no effect.

73. How do your academic expectations for boys compare with the expectations for girls?
1. I expect boys to do better.
2. I expect both to do the same.
3. I expect girls to do better.

74. What effect do you think each of the following (A- F) has on students' academic achievement?
The following are the selections:
1. They have a great effect.
2. They have a substantial effect.
3. They have some effect.
4. They do not have much effect.
5. They have no effect.
A. Parents
B. Teachers
C. Friends or peer groups
D. School Boards
E. Principal
F. Student himself
75. How often does the principal and/or other administrators in this school assist and give support to the teachers on ways to improve their students' academic achievement?
1. Very often
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

76. One important criterion for evaluating a teacher's performance should be how well his/her students achieve?
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

77. In this school, there is really very little a teacher can do to insure that all of his/her students achieve.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

78. When you are trying to improve your instructional program, how easy or difficult is to get the principal's assistance?
1. Very easy
2. Easy
3. Varies from time to time
4. Difficult
5. Very difficult

79. What is your policy with regard to students talking to each other while they are working on class assignments?
Students are:
1. Never encouraged to talk
2. Seldom encouraged to talk
3. Sometimes encouraged to talk
4. Often encouraged to talk
5. Almost always encouraged
80. How do you feel about students walking around in the classroom?
   Students are
   1. Never allowed to move without permission
   2. Seldom allowed to move without permission
   3. Sometimes allowed to move without permission
   4. Often encouraged to move without permission
   5. Almost always encouraged to move without permission

81. What kind of seating arrangement do you have in your classes?
   1. Students always select their own seats.
   2. Generally students select their own seats.
   3. Some select their own seats
   4. Generally teacher assigns seats
   5. Teacher always assigns seats

82. In your classes, how often are students seats changed?
   1. Daily
   2. Periodically during the semester
   3. They keep the same seat

83. How often do you work with your class as a whole?
   1. Always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Never

84. How often are all of your students working on the same lesson?
   1. Always
   2. Often
   3. Sometimes
   4. Seldom
   5. Never
85. How would you characterize your teaching objectives?
1. They are the same for all students.
2. They are the same for most of the students.
3. They are the same for some of the students.
4. They are different for most of the students.
5. They are different for each student.

86. How important are each of the following in determining teaching objectives for your students?
The following are the selections:
1. Very important
2. Important
3. Somewhat important
4. Not very important
5. Very unimportant
   A. School Policy
   B. Student Interest
   C. Individual student ability
   D. Your personal preference

87. Do you have a teacher’s aide?
1. Yes
2. No

88. What proportion of your students’ parents do you know when you see them?
1. Nearly all
2. About 75%
3. About 50%
4. About 25%
5. Only a few
APPENDIX C: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: The information that you give us on this questionnaire is completely confidential. No one will see your answers except members of our research staff. Complete confidentiality is assured. Write the number of the most appropriate choice in the blank that proceeds the question/statement.

1. Name ______________________

2. Please write the name of this school.

______________________________

3. Sex (Write the number in the blank).
   1. Female
   2. Male

4. What is your race or ethnic group?
   1. Black
   2. Chicano
   3. Other Spanish Speaking
   4. Native America
   5. Oriental Origin
   6. White

5. How long have you been the principal of this school?
   1. Just this year
   2. One to four years
   3. Five to nine years
   4. Ten to fourteen years
   5. Fifteen years or more

6. How long have you been a principal?
   1. Just this year
   2. One to four years
   3. Five to nine years
   4. Ten to fourteen years
   5. Fifteen years or more

7. How long did you teach before becoming a principal?
   1. Never taught
   2. One to four years
   3. Five to nine years
   4. Ten to fourteen years
   5. Fifteen years or more
8. How did you feel about your assignment to this school before you came here?
1. Very happy
2. Happy
3. Somewhat happy
4. Quite unhappy
5. Very unhappy

9. Which best describes the location of your school?
1. Rural area
2. Industrial suburb
3. Small town

10. Which best describes the pupils served by this school?
1. All children of professional and white collar workers
2. Mostly children of professional and white collars
3. Children from a general cross section of society
4. Mostly children of factory and blue collar workers
5. All children of factory and blue collar workers
6. Children of rural families

11. How many families of your students are represented at typical meeting of the PTA or similar parent group?
1. We have no parent organizations
2. Only a few
3. Less than half
4. About half
5. Over half
6. Almost all

12. About what is the average daily percentage of attendance in your school?
1. Over 90%
2. Between 89% and 70%
3. Between 69% and 50%
4. Between 49% and 30%
5. Less than 30%

13. What percentage of your students this year are transfers from another school?
1. 0% to 10%
2. 11% to 15%
3. 15% to 20%
14. What is the lowest grade in your school?
   1. 9th
   2. 10th

15. What percent on students in your school receive free lunches each day?
   1. None
   2. 9% or less
   3. 10%- 30%
   4. 31%- 50%
   5. More than 50%

16. In your judgment, what is the general reputation of this school among educators?
   1. Among the best
   2. Better than average
   3. About average
   4. Below average
   5. Inferior

17. With regard to student achievement, how you rate this school?
   1. Among the best
   2. Better than average
   3. About average
   4. Below average
   5. Inferior

18. With regard to student achievement, how good a school do you think this school can be?
   1. Among the best
   2. Better than average
   3. About average
   4. Below average
   5. Inferior

19. What do you consider to be the school's primary responsibility to the students?
   1. Teaching of academic subjects
   2. Enhancing social skills
   3. Personal growth and development
   4. Education/occupational aspirations
   5. Other
20. How successful would you say your school has been with regard to student development in the following areas?
The following are the selections:
1. Very successful
2. Successful
3. Somewhat successful
4. Not very successful
5. Very unsuccessful

A. Teaching of academic skills
B. Enhancing social skills
C. Personal growth and development
D. Educational/occupational aspirations

21. In general, what grouping procedure is practiced across sections of particular grade levels in this school?
1. Homogeneous grouping
2. Heterogeneous grouping
3. Random grouping
4. No intentional grouping

22. In general, what grouping procedure is practiced within individual sections of particular grade levels?
1. Homogeneous grouping
2. Heterogeneous grouping
3. Random grouping
4. No intentional grouping

23. To what extent do the teachers individualize the instructional programs for their students?
1. All individualize
2. Most have some individualization
3. Individualization varies from teacher to teacher
4. Most teachers have common programs
5. All teachers have common programs

24. Do you have any non-graded classrooms for children in your school?
1. Yes, all are non-graded
2. Yes, some are non-graded
3. No, we do not have non-graded
25. What proportion of the classrooms in your school has teacher aides?
1. All
2. Some
3. None

26. How many teachers in this school have at least a Bachelor's degree?
1. All
2. 75% or more
3. 50% - 74%
4. Less than 50%

27. How many teachers in this school have a provisional teaching certificate?
1. 75% or more
2. 50% - 74%
3. 25% - 49%
4. Less than 25%

28. How many teachers in this school have a permanent teaching certificate?
1. 75% or more
2. 50% - 74%
3. 25% - 49%
4. Less than 25%

29. How many teachers in this school have a graduate degree?
1. 75% or more
2. 50% - 74%
3. 25% - 49%
4. Less than 25%

30. In what grade does your school give intelligence or aptitude tests to students?
1. 9th
2. 10th
3. 11th
4. 12th
5. Do not give

31. In what grades does your school give standardized achievement tests to students?
1. 9th
2. 10th
3. 11th
4. 12th
5. Do not give
32. How often do teachers in this school refer to or consider a student's I.Q. or aptitude score for planning his/her work?
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

33. In this school, how often are students assigned to certain classes on the basis of their I.Q.?
1. Always
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

34. Which of the following do you think best predicts a pupil's success or failure in higher education?
1. Teacher recommendations
2. Group or individualized intelligence test
3. Other standardized test
4. School grades
5. Other

35. On average, what achievement level can be expected of the students in this school?
1. Much above national norm
2. Slightly above national norm
3. Approximately above national norm
4. Slightly below national norm
5. Much below national norm

36. What percent of the students in this school do you expect to complete high school?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% - 89%
3. 50% - 69%
4. 30% - 49%
5. Less than 30%

37. What percent of the students in this school do you expect to attend college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% - 89%
3. 50% - 69%
4. 30% - 49%
5. Less than 30%
38. What percent of the students in this school do you expect to complete college?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% - 89%
3. 50% - 69%
4. 30% - 49%
5. Less than 30%

39. How many of the students in this school are capable of getting good grades?
1. 90% or more
2. 70% - 89%
3. 50% - 69%
4. 30% - 49%
5. Less than 30%

40. How would you rate the academic ability of the students in this school compared to other schools?
1. Ability here is much larger
2. Ability here is somewhat larger
3. Ability here is about the same
4. Ability here is somewhat lower
5. Ability here is much lower

41. The parents of students in this school regard this school as a "baby sitting" agency.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Unsure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

42. The parents of students in this school are deeply concerned that their children receive top quality education.
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Unsure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

43. How many of the parents of students in this school expect their children to complete high school?
1. Almost all
2. Most
3. About half
4. Some
5. Almost none
44. How many of the parents of students in this school expect their children to complete college?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

45. How many of the parents in this school do not care if their children obtain low grades?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

46. How many of the parents of students in this school want feedback from the principal and teachers on how their children are doing in school?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Some
   5. Almost none

47. What proportion of the teachers in this school would prefer to be teaching in another school?
   1. About all
   2. About 75%
   3. About 50%
   4. About 25%
   5. Almost none

48. A typical teacher in this school has some contact with:
   1. All parents
   2. Most parents
   3. Some parents
   4. A few parents
   5. None of the parents

49. How much contact does a typical teacher have with most of the parents?
   1. About once a month
   2. About two times a semester
   3. About once a semester
   4. Once a year or less
50. Approximately what percentage of a typical school day does the average teacher spend on each of these activities?

____% Parent-teacher contact
____% Conferring with individual schools
____% Conferring with individual students
____% Administrative duties
____% Establishing and maintain order in classes
____% Classroom and small group instruction
____% Time between lessons
____% Other ___________________

100% Total

51. Evaluating teachers' performance is an important and often difficult tasks for principals. When evaluating a teacher's performance, how much importance do you place on his/her students academic achievement?

1. It is very important
2. It is quite important
3. It is somewhat important
4. It is not very important
5. It is not important at all

52. As a principal, how much effect do you think you have on students' academic achievement?

1. Very great effect
2. Substantial effect
3. Some effect
4. Very little effect
5. No effect at all

53. What effect do you think each of the following (A - F) has on students' academic achievement? The following are the selections:

1. They have a great effect.
2. They have a substantial effect.
3. They have some effect.
4. They do not have much effect.
5. They have no effect.

A. Parents  
B. Teachers  
C. Friends or peers  
D. School boards  
E. Principal
54. How often do you meet with the teachers as a group to discuss ways of improving student achievement?
1. Very often
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

55. How often do you suggest ways of improving student achievement to teachers?
1. Very often
2. Often
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. Never

56. To what extent do you think teaching methods affect students' academic achievement?
1. They have a great effect.
2. They have a substantial effect.
3. They have some effect.
4. They do not have much effect.
5. They have no effect.

57. To what extent do you think that a teacher's attitude towards his/her students affect academic achievement?
1. It has a great effect.
2. It has a substantial effect.
3. It has some effect.
4. It does not have much effect.
5. It has no effect.

58. To what extent do you think the degree to which their students achieve grade level in learning should be considered in evaluating a teacher's competence?
1. Very much
2. Some
3. Not much
4. Not at all
59. If the teachers and other staff members in this school were all doing their job well, nearly all of the students would achieve at grade level.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Not sure
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree

60. It is the principal's responsibility to work with the teachers to insure that their students achieve.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Not sure
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree

61. It is possible for a principal, with the cooperation of the teachers, to change a low achieving school into a high achieving school.
   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Not sure
   4. Disagree
   5. Strongly disagree

62. How would you characterize the achievement objectives in this school?
   1. Same for all
   2. Same for most
   3. Different for most
   4. Different for all

63. About what proportion of teachers in this school assign seats to their students?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Few
   5. Almost none

64. About what proportion of teachers in this school allow their students to move about the classroom without asking permission?
   1. Almost all
   2. Most
   3. About half
   4. Few
   5. Almost none
65. What proportion of the classrooms in your school have teacher aides?
1. All
2. Most
3. About half
4. Less than half
5. None

66. What percentage of your time in a typical week is devoted to each of the following activities?

% Long range curriculum planning
% Supervision of instructional staff
% Supervision of non-instructional staff
% Parent and community concerns
% Discipline
% Other administrative duties
100% Total

67. What proportion of these students' parents do you know when you see them?
1. Nearly all
2. About 75%
3. About 50%
4. About 25%
5. Only a few

68. In general, how do your students' parents feel about the achievement of their children?
1. Nearly all feel that they are doing well.
2. Most think students are achieving as well as they could.
3. Most think students are not achieving high enough.
4. Nearly all think they are not achieving high enough.

69. In general, how do you feel about the achievement of the students in this school?
1. Nearly all are achieving as well as they can.
2. Most are achieving as well as they can.
3. Less than half are achieving as well as they can.
4. Only a few are achieving as well as they can.
## APPENDIX D: SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Included Terms</th>
<th>Semantic Relationship</th>
<th>Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High perceiver</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle perceiver</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low perceiver</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0, 3.5, 2.0, 2.5</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8, 3.3, 3.2</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college preparatory</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocational</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleeping</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inattentive</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attentive</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unprepared</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on-task</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off-task</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staring</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class interaction</td>
<td>is a place for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td>is a place for</td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social interaction</td>
<td>is a place for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books</td>
<td>is used for (in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pencils</td>
<td>is used for (in)</td>
<td>class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper (notebook)</td>
<td>is used for (in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pencils</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talkative</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people's person</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserve/quiet</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation initiator</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>is a kind of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

231
basketball team
dance team
pep squad
cheerleader
art club is a kind of student
4-H affiliation
tennis team
beta club
FHA
student council
front
middle is a kind of position
back
early
late is a kind of arrival
college
military
vocational school is a kind of ambition
Likes
Dislikes is a kind of feeling
Okay
academic
sport is a kind of goal
APPENDIX E: TAXONOMIES OF SCHOOL A

High perceivers (named on the basis of class behavior)

Silent achiever
Preparer (comes to class ready)
Motivationalist
Ambitionists (ambitious)

Assertive, Aggressive Achiever
Talker
Joker
Mixer
Worker (does assignments)

Middle Perceivers (named on the basis of ambition; trader pursing vocational curriculum; pursuer-college)

Trader
Sleeper
Reservoir (reserved)
Passivor (passive)

Pursuer
Preparer (ready for class)
Interactor (interacts with Others)
Talker

Low Perceivers (also named on basis of ambition)

Commander
Nontalker
Vocationalist (type of curriculum taking)
Preparer (ready for class)

Cadet
Unpreparer
Talker
Gum Chewer
Volunteeror (to help teachers)
APPENDIX F: TAXONOMIES OF SCHOOL B

High Perceivers (named on the basis of interaction - talkative; nontalkative)

Talker
Noninvolver (no class involvement)

Listener
Nontalker
Band member

Middle Perceivers (named on the basis of participation in sports)

Athlete
Preparer (ready for class)
Attender (attentive)

NonAthlete
Nontalker
Non preparer

Low Perceivers (named on the basis of class participation)

Participator
Preparer (ready for (class)
Selective interest (does not pay attention all the time)

NonParticipator
Unpreparer
Joker
Talker
Disrupter
APPENDIX G: TAXONOMIES OF SCHOOL C

High Perceivers (named on the basis of school organizational affiliation)

- Cheerleader Conversator
  - Populist (popular)
  - People's person
  - Cheerleader
- Eaglette Helper
  - Friendly person
  - Dance squad

Middle Perceiver (named on the basis of participation in a school organization; artist - art club; noninvolver-no club)

- Artist Joker
  - Attender (attentive)
- Noninvolver Helper
  - Mixer (mixed class room interactions
  - High Achiever

Low Perceiver (named on the basis of participation in sports)

- Athlete Attender (attentive)
  - Vocationalist (curriculum enrolled in)
  - Nontalker
- NonAthlete Talker
  - Unambitionist (no preparation for college)
APPENDIX H: TAXONOMIES OF SCHOOL D

High Perceiver (named on basis of participation in school activity)

Dancer
Cheerleader

Group Affliator
Dance team member
Nontalker

Non talker
Cheerleader

Middle Perceiver (named on basis of participation in class)

Attender
NonAttendor

attender (attentive in class)
NonAttendor (inattentive in class)

Low Perceiver (named on basis of athlete/non athlete)

Basketballer
NonAthlete

Basketball player
Talker
Military ambitionist
(wants go to military)

Nontalker
NonAthlete
Unpreparer(for future)
APPENDIX I: CORRELATIONS OF INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>SES</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement 1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement 2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement 3</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05  
**P < .0001
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