Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

5-5-1994

Characteristics of Marginally Achieving Secondary Students and the Nature of their School Experience

Aeylin Summers

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Summers, Aeylin, "Characteristics of Marginally Achieving Secondary Students and the Nature of their School Experience" (1994). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1384.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1383>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

CHARACTERISTICS OF marginally achieving secondary
students and the nature of their
school experience

by
Aeylin Summers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership:
Leadership and Supervision

Portland State University
©1994

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The abstract and dissertation of Aeylin Summers for the
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership:
Administration and Supervision were presented May 5, 1994,
and accepted by the dissertation committee and the doctoral
program.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

[REDACTED]
Robert B. Everhart, Chair

[REDACTED]
Thomas G. Chenoweth

[REDACTED]
J. Victor McGuire

[REDACTED]
Gary R. Nave

[REDACTED]
James Carlile

[REDACTED]
David L. Morgan
Representative of the Office of
Graduate Studies

DOCTORAL PROGRAM APPROVAL

[REDACTED]
David A. Krug, Acting Dean
School of Education

ACCEPTED FOR PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BY THE LIBRARY

by [REDACTED] on 27 May 1994

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the dissertation of Aeylin Summers for the
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership:
Administration and Supervision presented May 5, 1994.

Title: Characteristics of Marginally Achieving Secondary
Students and the Nature of Their School Experience

In American high schools, students are sorted into three "tracks" to cluster resources for students of similar abilities and interests. Much is known about the high track student, and especially in the past decade, the low track or "at-risk" student. However, the middle track--or marginally achieving student--has been largely overlooked in the literature. Acknowledged as "lost in the middle" (Judson, 1992), as well as deserving of higher quality of service in their school systems (Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985), marginal achievers--defined here as having a GPA of 1.5-2.5, still maintain a profile of invisibility. Current reform efforts to increase student engagement and achievement increase the importance of understanding the characteristics of this student population to enhance the quality of instructional practices, program options, and support services.

This study described the characteristics of marginal achievers and the nature of their school experiences. Five groups of students were interviewed in two local high schools. These data were combined with the results of a quantitative analysis of 165 variables from the National Longitudinal Educational Study for a 500 case sample.

The results indicated:

- Gender, race, and socio-economic status could not be used to identify marginal achievers. Seventy-nine point four percent of the students reported being in two-parent families. Most students indicated feelings of high self-esteem.
- No demographic characteristics could be used to identify any school structure that was more likely to foster marginality, however, several climate factors emerged.
- Marginal achievers were not visible in their school's system of rewards or sanctions.
- Marginal achievers did not believe they had much value in their school system. They believed high track achievers were most valued.
- Marginal achievers had no intentions of dropping out of high school. They believed they would have little trouble being successful in college. They reported their parents had the same expectations.
- The students reported the primary parental support activity was student-parent discussions about school.

- The cost of college led many students to consider attendance at a community college. The reduced financial burden of a community college, along with lower GPA expectations, influenced how hard they worked in high school.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my mother,
Anne M. Zeumer, who has always
believed in my capabilities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee: Jim Carlile, Dr. Tom Chenoweth, Dr. Victor McGuire, Dr. David Morgan, and Dr. Gary Nave. Each of you has come along with me on my journey, and I am reminded, once again, that so many great accomplishments reflect the help of good friends. I would like to thank Dr, Robert Everhart, my chairperson, for his time, attention, and assistance with my study. If not for his help, I would never have gotten to the joyful ending of all of this work. Thanks to you all.

Also, I would like to thank my sons, Cody and Jeremy Hinton, who have been a big part of my academic career at PSU. Some day, when they understand what all this has meant, I hope they are proud of their mom, and I hope they are inspired to be willing to think hard about a problem and work hard to make a difference.

Finally, and most of all, I wish to thank my husband, Thomas Hinton, the second most knowledgeable person in this world about marginally achieving secondary students.

Thanks, T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES.	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER	
I OVERVIEW.	1
Introduction.	1
Statement of the Problem.	4
Significance of the Study	5
Methodology Overview.	8
Summary	10
II A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	11
Introduction.	11
Review of the Literature.	11
Achievement Tracks: High and Low The Middle Achiever School Organization, Tracking, and Marginality	
Marginality: Student Characteristics.	27
Describing the "Invisible Students"	
Summary	34
III METHODOLOGY	36
Introduction.	36

	Statement of the Problem.	36
	Operational Definition of Marginality .	37
	Methodology	40
	Qualitative Methodology	44
	Focus Group Sites	
	Focus Group Sample	
	Research Questions	
	Data Collection and Analysis	
	Procedures	
	Quantitative Methodology.	50
	NELS	
	NELS Sample	
	NELS Variables	
	Research Questions	
	Data Analysis Procedures	
	Summary	56
IV	PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	58
	Introduction.	58
	Student Characteristics	60
	Gender, Race, and SES Variables	
	Family Composition	
	Personality Characteristics	
	Non-School Activities	
	Student Part-Time Employment	
	Student Characteristics Summary	
	School Characteristics.	74
	School Characteristics	
	Climate Issues: Student/Teacher	
	Relations in School	
	Climate Issues: Teachers'	
	Instructional Style and	
	Expertise	
	Climate Issues: Level of Interest	
	in Course Content	
	Level of Expectation and Challenge	
	School Characteristics Summary	

	School Experiences.	97
	Positive School Interactions	
	Negative School Interactions	
	Student Abilities as Achievers	
	Patterns in Student Achievement	
	Teacher Favoritism	
	School Experiences Summary	
	Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans .	114
	Student and Parent Expectations	
	Parental Academic Support	
	Behaviors	
	The Nature of Parental Influence	
	for the Marginal Achieving	
	Student	
	Future Career Opportunities	
	Parent/Home Environment--Future	
	Plans Summary	
	Data Summary.	130
	Student Characteristics	
	School Characteristics	
	School Experiences	
	Parent/Home Environment--Future	
	Plans	
	Summary	136
V	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS,	
	SIGNIFICANCE, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
	FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.	137
	Introduction.	137
	Discussion of Results	137
	Conclusions	144
	Student Characteristics	
	School Characteristics	
	School Experiences	
	Parent/Home Environment--Future	
	Plans	
	Limitations to the Study.	148

Significance to Educational Leadership.	151
Point #1: Communicate Findings	
Point #2: Offer Data Collection Options to Teachers	
Point #3: Staff Development in Student Engagement Techniques	
Point #4: Staff Development in Student Assessment Strategies	
Point #5: Staff Development in the Creation of Assessment Rubrics	
Point #6: Communicate with Parents	
Point #7: Communicate with Students	
Recommendations for Further Research. .	166
Summary	168
REFERENCES.	170
APPENDICES	
A LETTER TO DR. KATTERLE.	175
B LETTER TO PRINCIPALS.	179
C CONSENT LETTER AND PERMISSION FORM.	182
D STUDENT INTERVIEW INFORMATION SHEET	185
E STUDENT FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS	187
F NELS QUESTIONNAIRE--1988 FOLLOW-UP.	192
G NELS CATEGORIES	224
H NELS VARIABLES.	258
I STATISTICAL DATA/FREQUENCIES.	262

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Demographic Characteristics (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	62
2. Comparison Data to NELS Sample (<u>N</u> =20,706) .	63
3. Self-Reported Self-Assessment Qualities (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	67
4. Non-School Activities (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	69
5. Marginal School Performance and School Characteristics (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	77
6. Student Reported Classroom Climate Variables Cross Tabulated with Gender, Race, and SES (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	78
7. Level of Expectation in Required Classes (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	92
8. Students' Self-Reported Grades in Required Classes (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	94
9. Positive School Interactions: Student Recognition (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	99
10. Positive School Interaction: Activity Participation (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	100
11. Negative School Interactions (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	102
12. Student Post High School Educational Expectations (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	115
13. Parental Post High School Educational Expectations: Std. Responses (NELS <u>N</u> =4,644)	117
15. Parental Support Activities in the Student's School Career: Std. Responses (NELS)	119

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Research Question Categories.	56

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW

Introduction

In 1983, A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education [NCEE]) proclaimed that the system of education in the United States was producing students who reflected "a rising tide of mediocrity," and our country would be at great competitive disadvantage, both nationally and internationally, as long as this situation remained unaltered. Since the report, a great variety of committees, task forces, blue ribbon panels, etc., have addressed the issues of student engagement and achievement and have made recommendations regarding the direction in which education must go. America's Choice (National Center on Education and the Economy, 1990), America 2000: Where School Leaders Stand (American Association of School Administrators, 1991), and Workforce 2000 (Johnston, 1987) are a few of the many reports which have examined America's educational systems and its position in the world marketplace, now and in the future. Put simply, these reports claim the United States will not be competitive on a global basis unless dramatic changes occur to increase student achievement and make education more relevant, more engaging, and more related to

useful workplace skills than current practice demonstrates. The various reports in turn have led to multiple efforts to restructure educational systems to improve student engagement and achievement.

Certainly, for reform efforts to be successful, proposed system and program changes must serve students better than those systems in place presently. However, while this focus on systemic practices could be very productive, the critical examination of the students themselves who are a part of this "tide of mediocrity" is all but missing. As a part of the effort to accomplish any increase in student achievement, there is an important need for greater examination and understanding of students as "achievers." Such is the focus of this study.

It is generally understood that in most secondary schools, students are separated into three broad categories, or "tracks," of achievers--usually some division of high, middle, and low levels. In the fundamental discussion of this practice, Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality, Oakes (1985) states:

Tracking is the process whereby students are divided into categories so that they can be assigned in groups to various kinds of classes. Sometimes students are classified as fast, average, or slow learners and placed into fast, average, or slow classes on the basis of their scores on achievement or ability tests. Often teachers' estimates of what students have already learned or their potential for learning more determine how students are identified and placed. Sometimes students are classified according to

what seems most appropriate to their future lives.
(p. 3)

While many educators argue the advantages and disadvantages of the system of tracking, there are few, if any, who would deny its existence and extensive use in shaping the three main classifications of student achievers. Oakes maintains that:

. . . probably 80 percent of the secondary schools and maybe 60 percent of the elementary schools still use some form of between-class grouping based on perceptions educators have about children's ability to learn. (O'Neil, 1992, p. 18)

This study advanced with the acknowledgment of these identified groups of achievers (which are examined in greater detail in the review of literature in the second chapter). A great deal is known about the high and low tracks of achievers--the high track because these students reflect the pride of any school system, the low track students because they draw great human concern. It is the middle track which seems to be the least defined and the least understood. It is this group that is the focus of this study.

The term "marginal" has been applied to the middle track achiever to describe the ". . . disconnection between students and the conditions designed for learning" (Sinclair & Ghory, 1987, p. 14) which these students experience. The occurrence is not that uncommon, since some estimates suggest that a significant percentage of the national high

school population, perhaps 50% or more, can be characterized as "marginal" achievers. Perhaps it is the state of "strained, difficult relationships with the school environment" (Sinclair & Ghory, 1987, p. 3) which accounts for the lack of accurate details regarding so vast a number of students. School systems publicize the achievements of their best students and make visible (though not often successful) efforts to better serve the needs of students who are "at risk" of failure. However, such attention is not paid to marginal, middle track students who continue to exist in a system which largely ignores them.

. . . they have been touched least by the personalization of public education that has benefited the brightest students, those identified as gifted and talented, and lately the most troubled, those identified as "at risk." The last to be treated as individuals, most of these students are intellectual dropouts. They manage to graduate, but leave high school undereducated and often uninspired to continue. (Judson, 1992, p. 1)

Statement of the Problem

If proposed change efforts are to better serve the marginal achievement population, it is critical to gain a better perspective regarding these young people as individuals and to understand the nature of their high school experiences. If educators do not understand more about the students who form the middle, marginal track of achievers, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to determine their primary educational needs. If such

determinations are not addressed specifically, is there any reason to assume that educational systems of the future will attend to the needs of this population any better than current practice demonstrates? There is little specific information regarding the types of students who enter high school and either choose, drift, or are placed into the middle group of marginal achievers. The centering research problem for this study then is: What are the characteristics of marginal achievement students (secondary), and what is the nature of their school experience?

Significance of the Study

As the nation continues in its massive efforts to restructure educational systems to increase the level and quality of achievement of our students, inclusion of marginal achievement students as a target population is critical for three key reasons:

First, while it is undoubtedly true that students who are at-risk of dropping out of school prior to graduation represent a significant challenge facing educators today, it can be argued that marginal achievement students represent a phenomenon of at least equal, if not greater, concern. It is clear that educational systems do not serve at-risk students well. However, by dropping out, these students sever their relationships and connections with school and

sacrifice the diploma as proof of achievement, or at least attendance. But marginal achievement students do not leave. They stay and graduate with a state certified diploma, which itself attests, not only to their "completion" of high school, but also to a richness of opportunities these students did not experience and a level and quality of knowledge and skill they may or may not possess. While these students may be capable of performing at a higher degree of excellence, their school experiences do not challenge them to work to their academic potential. If a centering goal of education is excellence, there is a powerful responsibility to serve these students who have been neglected for far too long.

Second, the phenomenon of marginality represents the failure of education at a broad, systems level, because marginal students encompass more of the total population than either the high or low tracks of students. Any system could not be achieving its organizational objectives and fail to serve that many people. We know that marginal achievers are present in high schools in large numbers.

Many examinations of school systems and practices have raised legitimate questions regarding which segments of the total population, if any, are being served by our current public school system. While it was the purpose of this study to focus only on the marginal achievement category of students, our understanding about this segment of the

population can contribute critical evidence for the need for broad system changes.

Finally, recalling the work of the multitude of committees inspired by A Nation at Risk (NCEE, 1983), the issues supporting a systematic inquiry into the nature of marginal students and their school experiences can be framed in a current economic context which creates an even greater sense of urgency. Magaziner's (1990) influential America's Choice: High Skills or Low Wages describes the link between education and the national economy.

More than 70 percent of the jobs in America will not require a college education by the year 2000. These jobs are the back-bone of our economy, and the productivity of workers in these jobs will make or break our economic future. No nation has produced a highly qualified technical workforce without first providing its workers with a strong general education. (p. 54)

The current economic prospect has been characterized as ". . . a mismatch between the labor force the nation needs . . . and the one our educational system is making available" (Salamon, 1991, p. 23). Estimates suggest that 30-70% of the current school population is comprised of marginal achievers who leave school without strong workplace skills. If more accurate percentages are only half as great, the term "mismatch" still seems generous, to say the least.

The concept of human capital provides a useful theoretical framework for this study. Central to the theory is the belief that an investment in people is every bit as

critical as an investment in land, equipment, etc., and this investment is worthwhile from an economic, as well as a human perspective. A business or industry can expect a greater return on the initial investment in its people--the human capital--as the level and quality of skills increases, creating a more efficient and effective workforce better able to face the competitive challenges of the world marketplace.

Methodology Overview

The study explores the characteristics and experiences of marginal students from two perspectives. First, qualitative information drawn from focus groups of students from two local high schools provides descriptive data with personal information describing marginal students as achievers. These student focus groups generated anecdotal material regarding the nature of their high school experiences and permit me to offer their perspective on proposed educational changes. The basic question in the focus groups was: What has school been like and how would it have to change to engage and motivate these marginal students to achieve?

Second, drawing from a national data base of high school sophomores (National Education Longitudinal Study-NELS description, see Chapter III), descriptive information further tested and explored the characteristics

of students who make up this broad population. Are certain students more apt to be marginal achievers than other students? For example, what is the representation based on gender for this middle group? Does race or socio-economic status (SES) seem to be a factor in marginality? The outcome of the combination of these two research approaches is an understanding of the characteristics of students who occupy the middle track of achievers and a more complex description of the nature of their own school experiences.

It is as important to clarify what this study is not as well as what it is. This study did not search for a single or mixture of characteristics that support a "deficit model" to explain why some students are incapable of producing at a higher level of academic achievement. It was the firm assumption of this research effort that, given the appropriate educational environment, these students are capable of achieving at a higher level of excellence. Gathering more information to describe the nature of such an environment was a key research concern.

The intent of the identification of characteristics of marginal achievement students is to use this information to shape educational reform efforts to serve these students better than they are being served currently. Also, by identifying the unique features of students who make up the marginal population, these students can be included in

future change efforts and become agents for their own educational success.

Summary

Efforts to restructure educational systems to increase student achievement must include marginal achievement students as a target population for change. Any new programs which do not have a significant impact on this population's school experiences would represent only a modest improvement over the present system. In order for new systems to be a strong match for these students, there is a need for better information and greater understanding regarding the students who make up this group, as well as the perspective of these students themselves regarding their own school experiences. This study examines marginal achievement students at the secondary level by combining qualitative information from interviews from student focus groups to explore the student perspective regarding their own school experiences with quantitative data drawn from a national student database to describe the characteristics of marginal achievers.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Two specific areas of literature relate to the study of marginality. The areas examined are: (a) the literature regarding student achievement levels (e.g. students as high, low, and middle track achievers) and (b) the literature focusing on marginal student achievement from both an organizational and characteristics perspective. A final section of the chapter examines the gaps in the information available currently regarding marginality.

Review of the Literature

Achievement Tracks: High and Low

In many schools, students are separated into three broad categories or "tracks" of achievers: high, middle, and low. The high track represents students who are, for the most part, engaged and successful in their school work.

The students in the top-track program have to be committed to the academic purposes of high school; in return they are recognized by being given a variety of services, resources, and privileges not available to others. (Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985, p. 119)

Their grades reflect achievement at an A or B level primarily, with a very occasional C grade. The typical selection of courses is geared toward entry into a four-year college or university program.

Inside of the high school environment, these upper track students receive strong support, service, and praise. They reflect the best of the public school system in intent and practice as they make progress toward their diplomas.

Their special courses provide sources of identification and prestige. Not only are they driven by deeply instilled momentum, but their trajectory is applauded by the wider community. They have high visibility and acclaim . . .
(Lightfoot, 1983, p. 149)

Outside of school, their high levels of achievement provide them with a variety of options including opportunities in higher education and employment. As a percentage of the entire high school population, the upper track accounts for ". . . a liberal estimate . . . is perhaps 15 to 20 percent" (Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1986, p. 9).

Once we account for this upper group of students, the remaining students can be viewed in terms of increasing disengagement from their school work. On one end, there are low track students who are unsuccessful and extremely uninvolved with academic work. A sizable portion of the low track group, often termed "at-risk," hovers close to dropping out of school completely. Many of these students do leave public high school for equivalency programs, vocational training, jobs, or, in many cases, drifting.

Nationally, the percentage of students who drop out of school stands at approximately 25%. The range of non-completion is from 50% or more in major cities (e.g. Chicago, New York, etc.) to 5% in smaller urban, suburban, or rural locations (Boyer, 1983).

In the high school environment, the academic work of lower track students is characterized primarily by F grades, resulting in failed classes that must be repeated and passed for credit in order to graduate with a standard diploma. Occasional D grades mark brief episodes of interest and some degree of marginal success. The experiences of the lower track of students ^{are} ~~is~~ seen as one of the most serious problems in education today. The "at-risk" student population has received a staggering amount of attention in research, literature, resources, and programming in an attempt to understand and provide for the successes of these young people who will leave school virtually unemployable at any but the most menial jobs and with small hope for a successful future.

The Middle Achiever

Subtracting this lower track of students leaves a significant block of students in the middle, characterized as relatively disengaged and usually experiencing marginal levels of achievement. Whether they are viewed as "lost" or "drifting," "just out there," or "not really anywhere," the description of the middle track student floats as much as

the students themselves float, which is a situation that demands some further attention.

In studying the current literature, it is apparent that the ambiguity regarding the middle achieving student's characteristics has given rise to multiple definitions of these students. The concept of a student being a "marginal achiever" is often intermixed with the term "underachiever," both signifying a level of performance that is lower than expected for an individual student and lower than is satisfactory according to established academic standards. However, how those terms are applied to a given student case is not consistent in the literature. Butler-Por (1987) states:

Broadly, underachievement is defined as a large discrepancy between the child's school performance and some manifestation of the child's true ability such as teachers' and parents' observations or achievement, creativity and intelligence measures. For research purposes different methods of identifying underachievers are used. Most studies define underachievers by the large gap between the under-achiever's school performance and potential. (p. 6)

Sinclair and Ghory (1987) take a similar case of a student not reaching expected standards and label this as "marginal" achievement. "All students need to learn what schools are expected to teach, but in every school some students are not achieving. These are the students we consider marginal" (p. 14). Sinclair and Ghory continue to identify the types of students who can become marginal:

Various types of students become marginal, such as the learner not working up to potential, the understimulated exceptional learner, the one with a long history of academic failure or substandard achievement, and the one suddenly performing poorly despite previous success. Students can become marginal regardless of sex, race, family structure, or economic background. Marginal learners, then, can include "children at risk" from low-income minority homes as well as youth from well-to-do families who are forced to maintain a delicate balance on the margins because they face less-than-constructive circumstances in the school setting . . . For many learners, being marginal becomes a way of life in school. (p. 14)

These definitions blend together cognitive abilities, demographic features, environmental factors, etc., in a manner that makes it difficult to extract a clear or consistent set of terms. For the purposes of this study, a critical distinction is made regarding the identification of a "marginally achieving student." Marginally achieving students are, in fact, performing at a level that is below established expectations of quality for academic work. However, different from "at-risk" students, they are consistently achieving at a level that is sufficient to earn them passing grades of C or D in most, if not all, of their classes, thus, enabling them to make gainful progress toward their diplomas.

While these parameters may establish the population of students to be studied in this research effort, it should be remembered that considerable ambiguity about the population really still exists. Because they do not fit into either the high or low end groups, middle track students are often

described either in ambiguous, imprecise terms or by exclusion from the other, better defined populations.

. . . for those who are not dramatically achieving or in the midst of a visible crisis--the regular kids--(their school) is a place they pass through unnoticed. (Lightfoot, 1983, p. 149)

Glasser (1990) likened a class of students to

. . . a gang of street repair workers. If they were working as hard as the students do in class, half or more would be leaning on their shovels, smoking and socializing, perfectly content to let the others do the work. (p. 1)

In the scenario, middle track or marginally achieving students are the ones who do nothing more than show up to the work site and observe.

The fact that these students are willing to come to school without coercion, behave appropriately without causing undue problems, and make progress (marginal though it may be) toward a diploma, seems to render them ineligible for the kind of attention and definition conferred on others. And yet, in his book, Horace's Compromise,Sizer (1984) entitles his chapter regarding marginal students, "Docility," and states:

No more important finding has emerged from the inquiries of our study than that the American high school student, as student, is all too often docile, compliant, and without initiative. Some who have initiative use it to undertake as little engagement as possible with school. (pp. 54-55)

This lack of engagement is reflected in the school work of the marginal student, earning primarily C and D grades, with occasional Fs and Bs to mark examples of even greater than

usual disinterest or uncharacteristic motivation. While the academic performance level is low, marginal students do not exhibit all of the behaviors of at-risk students (e.g. failing classes, leaving school, etc.) because they do attend on a regular basis and make progress toward their diplomas. Yet, middle track students do not seem to be nearly as engaged in their school work as upper track students, for they submit work of marginal quality and accept grades at just passing levels. They exist somewhere in the middle of engagement and dropping out, with a strong inclination to slide academically toward the lower track.

Inside of the high school environment, this group of middle track or marginal achievement students is estimated to be very large in number. Whether it be a general description captured in the title, The Neglected Majority (Parnell, 1985), reference to ". . . the masses in the 90-120 IQ range" (McNeil, 1988, p. 75), or attempts at more precise percentages ranging from "exceeding two-thirds of the number of high school students" (Sedlak et al., 1986, p. 9) to ". . . 70% of the total school population" (Powell et al., 1985, p. 174), it appears that the portion of students who are experiencing only marginal success accounts for a major share of the total school population. However, as Judson (1992) notes:

. . . no one knows just how large that group might be, as so many of its members drift through school without sending up the red flags that educators use to recognize students in trouble . . . those

who suffer in silence, or who know how to blend in, can be invisible to the system. (p. 2)

In addition to large numbers, it is acknowledged that these students could and should be achieving at higher levels than current performance indicators (e.g. standardized test scores, achievement tests, grades, etc.) suggest. Often, however, school resources are focused on the needs of the upper and lower track students, and those in the middle are left to fend for themselves. In The Shopping Mall High School (Powell et al., 1985), teachers, psychologists, administrators, parents, and the students themselves describe the experiences of the marginally achieving high school student as follows:

Few characteristics of the shopping mall high school are more significant than the existence of unspecial students in the middle who are ignored and poorly served. Teachers and administrators talk a great deal about the problem. "We do very much for the top, top students and the real problems," one teacher asserted, "but for these average 'nice' kids with low motivation we don't do much of anything." "Honors kids are fine and kids with handicaps are fine, but what are we doing for the average kid?" another said. An administrator made the same point: "We're doing a lot for the accelerated kids, we're doing a lot for the student who needs special help, but this kid in the middle gets the least attention." (pp. 173-174)

If it is acknowledged by school personnel that this large group of "Unspecial" students is deserving of better support and resources in educational systems, then how is it this great imbalance between student needs and school services exists? To answer this concern, we turn to a brief

examination of some of the key aspects of the organizational structures of most high schools which, we shall see, contribute to the perpetuation of the experiences of the students "in the middle."

School Organization, Tracking, and Marginality

The objectives of any organization play a major role in shaping the services offered to the clientele. A major objective of the educational system of this country is:

. . . to prepare its students for adult status, by training them in the knowledge and skills, and by indoctrinating them in the moral orientations, which adult roles require . . . (Bidwell, 1965, p. 973)

If this "training and indoctrination" is ". . . an American version of the egalitarian ideal, that is, to provide each student with an opportunity for social, political, and economic equality" (Cusick, 1983, p. 1), then the enormity and complexity of this educational objective becomes profound.

The goal of providing educational services to every school-age person in the nation--regardless of race or religion, ability or desire--and guiding each person through an educational process culminating in a common endpoint--a high school diploma--has been likened to taking all of the world's children and passing them through the eye of a needle. Educational systems begin with students at a wide variety of "starting points," with different abilities,

personal goals, and perspectives. These diverse students are moved through 12 or more years of common school opportunities and experiences to arrive at a homogenous endpoint--graduation--signified by the receipt of a common diploma.

To fulfill this goal of educating such a dissimilar national population, certain organizational structures which support a consistent, uniform operation for many different students are normally present. At least two components of the secondary structure--curricular tracking and teacher/student role relationships--seem to actually contribute to the marginal school experiences for a large portion of the students the system is supposed to educate. Therein lies a fundamental problem for the middle group of students.

The tracking of students into various achievement groups has been proffered both as a necessary sorting system for managing the quantity of students attending school and as a system for placing students in classes with a curriculum best suited to their ability levels, thereby increasing the opportunities for student success. Yet the practices of tracking profoundly shape the marginal experiences of many high school students.

The content of middle track classes is usually described in terms of "general education." For students who are not certain what their specific field of study or

specialization will be, a general education track represents a selection of classes designed to offer exploratory experiences in a variety of disciplines, such as the arts, sciences, etc., without, however, any curricular "road map" or a clearly defined set of classes such as those clustered and available to identify the path of the high track, college-bound student or the vocational student. Without a more precise curricular organization, the middle track student can become lost almost immediately upon entering into the secondary system. Students in this generalized curriculum seldom are pushed to exceed the minimum number of classes required for graduation. Consequently, a minimum standard often becomes a maximum ceiling. The characterization that these students "drift" through the system acknowledges a lack of guidance from teachers, counselors, etc., to help make more complicated curricular choices. In fact, it is this lack of advocacy that is one feature of ". . . the structure and tone of school which encourage invisibility" (Lightfoot, 1983, p. 149).

In some schools, the content in middle track classes is somewhat aligned with the academic work associated with the high track curriculum (Goodlad, 1984). However, distinctive to the middle track courses is a reduced level of teacher expectation for student performance. This level of expectation, based on a role definition of students and teachers for self and others, is sometimes termed the

classroom "bargain." The bargain is based on the mutual acknowledgment by the teacher and the middle track students that both parties wish for students to "get through the class." Yet, some students are not interested in being pushed toward higher levels of academic achievement, and, given this level of ambition, teachers decide not to expend the energy to motivate reluctant students. The bargain, then, is a tacit agreement between students and the teacher that if the students show up, behave according to general school standards, and produce work at even a marginal level, the teacher will reward them with passing grades (e.g. D or C). The students will earn the accompanying credit and eventually graduate. The teacher's perspective is grounded in "giving the students what they want--this is all they can handle" and may include:

relatively little concern for academic content; a willingness to tolerate, if not encourage, diversion from the specified knowledge to be presented or discussed; the substitution of genial banter and conversation for concentrated academic exercises; improvisational instructional adaptation to student preference for or indifference toward specific subject matter of pedagogical techniques; the "negotiation" of class content, assignments, and standards; and a high degree of teacher autonomy in managing the level of academic engagement, personal interaction, and course content. (Sedlak et al., 1986, p. 7)

Other literature describes how this congenial arrangement shapes the marginal experiences of the middle student. A history class described in Horace's Compromise (Sizer, 1984) gives an example of the student's role in the

middle track classroom, where there is a distinct lack of pressure to achieve:

Over ten minutes into the period, (Mr.) Brody finally turned to history and announced that the purpose of this class was "to cover chapter six." The students, slouched or leaning, just looked at him. No one (save me) picked up the heavy textbook. I discovered that chapter six covered some aspects of the American westward movement. Brody moved through the text, slowly asking a question of no one in particular and then slowly answering it himself. The students quietly watched this performance. (p. 155)

Almost as a return "payment" for not being pushed by the teacher to achieve, the middle track student, in turn, does not demand much of the teacher. Students "behave," remain quiet, and, thus, put little, if any, pressure on the instructor to work hard with these students. Compare the bargain with those for the "bright kids." In The Shopping Mall High School (Powell et al., 1985), two sections of a junior English class are taught by the same teacher, one a high track class for college-bound students and one a middle track class for "regulars." The differences in the "bargains" are evident:

(Mr.) Cleveland adjusted classroom procedures in various ways to accommodate the two groups. The regular students received no more than twenty-five minutes night of homework and the advanced students double that amount, though neither group got homework every day. Many advanced students would submit five-page term papers--the maximum Cleveland allowed--while he would accept from regular students a term paper of eighty words. He felt regular students did not like to talk, so he held discussions to a minimum and required oral presentations only in the advanced class. When discussions did occur in the regular class, they emphasized concrete details rather than analysis.

Regular kids, Mr. Cleveland explained, preferred more variation in classroom activities than the advanced class. If he employed two activities during an advanced class (say, a film and discussion), he would often use four in a regular class (film, discussion, lecture, and seatwork). (p. 185)

Finally, as evidence of the critical component of the marginal bargain--"don't make any trouble and we'll get along," Cusick (1983) offers an example of a social studies teacher who was discussing railroad mileage:

All the time the teacher was talking about railroad mileage. Some had their books open but did not look at them. Others just sat and stared or talked to their friends. This apparently didn't bother Mr. P. No individual was getting singularly disruptive so he just went on until even he became bored and concluded quickly that although "America has a lot of problems it is still the best country in the world." (p. 54)

Curricular tracking and classroom bargaining are only two components of a complex organizational structure which appear to support the phenomenon of marginality. It would seem the experiences of the middle track student are at least accommodated, if not initiated, to a great extent by the educational systems in place in most secondary schools in this nation.

Some believe the objective of educating so diverse a student population necessitates an organizational structure that is somewhat bureaucratic in design. These uniform organizational processes lead as many students as possible to the accepted symbol of the completion of public education--a high school diploma. However, inherent in this

bureaucratic design of secondary schools is a consistent, stable set of policies and procedures that is inflexible or less adaptable to the unique needs of the student population. For students to be successful then, quite often it is the student who must adapt and conform to the systems of the school.

Certainly, students who are genuinely motivated to participate actively and work hard to achieve at high levels of excellence will have an easier time with this process of adaptation, and they can enjoy the smoothest, most productive educational experiences. However, students who are willing to simply "act the part," even without such intrinsic encouragement, will likewise arrive at the same outcome--receipt of a diploma--with only the minimum level of commitment, engagement, and performance. Attendance, acquiescence, and an uninspired academic performance are sufficient to enable many students to complete the standard secondary program and receive a high school diploma, hence, the phenomenon of marginality.

However, the fact that the system may support a marginal, middle track experience, coupled with the knowledge that a large portion of students may find themselves accurately described as "lost in the middle," does not signify an easy compromise or a series of simple choices students can routinely make. For some students, the process of adapting and conforming to the systems of

secondary schools in this country represents an extremely challenging experience. An excerpt from a letter written by a high school senior one semester from graduation shares one price of this adaptation to the system. This student dropped out of school rather than conform and be "invisible" any longer, a victim of "irreconcilable differences between school systems and children who don't seem to fit" (Cray-Andrews, 1989).

Like a fingernail, I've been filed and manicured to look and act like the system wants. Through the years, I have deviated from the system and have paid many a consequence for that. Every time I try to do something in school that doesn't fit the mold, I'm punished. What does this punishment accomplish? Nothing. Absolutely nothing. I apologize, although I shouldn't have to, for being the way I am. . . . I can no longer sit back in this system and just go with it. I have to be an individual. If I'm not allowed to do that, I go crazy. (p. 35)

A compelling body of literature suggests some important trends regarding the difficulty of the "fit" of certain portions of the population. These populations can be examined according to characteristics which identify student groups who consistently experience unequal treatment in the educational system, unequal expectations, and unequal instructional opportunities. There is a need to examine the relationship regarding what is known about these student populations, identified by various characteristics including race, gender, and social class, and the experience of marginality.

Marginality: Student Characteristics

Considerable research focuses on race, class, and gender as factors influencing educational achievement. This research often concludes that certain students experience diminished opportunities normally available for white, middle and upper class children, especially males.

Two distinct theoretical frameworks summarize the systematic differences of achievement in this nation's schools. One branch maintains that there are certain deficiencies in the children's experiences which render them unable to achieve at a higher level of scholarship. Certain groups are less able or "disadvantaged" in terms of their ability to learn and succeed. Socially, different attitudes and values, inherent in the cultures of these population groups, have the effect of limiting their achievement in school (Weis, 1988). Reduced levels of achievement, therefore, are an *effect* or result of student-centered deficiencies. A second framework maintains that children are born with basically similar abilities to learn and achieve. Outcome differences are determined by human interests, exposure to opportunities, and predilections toward one subject area over another. Once in school, the differences in the achievement levels of various portions of the student population are the results of dramatically different treatment within a school system. Schools, therefore, are viewed as sorters of students according to

social, economic distinctions which mirror the social and economic place they will hold as adults in society outside of school. For students of specific populations, reduced levels of achievement or academic interest areas skewed toward certain career outcomes are caused by radically different treatment within educational systems (Hare, 1987; Simms & Contreras, 1980).

While the "weightings" of race, class, and gender are not clear as distinct entities (Haw, 1991), there is considerable evidence to support systemic differences in the treatment and achievement outcomes of various student groups. By race, black students are more frequently identified as low achievers qualified for special educational services than white students. Conversely, white students are more likely to be identified for gifted classes than black students (Meier, Stewart, and England, 1989). Hispanics have the lowest levels of educational attainment, as compared to black and white student groups. From preschool programs through college, Hispanic students are statistically underrepresented in all student populations (National Council of La Raza, 1992; National Institute of Education, 1977).

One area of the secondary educational systems of this country where the experiences of students as identified by race seem to coincide and, in some cases, undoubtedly overlap with the experiences of students as identified by

social class, is vocational education. A predominant number of students who are routinely steered away from high-track, college-bound coursework in favor of vocational skill training include students who are non-white and poor. In her study of tracking, Oakes (1985) states:

Rather than change the character of the academic curriculum to meet the needs of a diverse student population (and thereby preserve the common school), the inclusion of vocational programs permitted schools to differentiate their curricula and to sort students. As a result, vocational programs provided a means of encouraging working-class children not to drop out of school while keeping them from receiving an academic education. In these programs lower-class students learned attitudes and skills appropriate to manual-labor positions.

A recent analysis of the vocational experiences provided for black adolescents in schools argues that these programs from their inception have been limited largely to preparing youngsters for jobs traditionally held by blacks. (p. 153)

A division similar to those arguments related to race separate the position of education in relation to social class. Some theorists maintain that school experiences work to provide mobility out of poverty toward more and better economic and social opportunities, while others view the structure of schools instrumental in perpetuating social class stratification much the same way racial stratification is maintained (Hauser, 1971).

The academic outcomes for children of low socio-economic status (SES), however, often echo those for non-white children, finding low-SES students rated significantly lower in all measures of achievement than

high-SES students. "They received lower test scores, lower grades, and fewer prizes . . ." (Herriott & St. John, 1966, p. 5).

The information related to different treatment on the basis of gender is equally significant in terms of differential educational treatment. A "hidden curriculum" seems to create a dramatically different school experience for girls than for boys, which seems to reinforce traditional social sex roles of male superiority and female subordination (Delamont, 1990; Gough, 1976).

In the lower grades, girls achieve at levels equal to or higher than the achievement levels of boys. However, in the higher grades, the levels of achievement for girls begin to fall until they are surpassed by boys, especially in the areas of math and science. However, this decline in achievement test scores exists contrary to the fact that girls will typically receive better grades than boys, which

. . . may be one of the rewards they get for being more quiet and docile in the classroom . . . Girls are more likely to be invisible members of classrooms. They receive fewer academic contacts, less praise, fewer complex and abstract questions, and less instruction on how to do things for themselves. (Sadker & Sadker, 1982, p. 101)

Girls who are achievers at the high end of the spectrum in math are less likely to be identified than boys, while girls who are learning disabled are similarly less likely to be placed in special programs. Academic advisors and teachers may try to steer girls toward classes including

typing, business machines, etc., which support stereotypically female occupations such as office oriented, clerical work, instead of courses designed for transition into post high school, university work in math or the sciences (Chapman, 1988). Numerous research efforts support the findings that language and textbooks consistently reinforce gender bias in the classroom (Stitt, 1988).

Examined together, the literature regarding race, class, and gender issues builds a strong case that children who are non-white, "non-male," and poor will have a different educational experience than white, male, middle or upper-class students. Their experiences will be shaped by specific expectations from within the school system, which are reinforced through tracking, teacher bias, language, and instructional materials, as well as a complex network of external attitudes, values, and social expectations which have a powerful reinforcing impact on these students.

One academic outcome of these internal and external forces is a product of marginal experiences for students who are identified by race, class, and gender. In these cases, the "fit" between students and school systems is set in very specific, fairly narrow terms. As stated previously, the extent to which a student is able to approximate the profile of the centering, mainstream student and follow basic school policy plays a large role in determining the ease with which she or he will "pass through the eye of the needle" and

attain a high school diploma. It would seem that the pressures to make such personal adaptations are very powerful.

Describing the "Invisible Students"

The relationship between what is known about the experience of marginally achieving secondary students and what is evident regarding the educational experiences of certain student populations is not clear. It may be, for students of a certain race, class, or gender, that marginality is a function of all or some of the characteristics. Differential treatment within the system may cause some students to decline from the highest levels of achievement to float somewhere in the middle.

It may be, however, that for some students, marginality is not a function of any of these characteristics. There are certainly representatives in the middle group of achievers who are white, or male, or both, who bring another perspective to life as a marginal student. A great deal of research regarding students who are identified as talented and gifted (TAG) who are achieving at levels far below their potential suggests another unanswered facet to the description of marginal achievers (Parish & Parish, 1989; Wolfie, 1991). And there may be many more.

It may be that the strength and pervasiveness of classroom bargains which enable students to invest very

little and still achieve a diploma entices students to float in the middle ground of marginality in patterns that cut across racial, class, and gender distinctions. Since the student population of middle track achievers is consistently described in terms that are not only ambiguous but homogenous, it is difficult to get a clearer perspective regarding who these students are and what the true nature of their school experiences has been. By describing so vast a population with a single classification--middle track students--it is easy to participate in the same types of behaviors and attitudes which contribute to the marginal performance. The presence of these students is acknowledged, but their complexity and diversity are not.

One point that does seem to be apparent, however, is the fact that the features internal and external to school systems which serve to keep this phenomenon of marginality securely in place are complex, powerful, and pervasive. These students will probably not find their way out of marginal academic performance without significant attention and intervention from the very system in which their role is defined. Unless educational systems gain a sharper understanding of the vast population of middle achievers as individuals with unique characteristics and needs, it is difficult to envision a different educational outcome for students.

Summary

The literature clearly indicates that a large portion of the secondary school population in this country achieves at marginal levels of performance. This phenomenon is acknowledged in two ways: First, within the three "tracks" of student performance, a vast number of high school students are experiencing only marginal levels of achievement and engagement--attending school and investing enough effort to achieve a diploma, but not enough to achieve an education. Second, certain segments of the student population, characterized by minority status, low SES, and gender, experience this minimal academic success in disproportionate numbers.

While these factors are born out by the literature, it is not clear how these two bodies of information are related, if at all. Does the system's bureaucratic structure and lack of flexibility cause students to become only marginally attached, willing to participate to the degree required to attain a diploma but no more? Is marginality an effect of the various attitudes and social expectations experienced by students who do not fit the narrow parameters of a successful, mainstream student? In what ways are race, class, and gender associated with marginality and how is marginality manifested for these students? Finally, and perhaps most significantly, can a clearer perspective regarding marginal students and the

nature of their school experiences guide reform efforts to better meet the needs of a portion of the large population for whom schooling is little more than a "stop-over" on a nebulous journey?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the problem that was examined and the methodology used in this study. The methods were related and twofold. First, a qualitative dimension used interviews from student focus groups in local high schools to gather anecdotal material regarding the nature of the school experiences of these marginally achieving students. Second, a quantitative dimension focused on selected variables from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) data set to further define the characteristics and experiences of the students. The combination of research methodologies allows a rich and complex characterization of marginally achieving secondary students and their school experiences.

Statement of the Problem

As discussed in Chapter II, a significant portion of the secondary students in this country is disengaged and experiencing only marginal academic success in school. For the majority, their efforts will be sufficient to enable them to complete high school and receive a diploma. Yet,

there is inadequate information regarding the phenomenon of marginality that characterizes a sizable group of students. We know very little about the characterization of the population itself, and even less about how students in this population view their status in the school. Gaining a clearer view of the characteristics of marginally achieving secondary students and understanding what school has been like for them is essential to shaping educational services to better meet their needs. Thus, the primary research question in this study is: What are the characteristics of marginally achieving secondary students, and what is the nature of their school experience?

Operational Definition of Marginality

For the purpose of this research study, marginally achieving students were identified strictly on the basis of achievement data, which is reported as academic grades. The total sample was drawn according to the grouping variable GRADES, which reflects a student's Grade Point Average (GPA). The GPA is calculated on a 4-point scale (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, and F=0 points). For the purposes of this study, a marginal student was defined as a student whose GPA falls within the GPA range of 1.50-2.50.

This GPA range represents the grade profile of a student who has passed virtually all of her/his classes at primarily the D or C level, with the inclusion of occasional

Fs and Bs to keep the grade point at this level. The upper limit of this range (2.50) was determined by calculating the GPA of a student whose work was consistently assessed as "average" or "C" level, which would generate a GPA of 2.00. A 2.00 GPA would be the highest level of academic achievement a student could attain consistently and still be considered a marginal achieving student. An extra .5 was added to reflect the fact that many of these students may have received grades that were somewhat inflated and thus increased the GPA. Still, the overall quality of their work is judged to meet a minimal standard.

The lower range limit (1.50) was determined by calculating the GPA of a student whose work is consistently assessed as "below average" or "D" level, which would generate a GPA of 1.00, the lowest level of academic achievement a student could attain and still pass a class, gain credit, and make progress toward a diploma. An extra .5 was added to the lower range to indicate the same inflated grade values and the unlikely occurrence of a straight 1.00 cumulative GPA.

The concept of grade inflation brings up a concern regarding the use of grades as the indicator of achievement and engagement in school. While grading policies and practices are standardized within certain guidelines of acceptable, professional practices, grades still reflect the perceptions or judgment of teachers, that is, arguably,

somewhat subjective in nature. Any given grade could represent an inaccurate picture of a student's level of achievement, either by inflating or deflating the grade beyond a justified level. Such practice is not uncommon, and standards vary widely from teacher to teacher, school to school, etc. However, despite this subjectivity, certain patterns emerge over time regarding student achievement, supporting the basic profiles identified previously as high, middle, and low "tracks."

Certainly, the use of grades is appropriate as a measure of student achievement levels, and, therefore, a fitting indicator of marginality. However, the use of grades as the sole indicator of marginality acknowledges a critical aspect of the relationship between grades and the attainment of a high school diploma. There are other features which could be acknowledged and/or measured as rightful and appropriate demonstrations of a student's engagement in school, including participation in after school activities, athletics, music or drama programs, a student's self-assessment of success or engagement, etc. However, the diploma reflects a student's academic achievement, and it is only the acquisition of the required credits, representing work of at least a D, or marginal, level of quality, that will result in a diploma.

This study involves students who are sophomores, which means they will have interacted with more than a dozen

teachers in the two years of high school they have experienced. Individual differences by teacher may be less significant, while larger patterns of engagement and achievement will have begun to emerge.

Methodology

This study examines the characteristics of the portion of the secondary school population that occupies the middle track or "marginal" achievers and describes the nature of their school experiences. The study necessitated two complimentary approaches to best address the research question. First, interviews of a purposeful sample of sophomores and juniors were used to gather personal, anecdotal material from secondary students regarding the nature of their school experiences. The interview questions centered on four categories of inquiry: Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans. Second, in order to better understand the universal characteristics of marginally achieving students, this study drew a sample from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) data set, to examine the selected variables in the same four categories of information. The NELS data used for this research is drawn from the survey responses of approximately 20,000 sophomore students in the second round of a national study examining patterns in high school attendance and

completion. More details of this study are forthcoming in this chapter.

There is an important connection between the two methodologies. The qualitative portion examines marginality from the viewpoint of a small sample of local students who are, themselves, middle track, marginally achieving students. The focus group methodology is appropriate to gather such student perspectives, which serves to contextualize further descriptive data through an understanding of real school experiences, thus providing insight into how these students actually function. Also, interviews gave students the opportunity to indicate what schools would have to be like for them to become more engaged and achieve at higher levels (Morgan, 1988).

Focus groups as a method of qualitative research represent a very appropriate data collection technique with particular benefits for this study. According to Krueger (1988):

Focus groups can be used before an experience such as in planning (including strategic planning), needs assessment, assets analysis, program design, or market research. Each of these tasks typically draws upon information from several sources, one of which is particularly suited to focus groups--the perceptions of both current and potential clientele. (p. 31)

As stated in Chapter II, marginally achieving students are often overlooked in the working systems of a school. Chronicling their perspectives and experiences gives a "voice" to a portion of the secondary "clientele" that

deserves the opportunity for such input. The group format has the advantage of providing support for the students who may be somewhat hesitant to participate in any discussion of their experiences. Focus groups also stimulate interaction and serve to increase the quality of the discussion (Krueger, 1988; Morgan, 1988).

The quantitative section drew from a national sample population to further explore the critical variables and provide descriptive data regarding the characteristics of marginally achieving students. This portion of the research has the attribute of drawing from a large sample population of students who participated in a study surveying a wide variety of interest areas, many of which are directly pertinent to the examination of marginal achievement. Of critical interest is the confirmation or disconfirmation of characteristics which surfaced in the focus groups or the emergence of unique variables.

The methodologies employed in this study gathered student data only, both in the focus groups and in the sample survey group of student-reported information. This decision was made for two main reasons. First, in order to describe any population, it is suitable to include the responses and perceptions of the people in that population as a source of significant information. At a future point, the inclusion of responses from other populations, such as teachers, parents, etc., may provide additional insights

into the marginal achieving student. *This* study began with the students, themselves, as the research target.

The second reason for the student focus is that a great deal of literature has been produced describing programs, materials, curriculum and instructional techniques, etc., aimed at increasing student engagement and achievement. In some cases, these strategies have been developed with little, if any, involvement of the students for whom they were designed. If it is our professional intent to increase the involvement, engagement, and quality of the academic experiences of these students, then student responses *must* become a primary source of information and input.

Understandably, using student material as a sole data source carries certain risks in terms of validity and generalizability. When asked to self-report their perceptions of their own abilities or how their teachers might regard their work or their attitudes in class, students *may* present a view that would be challenged by teachers, parents, or any other stakeholders in the school experience.

However, if it is true that the self-reported perceptions of these students do, in fact, constitute their sense of what school means to them, and if this understanding carries any influence over how they function in the school environment, this information *must* be factored in as one component in the complex decision-making and

design process used to determine the course of study made available for these students. This study proceeded with the acknowledgment that it serves to describe the phenomenon of marginality from the student perspective only regarding the topics of Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans. We turn now to a more in-depth discussion of the research methods employed.

Qualitative Methodology

The focus group interviews were conducted during a two week period in April and May of 1993 with the objective of gathering anecdotal data from students who are, themselves, marginal achievers, to understand what school has been like for them and how they perceive their school experiences. The focus group work was accomplished in several stages, beginning with the selection of two interview sites.

Focus Group Sites

Data collection began with student focus groups in two local high school settings. School Site A is a large school, located in the center of a commercial area of a suburban community. Approaching the school at the lunch hour, there was a sense of noise, traffic, and large groups of students moving around the grounds. A fast food restaurant located across the street from the school drew a steady stream of teenagers inside, while others sat on the

sidewalk out front or rode by in cars. According to student registration data, approximately 15% of the 1,600+ students are Black, Asian, or Hispanic.

Site B is located about 10 miles away in a more rural area of the same community. The site is somewhat isolated, and most of the traffic on the main road turns into the school. Except for a few homes, there is little reason to drive on the road except to go to the school. Although it was lunch time, there were no students in front of the school on either day when I arrived. It was extremely quiet and almost pastoral in the setting. Once inside the school building, the difference between these students and those at School Site A was striking. The student population of over 1,600 is almost 100% white. If there is a "minority" population at the school, it might reflect a group of students, termed by one focus group participant as "rednecks."

Focus Group Sample

Five sets of student focus groups were formed. The focus groups consisted primarily of sophomore students whose GPAs fell in the range of 1.50-2.50. A small selection of juniors in the same GPA range was included in the groups to provide a perspective reflecting one more year in the high school environment.

Students were selected for inclusion in focus groups through a specific sampling process. In each school, lists

of all students in the sophomore and junior classes arranged according to cumulative GPA were examined, and the cutoff points of 1.50 and 2.50 were established. A name was selected at random as an initial starting point, and every ninth name was marked until 50 names were identified. The total of 50 names for each school was established to increase the opportunity to have 25 participants at each site. Once the student names were selected, the progression for the focus group work was as follows:

1. District permission was secured with a letter of intent and an outline of basic research procedures to district personnel (Superintendent) (see Appendix A).

2. Narrative information was submitted to each building principal to increase their understanding of the project. Communication took place with all appropriate school personnel to increase site awareness, understanding, and support for the project (e.g. counselors, teachers, etc.). Concerns were identified and addressed (see Appendix B).

3. School personnel were enlisted to distribute study information to student sample population from current sophomore and junior enrollment lists. Packets included (see Appendix C):

- descriptive letter to explain research project--emphasis on anonymity and voluntary aspects of the interviews/procedural information

--parent/guardian and student permission forms

4. Due to the age of the participants, active parent consent was required. From the pool of students who were available to participate, contacts were made and dates and times for interviews were secured in each site.

5. Interviews were conducted during a two week period in April/May, 1993.

Although a total of 100 packets were distributed between the two schools, only 22 students were available to participate in the study, which was a lower number than anticipated. Although lunch was provided, the students were not interested in giving up any social time with their friends during the lunch hour to participate in a research study.

The low numbers of participants available for the student focus groups left no opportunity to arrange the placement of students into groups of a certain makeup. The makeup of the groups varied more at Site A than Site B, which is a reflection of the overall student populations at both schools. At Site A, group one included two black male students, and group two included one Hispanic male. All of the rest of the students at both sites were white.

Of the 22 participants, there were 12 males and 10 female students. By chance, two groups consisted of all girls, two groups were all boys, and only one group was of mixed gender. To a certain degree, the gender dynamics of

each focus group shaped the proceedings and responses for each session. Identical questions asked in the setting of all boys prompted different responses from a group consisting of all girls or the group of boys and girls together.

Research Questions

The research questions that shaped the qualitative segment of the study were designed to gather information about the students' own perspectives regarding their school experiences. The four categories examined in these interviews were: Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans. As suggested by Knodel (1993), the topic organizers were left somewhat broad and were ". . . formulated as a set of discussion guidelines that can be used by the moderator during the focus group sessions" (p. 36).

This section of the study addresses the nature of the school experiences for the marginally achieving student. Some of the areas examined include: What has school been like for them? How have they been treated in the school system? How have they responded? What factors produce an achievement record of Cs and Ds? Do they perceive themselves as marginal achievers? Also, what factors would cause a change in these students to increase their level of engagement and achievement?

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Three interview sessions were conducted at Site A and two at Site B. In each building, a conference room was secured to minimize interruptions and distractions. A pizza lunch was provided for the students, and information sheets were distributed for completion prior to the main interview session (see Appendix D). The information sheets were used to gain some basic background data from the students, and to get them thinking about the main topics of the discussion to come. Also, as they ate, talked, and filled out the sheets, the experiences served as an "ice-breaker" in this new situation (D. L. Morgan, personal communication, April 19, 1994).

A protocol of questions addressing the four categories of inquiry shaped each of the sessions (see Appendix E), and information from the focus groups was collected by audio recordings. Students were identified by first names only, which were recoded in the final analysis. Field notes were compiled and analyzed at the completion of each session.

Upon completion of the five sessions, all tapes were transcribed into text form. Since the protocol was largely the same for each session, there was a basic structure to the student information. Areas of similarities and differences were code-mapped (Knodel, 1993) through a color-coding process for further analysis after the completion of the quantitative portion of the study. Some

of the responses from the focus group interviews became factors in the selection of variables to be included in the NELS portion of the study. A specific "transfer code" was created for the overview grid (Knodel, 1993) to indicate data points that were explored in both the focus group interviews and the NELS research, since these variables represented potential areas of confirmation or disconfirmation in the study.

From this preliminary sorting, consistent themes emerged in the four categories. As seen in other focus group research,

Interpretation is facilitated by the fact that statements can be examined within the context of the broader discussion and in light of information available from other sources based on different methodologies such as surveys, case studies, or in-depth interviews. (Knodel, 1993, p. 43)

In combination with the results of the quantitative portion of the study, these themes became the primary areas for interpretation and analysis in Chapters IV and V.

Quantitative Methodology

Upon completion of the focus group interviews, a sample was drawn from the NELS database in order to further explore the student characteristics through analysis of specific variables. Since the NELS data comprise a substantial component of this study, a brief description of the research is provided here.

NELS

In 1988, the National Center for Educational Studies initiated a series of National Educational Longitudinal Studies (NELS) which focused on the transition experiences of students as they left junior high or middle school, attended high school, and began their careers. The research sample consisted of 24,599 students in the base year survey (20,706 students in the first follow-up survey, 1990), selected at random from 1,035 public and private schools from across the United States. The data sources include student, parent, teacher, and school administrator questionnaires (see Appendix F), as well as 8th grade achievement test scores in reading, math, science, and history. Data content includes 17 categories representing student characteristics, home environment, teacher attitudes, and school characteristics (see Appendix G).

Four objectives constituted the basis for creating the NELS database:

1. To predict/explain future student outcomes as measured in later survey waves.
2. To obtain valuable cross-sectional descriptive data.
3. To explain student achievement with cross-sectional descriptive data.
4. To support educational policy analysis.

Although all four objectives are part of this study of marginally achieving secondary students, objective #3 is the most critical to this research project. The primary objective for utilizing the NELS data base was to develop profiles of students who are included within the middle or marginal track of student achievers.

NELS Sample

Using the SPSS software program, the NELS sample of 20,706 sophomores was accessed. From that population, a sub-sample of 4,644 cases was drawn. The selected cases met the criteria of students who reported a Grade Point Average (GPA) that fell in the span of 1.50-2.50 and who had participated as eighth graders in the initial survey in 1988 and as tenth graders in the first follow-up survey in 1990. The tenth grade first follow-up information was used for this study. It is important to note this sample was *not* stratified according to specific gender, racial, or ethnic categories of the population. The objective was to draw a sample according to GPA and examine the characteristics of any student who was included. Since the NELS sample constituted a random sample, it is assumed that the sub-sample of 4,644 cases is both valid and reliable.

NELS Variables

From the student questionnaire data set, a total of 165 variables was selected from the NELS database and sorted to

examine each research category. The variables were drawn according to the following considerations:

Did the variable offer descriptive information about marginally achieving students in one of the four research categories?

Did the variable match a data point from the focus groups?

Did the variable offer new details in an area that was explored in the focus groups?

Did the variable challenge information that was explored in the focus groups?

Research Questions

The quantitative portion of the study examined specific variables related to the students who are marginal achievers. As with the interview data, four basic areas constitute the broad topics for inquiry: Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans. The following are examples of the types of variables explored in each category:

Student Characteristics: The purpose of examining student characteristics is to create a profile of the marginally achieving student population regarding race, class (as measured by SES), and gender. The following questions shape this portion of the quantitative research:

--What is the frequency of male students in the marginally achieving student sample?

--What is the frequency of females students?

--What is the frequency of white students in the sample?

--What is the frequency of non-white students?

School Characteristics: The purpose of examining school characteristics is to create a profile of the marginally achieving student population regarding school location and size. The following questions shape this section of inquiry:

--What is the frequency of students in the sample population who attend schools in an urban location?

--What is the frequency of students in the sample population attending large schools (with an ADM over 1,000 students) or the frequency for students in smaller schools (with an ADM below 1,000)?

School Experiences: The purpose of examining school experience is to create a profile of the marginally achieving student population regarding interactions with their school's system of rewards and sanctions. The following questions shape the inquiry:

--What is the frequency of students in the sample who had received recognition awards for academic achievement or positive behavior?

--What is the frequency of students in the sample who had been disciplined for school rule infractions?

Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans: The purpose of examining home environment is to create a profile of the marginally achieving student population regarding the frequency of parental support for school work (e.g. homework checks, homework help) and the frequency of student/parent discussions about school and post-secondary education (PSE). The following question shapes the inquiry:

--What is the frequency of parental support and assistance for academic work?

Data Analysis Procedures

The four category headings of Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans paralleled the organizers from the focus groups and shaped the analysis of the quantitative data as well. The variables were sorted by research category (see Appendix H), and frequency and percentage data were drawn to provide descriptive information regarding marginally achieving students. Based on the literature presented in Chapter II, chi-square analysis was included to test the significance of gender, race, SES, and level of parent education in relation to specific student responses (see Appendix I).

Summary

This research study employed both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies to describe the characteristics of marginally achieving secondary students and their school experiences. Both portions of the study were structured around four broad organizers, which are indicated in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Research question categories.

The study began with a qualitative segment involving focus groups of marginally achieving secondary students to generate anecdotal information regarding their school experiences and their perceptions of how schools need to change to motivate them to become more engaged and achieve

at higher levels of excellence. This information was explored further with a quantitative study using the NELS database to continue the description of characteristics and experiences of students who are a part of the middle track of student achievers. The results of the two methodologies are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Introduction

As described in the review of the literature in Chapter II, the middle-achiever, or the marginally achieving student, is often characterized by their position relative to other, well-defined levels of achievers, i.e. "They're not high and they're not low." In schools, significant programming decisions regarding curriculum and materials, instructional technique, placement in coursework, etc., are made with little, if any, knowledge about who these students are and what services would best meet their needs. Because these students constitute a large percentage of the student population, it is clear that a significant portion of the overall school population is not being well-served.

The primary research goal of this study is to describe the characteristics of marginally achieving secondary students and the nature of their school experiences. There are four major categories of inquiry: Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans. First, in relation to Student Characteristics, what can we learn about the characteristics describing the students who fall into

this achievement span as measured by a GPA of 1.50-2.50? Are there particular demographic features which distinguish this population? Second, in relation to School Characteristics, since the field of interest is academic achievement and school experiences, are there certain characteristics that describe the school demographics and the instructional environment in which these students exist? Much like student characteristics, are there larger, defining features related to the school systems themselves that give insights into the phenomenon of marginality? Third, in relation to School Experiences, how can we describe the nature of the school experiences for these students? What is it like to attend school and earn C and D grades? How do these students function and how are they regarded in the school environment? Finally, in relation to Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans, how do parents and the home environment factor into the experiences of the marginally achieving student? What is the nature of their influence on the experiences of the marginal achiever?

The findings are organized around the specific research questions shaping each category. Frequency and percentage data and results of tests of statistical significance may be found in Appendix H. For the purposes of reporting, codes of S=Student, T=Teacher, and R=Respondent were used. Brief summary remarks will end each section. After all four sections of information have been presented, a composite

summary of the characteristics of marginal achieving secondary students and the nature of their school experiences concludes the chapter.

Student Characteristics

The intention in compiling the demographic characteristics of a marginally achieving student was to create an identifying composite of such an individual. Were there key variables which would begin to describe a student in the 1.5-2.5 GPA achievement range? The specific research questions (RQ) examined the following areas:

1. What is the distribution of students in terms of gender, race, and socio-economic status (SES)?
2. What is the distribution of students in terms of family composition?
3. What is the distribution of students in terms of self-reported personality characteristics, such as self-worth and personal capabilities?
4. What is the distribution of students in terms of non-school activities?
5. How did students describe the impact of working part-time in their lives?

Based on the literature about student underachievement, basic demographic information was collected in order to gain some perspective of who these marginal achievers are as individuals (RQ 1, 2). Questions addressing the students'

assessment of their personal qualities were used to ascertain how marginally achieving students see themselves and evaluate their level of capability (RQ 3). Non-school activities were examined for level of engagement and support of academic pursuits (RQ 4). What do these students do in their non-school, discretionary time, and how does this relate to their school achievement? The opportunity to earn money distinguished working at a job from other non-school activities. What was the impact of this on the marginal achieving student's life (RQ 5)?

Gender, Race, and SES Variables

The NELS information regarding the distribution of responses for gender, race, and SES for the 4,644 student sample population of marginally achieving sophomores is presented in Table 1.

For the purposes of providing comparison information, Table 2 presents the data for the same demographic variables from the total NELS student sample. For Race and SES, the frequencies for missing responses (2,038) were sufficiently high to warrant the presentation of the percentages for the total sample of 20,706, as well as the adjusted percentages for the total sample minus the missing responses, or 18,668 student respondents.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics (NELS $N=4,644$)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	2,521	54.3
Female	2,123	45.7
<u>Race</u>		
Asian/Pac Islander	175	3.8
Hispanic	600	12.9
Black	482	10.4
White	3,323	71.7
American Indian/ Alaskan	57	1.2
<u>Socio-Economic Status (SES) Quartiles</u>		
Q1=Low	1,179	25.4
Q2	1,337	28.8
Q3	1,241	26.7
Q4=High	887	19.1

Based on the literature reviewed in Chapter II, there may have been some cause for the expectation that females, minority students, and students in the low SES quartile would have increased representation in the marginally achieving sample. Beginning with gender, however, the distribution of students favored males, both in the survey sample and in the student interview groups. While the males represented only 50.5% of the total NELLS sample, their percentage increased to 54.3% in the marginally achieving sample. The corresponding ratio for females was 49.5% in the total sample which declined to 45.7% in the marginally achieving group. While these percentages are not

dramatically distinct, the differences do represent approximately 800 more male students and 700 fewer female students whose GPAs were in the marginally achieving range when compared to the total sample. The male/female distribution represented in Table 1 was matched in the five focus groups, where there were 12 male students and 10 females. In the student interviews, while the numbers may have distributed more evenly, the response patterns were not always the same.

Table 2
Comparison Data to NELS Sample (N=20,706)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage	Adjusted Percentage (N=18,668)
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	10,462	50.5	
Female	10,244	49.5	
<u>Race</u>			
Asian/Pac Islander	1,302	6.3	7.0
Hispanic	2,751	13.3	14.7
Black	2,218	10.7	11.9
White	13,837	66.8	74.1
Am Indian/Alaskan	259	1.3	1.4
Missing Value	339	1.6	-
<u>Socio-Economic Status (SES)</u>			
Q1=Low	4,556	22.0	24.4
Q2	4,472	24.0	24.0
Q3	4,378	21.1	23.5
Q4=High	5,262	25.4	28.2
Missing Value	2,038	9.8	-

For the most part, the boys groups were louder, noisier in a "rowdy" or disruptive manner, and more active than the girls groups. In both boys groups, there were instances where the students got up out of their seats to act out and move around during the sessions. The girls groups were noticeably quieter, more compliant, and watchful for cues regarding the rules and expectations in the research setting, which was unfamiliar to them. If, as suggested in the literature in Chapter II, it is accurate that students who are compliant and well-mannered can have a smoother school experience than those who are loud, disruptive, or who call attention to themselves in negative ways, the contrasts between focus groups suggested that gender, may, in fact, play a role in the treatment the students receive in the school system. Gender issues are discussed further in the "School Experiences" category.

While gender issues were reflected in group responses and behaviors in the interview sessions, racial issues did not surface as a meaningful feature of marginality, either in the interviews or the student survey. Recalling the literature suggesting differential treatment in the school system may cause minority students to experience diminished opportunities in relation to white students, from the NELS survey, the predominant response in the marginally achieving sample was White (71.7%), with representation in the other racial or ethnic categories which matched the corresponding

percentages in the total NELS sample. One exception to this pattern was for Asian students, whose representation of 7.0% in the total population fell to 3.8% in the sub-sample of marginally achieving students. Recalling the makeup of the focus groups, with so few non-white students in the interviews, it is not surprising that race did not emerge as a factor in marginal achievement.

The issue of SES and its influence on school experiences was not addressed in the focus groups, as no reliable vehicle was available in school records to determine the SES of students. From the NELS sample, SES showed a relatively even distribution of students in quartiles 1, 2, and 3, which basically paralleled the comparison data from the total sample. However, there was a substantial decrease in the number of students in the marginally achieving sample who came from the highest SES range, where the percentage comparison reflected a drop from 28.2% total representation to 19.1% in the sub-sample. While it can be said that the phenomenon of marginality cuts across all economic lines, students in the highest SES quartile were less represented than students in the other three quartiles.

Family Composition

Sinclair and Ghory (1987) include "family structure" as one feature of a student's profile that could be factored into an examination of that student's level of achievement

(see Chapter II of this text). Analysis of the NELS sample indicated that while 19.3% of the students reported living in a single parent household, and an additional 13.7% lived with one birth parent and a step parent, the majority, 64.2%, still lived with both birth parents. From the information sheets the students were asked to complete prior to each interview session, of the 22 participants, 14 students lived with both birth parents, 4 lived with the birth mother and a stepfather, and 4 lived with one birth parent. Thus, it would appear that these students live in a family structure that was relatively stable.

Personality Characteristics

The students selected for the interviews as well as those in the NELS database reported grades of primarily Cs and Ds in their major subjects. However, these same populations of students still seemed to maintain a strong sense of personal worth and faith in their own abilities. As shown in Table 3, the responses to the four NELS variables report a strong, positive feeling of esteem.

This pattern was reinforced in the interviews, as students presented a vivid contradiction to the image of an "invisible person" or a part of a "great, gray mass." They were articulate, direct, quick to laugh at each other's stories and able to laugh at themselves. Some of the students were known to be part of the "popular crowd" of their class, either according to sports participation,

physical attractiveness, or outgoing personality features. At various times in the sessions, the students sang, danced, and demonstrated the proper technique for a free-throw in basketball. In general, they were animated and active.

Table 3
Self-Reported Self-Assessment Qualities
(NELS $N=4,644$)

Variable	% Strongly Agree	% Agree
R feels good about him/herself	29.6	60.2
R feels s/he is a person of worth	28.2	61.2
R able to do things as well as others	25.2	64.3
On the whole, R satisfied with self	22.1	60.0

Overall, all of the students indicated that they felt very good about themselves and their individual abilities. These self-assessment features *could* represent a powerful source of motivation to these young people. However, rather than use this apparent sense of self-esteem as inspiration to pursue higher levels of academic engagement, consistently, these students earned grades indicating only marginal achievement. Further, the phenomenon of marginal engagement seemed to be as apparent outside of school, when the students could make independent choices with their discretionary time.

Non-School Activities

The NELS study asks students to indicate their participation in a range of non-school activities. The intent of these questions is to ascertain how they spend their discretionary time. Results of 16 variables related to non-school activities are summarized in Table 4. Students were asked to indicate how often they participated in each activity. The responses were grouped into three sections according to the response rate.

--Activities in which 60% or more of the students often participated are grouped together in the first section.

--Activities that received sizable percentages for students who participated often and students who never participated are grouped together.

--Activities in which 60% or more of the students never participated are in the final category.

High participation activities--talking on the phone with friends, visiting friends at the local hangout, and driving or riding around (presumably with friends)--are those in which these students participate on the most frequent basis. While these activities may define the students more as typical teenagers rather than identify characteristics unique to marginal achievement, they share the characteristics of involving little academic or mental challenge.

Table 4
Non-School Activities (NELS N=4,644)

Response Choice	% Often	% Seldom
<u>High Participation</u>		
Talk on phone w/friends	80.7	19.3
Visit w/friends at local hangout	72.2	27.8
Drive, ride around	61.4	38.6
<u>Some Participation</u>		
Do things w/mom and dad	58.8	41.3
Go to park, pool, gym	44.8	55.2
Play ball, other sports	46.5	53.5
<u>Low Participation</u>		
Perform community service	5.3	94.7
Use P/C	11.3	88.7
Sports lessons	11.8	88.2
Attend youth groups	15.2	84.8
Music, art, dance class	17.1	82.9
Attend religious activities	22.4	75.6
Read for pleasure	34.7	65.3
Work on hobbies	38.9	61.1
Talks w/other adults	39.4	60.6

For the purposes of reporting, participation once or twice a week and every day or almost every day are reported as "Often." Rarely or never and less than once a week are reported as "Seldom." Percentages for multiple or missing responses are not included in the table.

Conspicuously less favorable are activities of an academic nature (such as using a computer or reading for pleasure), or regular activities involving a higher level of commitment (such as attending classes in music or art or participating with youth groups or in religious activities). Loosely structured, open-ended activities such as playing in a ball game or going to the park evidence an even split with about half of the respondents participating and a like

number not participating. While engagement in some hobbies *could* represent a more challenging opportunity, less than 40% of the respondents claim regular participation.

Student Part-Time Employment

Based on data collected during interview sessions, part-time employment surfaced as a main feature of non-school activities for the focus group students. Seven of the 10 juniors and 5 of the 12 sophomores worked for pay, with restaurant and grocery work being most typical. The hours varied from Jill, a sophomore who worked Saturdays only, to Jacob, a junior who claimed to work 35 hours per week at a local restaurant.

The impact of working at a job as a non-school activity was examined at some length, specifically in terms of the role a job played in the lives of these marginal achievers and the effect a work schedule could have on school effort and level of achievement. The consensus of the student interviews was that the opportunity to earn money was a greater priority than school, even though the money was used for "discretionary" items such as clothing, entertainment, and car expenses, and not for basic family needs. Overall, students did not perceive work as interfering with school demands, as long as they remained relatively consistent in their attendance and were attentive to some studying, the usual amount of homework which the school gave required

little, if any, time outside of the classroom. Mike, a sophomore who worked about 20 hours per week, claimed,

I have had homework about three times this year. It's not the same as when my parents were in school, which they don't understand. The teachers today just don't want to grade papers, so they don't give homework any more.

Final exams and projects presented a bit more pressure in terms of needing to balance work with time to prepare school materials. However, this was pronounced very manageable, since school usually demanded very little, exams were basically once a term, and work was too important to miss.

From the students' perspectives, the reduced study time had little effect on the quality of the schoolwork produced. Most of the students agreed with the statement made by Steve, a sophomore working almost 25 hours a week at a car detailing shop, when he stated:

It doesn't matter what my schedule is anyway. I only put so much time in on school stuff, and when that time is up, I quit on it whether I have to go to work or not. At work, my boss decides how many hours I have to put in and how hard I have to work. But in school, I decide when it's time to quit, and for me, that's usually pretty early.

Working a job was a fairly defined feature of the students' non-school activities. The rest of the time, for those who worked, and *most* of the time for those who did not, was spent "hangin' out, bein' with friends, walkin' around." Only Clarence, who played varsity football, and Jerry, who played basketball, participated in school sports.

For the remainder of the students interviewed, there was no current participation in organized school sports, or sports in general, beyond "shootin' hoop" every now and then.

There were no references to hobbies, music lessons, any regular club participation, or activities of a particularly significant interest to the students.

After putting in a fairly uneventful day in terms of academic performance at school, students said they went home to spend their personal time in a similarly undemanding fashion. Still, while their level of engagement in school may not have been particularly high, students emphasized that they *had*, in fact, *gone* to school, did most of what was asked of them, and had put in quite a bit of *time*. Therefore, the students felt they had earned a break when they went home.

Mark, a TAG student, summarized his personal profile like this:

I make it through my classes, no sweat. I see my friends, eat some lunch, and go home. When I get home, I hang out. I listen to music, I chow. Three times a week, I get organized and take a shower before I have to go to work. I come home, and it starts all over again. My teachers stay off of my back, because I pass everything, and I show up for class. My parents stay off my back because I go to school, I have a job, and I don't do drugs. It's all completely under control. Right now, I'd say my life is perfect. I don't know how long it's going to last, but right now, it's right where I want it.

Student Characteristics Summary

The information collected from the Student Characteristics segment is summarized according to three main points.

1. Specific demographic variables such as gender, race, SES, or family composition did not seem to be significant identifiers of the marginal achieving student. Although there were more male students in the sub-sample than females, and strong perceptions of gender issues surfaced in the interviews, it is not clear how this factors into characterizing the marginal achieving student, if at all.

2. The students who are identified as marginal achievers still seemed to maintain a secure sense of who they are and what they are able to accomplish as individuals. They believe they are strong and capable at this point in their lives. They do not look at their current lifestyles and see examples of people who are "lost" or "forgotten." Rather, they see themselves as meeting, at an adequate level, the multiple expectations held at school, at home, and, for some, at a job. They do not see themselves as "marginal."

3. The level of participation and active engagement in self-selected, non-school activities followed a pattern of easy access, low risk options, with an emphasis on relationships. The students spent a great deal of time

operating at a modest level of challenge, engagement, or effort, a condition that was satisfactory to them. They believed that their responsibilities to schoolwork and to their jobs were easy to balance, with work being a higher priority. Those who were employed seemed to accept the increased performance expectations fairly easily.

These points support an important conclusion of the Student Characteristics segment. While the students in the middle achievement group see themselves as capable and satisfied with who they are and how they perform academically, teachers, counselors, other school personnel, and even parents characterize them, according to the literature presented in Chapter II, as "lost" and "invisible." The study was designed to address more precisely how school shapes the characteristics and experiences of the marginal achieving student in the secondary environment. In the next section, we examine the organizational correlates of marginal achievement.

School Characteristics

The previous segment examined the student demographics to try to identify specific characteristics of the marginal achiever. This section, School Characteristics, begins to narrow to the field of interest, academic achievement, by exploring the school environment in which the students function. Are students more likely to fall into the middle

group in a school characterized by a given size, location, etc.? How do climate variables, such as general level and/or quality of the teacher/student relationships, level of interest or class expectation, factor into student engagement and achievement? The specific research questions examined the following areas:

1. What was the distribution of schools in terms of size (ADM), location (urbanicity), and SES?
2. What was the distribution of students' perceptions of teacher/student relations in their school?
3. What were the student-reported perceptions of their teachers' instructional style and expertise?
4. What was the student-reported level of interest in the general content?
5. What was the student-reported level of expectation and challenge felt in the general coursework?

To build an initial sense of the scope of school systems from which the sample of marginally achieving students was drawn, basic demographic features were gathered (RQ 1). In order to provide a context for their school experiences, it is necessary to gain a sense of how the students perceived the general environment of their school. Questions addressing the students' feelings and perceptions regarding school climate and content issues were a direct reflection of the concerns that surfaced in the literature review (RQ 2, 3, and 4). Finally, since high school

academic achievement is primarily a performance-oriented construct, students reflected on their school environment specifically from a performance standpoint. How much did they feel challenged in school and how hard did they actually work (RQ 5)?

School Characteristics

The sample of students drawn from the NELS research data was not stratified for region, location, or size of school. Thus, there is a strong representation of types and sizes of schools from all areas of the country. These characteristics are summarized in Table 5.

If descriptors of marginality include being "lost" or "invisible in the system," there may have been an expectation of data supporting lower percentages of marginally achieving students in smaller schools or in locations out of urban areas, where school systems may have had the resources to better serve this population. In fact, in examining Table 5, this was not necessarily the case, with approximately equal percentages of marginally achieving students found in schools with enrollments of 700 students or less and schools of 2,000 students or less. Also, there was a substantial increase in the percentages of marginally achieving students in suburban areas as contrasted to urban locations. Marginal student performance does not seem to be confined to any type of school classification, location, or enrollment.

Table 5
Marginal School Performance and School
Characteristics (NELS $N=4,644$)

Variable	Response Choice	Percentage
Classification	Public	89.5
	Private:	
	Catholic	5.4
	Private (other religion)	2.0
	Private (non-religious)	2.8
Urbanicity	Urban	26.3
	Suburban	57.5
	Rural	16.2
Region of Country	Northeast	17.5
	North Central	29.7
	South	32.2
	West	20.5
Size of School	1-399	11.2
	400-599	12.1
	600-799	9.8
	800-999	11.9
	1,000-1,199	13.4
	1,200-1,599	16.9
	1,600-1,999	12.4
	2,000-2,499	6.0
	2,500+	6.4

Climate Issues: Student/
Teacher Relations in School

Narrowing the focus from a global picture of school demographics to the immediate classroom environment, several research questions addressed the students' perceptions of general climate issues. Herein, I assumed that how a student perceives the teacher's level of interest or response on an individual basis can have a profound effect on a student's level of engagement and achievement. Seven

NELS variables related to the concept of classroom climate are summarized in Table 6, with statistical data reflecting student responses as functions of gender, race, and SES (see Appendix I):

1. Students get along well with teachers.
2. The teaching is good at school.
3. Teachers are interested in students.
4. When R works hard, teachers praise effort.
5. In class, often feel put down by teachers.
6. Often feel put down by students in class.
7. Most teachers listen to R.

Table 6
Student Reported Classroom Climate Variables
Cross Tabulated with Gender, Race,
and SES (NELS $N=4,644$)

Variable	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	Chi- Square	df	Prob
1) <u>Students get along well with teachers</u> (see Appendix I, #1).							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	3.1	66.4	26.7	3.9	8.57	3	0.04
Female	2.6	66.6	28.3	2.5			
<u>Race</u>							
Asian/Pac Isl	4.1	69.6	22.8	3.5	31.30	9	0.01
Hispanic	4.2	66.1	26.9	2.8			
Black/Not Hisp	2.4	57.0	35.6	5.0			
White/Not Hisp	2.6	67.8	26.5	3.1			
<u>SES</u>							
Q1=Low	2.7	64.2	29.2	3.8	22.38	9	0.01
Q2	2.4	65.7	28.8	3.1			
Q3	2.5	67.9	25.7	3.9			
Q4=High	4.2	68.6	25.3	1.8			

Table 6
Student Reported Classroom Climate Variables
Cross Tabulated with Gender, Race,
and SES (NELS N=4,644)
(Continued)

Variable	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	Chi- Square	df	Prob
2) <u>The teaching is good at school</u> (see Appendix I, #2).							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	10.4	65.3	18.6	5.6	20.25	3	0.01
Female	7.7	69.8	18.7	3.8			
<u>Race</u>							
Asian/Pac Isl	9.4	67.1	20.0	3.5	14.62	9	0.10
Hispanic	10.4	68.7	17.8	3.2			
Black/Not Hisp	12.3	67.4	15.9	4.4			
White/Not Hisp	8.5	67.3	19.1	5.1			
<u>SES</u>							
Q1=Low	10.1	70.0	15.7	4.2	20.68	9	0.02
Q2	8.9	65.8	20.2	5.1			
Q3	7.4	67.4	19.7	5.6			
Q4=High	10.9	66.5	18.5	4.2			
3) <u>Teachers are interested in students</u> (see Appendix I, #3).							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	9.5	59.3	25.5	5.6	4.45	3	0.22
Female	8.8	61.7	25.0	4.5			
<u>Race</u>							
Asian/Pac Isl	10.1	65.7	19.5	4.7	13.69	9	0.13
Hispanic	10.4	61.2	24.2	4.2			
Black/Not Hisp	10.8	62.1	20.9	6.2			
White/Not Hisp	8.7	59.7	26.4	5.2			
<u>SES</u>							
Q1=Low	9.9	60.7	24.1	5.3	16.73	9	0.05
Q2	7.4	60.7	26.2	5.7			
Q3	8.7	59.3	27.0	5.0			
Q4=High	11.5	61.0	23.2	4.3			

Table 6
Student Reported Classroom Climate Variables
Cross Tabulated with Gender, Race,
and SES (NELS N=4,644)
(Continued)

Variable	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	Chi- Square	df	Prob
4) <u>When R works hard, teachers praise effort</u> (see Appendix I, #4).							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	7.2	43.1	41.3	8.4	7.38	3	0.06
Female	6.0	44.4	42.8	6.8			
<u>Race</u>							
Asian/Pac Isl	9.9	50.9	32.7	6.4	60.39	9	0.01
Hispanic	8.1	48.4	38.2	5.3			
Black/Not Hisp	11.4	48.5	33.8	6.4			
White/Not Hisp	5.5	41.8	44.4	8.3			
<u>SES</u>							
Q1=Low	7.1	47.7	37.4	7.9	35.25	9	0.01
Q2	5.5	40.0	45.1	9.4			
Q3	6.5	42.8	43.2	7.5			
Q4=High	7.9	45.4	41.6	5.2			
5) <u>In class, often feel put down by teachers</u> (see Appendix I, #5).							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	4.3	17.4	59.5	18.8	3.05	3	0.38
Female	3.3	18.1	60.0	18.5			
<u>Race</u>							
Asian/Pac Isl	2.9	18.7	59.1	19.3	56.71	9	0.01
Hispanic	3.2	14.9	60.4	21.5			
Black/Not Hisp	4.4	14.5	51.1	30.0			
White/Not Hisp	4.0	18.7	60.8	16.6			
<u>SES</u>							
Q1=Low	4.3	17.3	57.2	21.3	12.88	9	0.17
Q2	3.1	17.5	61.4	17.9			
Q3	4.6	18.0	59.9	17.5			
Q4=High	3.2	18.5	60.3	18.0			

Table 6
Student Reported Classroom Climate Variables
Cross Tabulated with Gender, Race,
and SES (NELS N=4,644)
(Continued)

Variable	% Strongly Agree	% Agree	% Disagree	% Strongly Disagree	Chi- Square	df	Prob
6) <u>Often feel put down by students in class</u> (see Appendix I, #6).							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	3.9	16.5	57.7	22.0	6.57	3	0.09
Female	4.5	18.7	57.1	19.8			
<u>Race</u>							
Asian/Pac Isl	2.9	15.9	55.3	25.9	51.25	9	0.01
Hispanic	1.4	18.2	57.4	23.0			
Black/Not Hisp	3.7	16.5	49.2	30.5			
White/Not Hisp	4.8	17.6	58.7	18.9			
<u>SES</u>							
Q1=Low	4.8	18.3	55.3	21.6	9.86	9	0.36
Q2	3.7	18.4	57.1	20.8			
Q3	4.7	15.7	59.5	20.2			
Q4=High	3.3	17.4	57.7	21.5			
7) <u>Most teachers listen to R</u> (see Appendix I, #7).							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	5.8	56.2	30.9	7.0	8.63	3	0.04
Female	6.2	59.3	29.3	5.2			
<u>Race</u>							
Asian/Pac Isl	4.7	62.0	28.1	5.3	40.45	9	0.01
Hispanic	5.6	62.5	25.6	6.3			
Black/Not Hisp	11.0	59.0	23.1	6.8			
White/Not Hisp	5.4	56.6	31.8	6.2			
<u>SES</u>							
Q1=Low	6.1	59.5	28.2	6.2	8.93	9	0.44
Q2	5.8	56.9	31.2	6.2			
Q3	6.2	54.9	32.5	6.3			
Q4=High	6.0	60.0	28.2	5.9			

An examination of these data shows that a majority of the respondents regard their teachers positively with respect to teacher/student relationships, classroom climate, and general level of instructional ability. However, within a generally positive framework, there were some significantly difference response patterns based on gender, race, and SES. As a function of gender, boys were more likely to respond that "Students get along well with teachers," and that "The teaching is good at school," while girls responded more positively in response to "Most teachers listen to r."

Race produced several significant differences in response patterns. Interestingly, while Black students were more likely to disagree with the variable "Students get along well with teachers," which suggests a negative response or tension from these students' perceptions, they were also more likely to strongly agree that their hard work was praised and they were listened to by their teachers, and disagree that they felt put down in the classroom by their teachers or other students. In response to the variable "When R works hard, teachers praise effort," White students were more likely to disagree than Black, Asian, or Hispanic students.

The literature related to SES and school achievement suggested that low SES students may experience different, diminished opportunities when compared to students in a

higher SES quartile. This is born out somewhat in these data, specifically in the more positive responses of students in the high SES quartile. They were more likely to agree that students and teachers get along well, the teaching is good, teachers are interested in students, and that hard work earns teacher praise than students in the lower SES quartiles.

Climate Issues: Teachers'
Instructional Style and
Expertise

The examination of data regarding a teacher's instructional style and expertise indicated some interesting contradictions in the student perceptions of their teachers' abilities. The responses in this area overlapped repeatedly with student/teacher relations and classroom climate issues. Some key themes emerged in relation to the marginal achieving students' perceptions of how their teachers function and respond to them in the classroom.

A variety of delivery techniques surfaced as the positive feature of an instructor who was favored by the students. A teacher who showed a sense of style and freedom in her/his repertoire was seen as being more likely to encourage and appreciate these characteristics in the students themselves. Cooperative learning techniques or any group project configurations were emphasized positively, not so much for their instructional superiority as for the opportunities they provided to be with friends.

The ability to explain material without being condescending and working to make sure the students really understood content was another area of focus. Teachers who had mastered a balance between "getting on our level" and "not talking down to us like we're babies" were viewed as a positive person in the school day. It was clear the students would be willing to work through content they did not particularly like, as long as it was presented in a way that showed the teacher was making the material accessible to them and offering a chance for success. Conversely, when this relational component was not evident with a specific teacher, even a subject that was positively regarded could just "slip," in the words of one participant, ". . . to just another C or even a D, but not an F, because that just causes too many problems."

Teachers who were able to respond to students as individuals were viewed, not only as being fine professionals, but as a lifeline keeping students alive in a class. The personal connection between teachers and students was the overriding feature of the discussion about the interpersonal skills teachers demonstrated as part of their instructional capacity in the classroom. Mike, a sophomore, summarized such a relationship, which had evidence of both the positive and negative aspects to which students alluded in the discussion.

I started out working hard in math. I wasn't just one of the herd. Sometimes a teacher may find me

interesting; I may find them interesting. Sometimes a teacher will explore something with you and maybe go further with you than with all the rest of the class. Makes me think they see something in me they don't see in someone else. My math teacher lost interest in me when I bombed on the tests. She doesn't do a very good job of explaining to me, so I probably haven't been the best student. I've brought it on myself, but that's the point of gearing down.

According to the remarks made by the students, the more consistent a teacher was in establishing this connection with a broad base of students, the more likely it was received as being genuine and positive. A teacher had to be able to look past the exterior to the real person inside. Comments came from a variety of students to support this perspective:

Ms. M really cares about you. Kids come in to talk to her, even if they don't have class. She keeps things confidential. Ms. F finds the good in everybody, even if you smoke or do drugs. She's always trying to get you to stop, but she'll always love you for who you are.

Mr. A is there if you need him. You're more than just a student ID number to him.

Conversely, teachers who were unable to establish this positive connection were viewed harshly. Inconsistencies were unforgivable to these students. Teachers who allowed students to become targets of other students in the class without putting a stop to that behavior were viewed negatively, even if the teacher did not participate. It was viewed as the teacher's job to protect *all* students, even from each other.

Students were presented with the opportunity to evaluate their teachers' instructional styles from the perspective of negative characteristics. Teachers who talked too much received consistently negative remarks.

Jerry, who described a pattern of teachers who:

. . . go on and on and only stop in enough time to give you the assignment for the next day, which you can't understand, because they haven't stopped talking long enough for you to ask questions. So you go home and try the best you can.

Students indicated that this style of teaching was quite common.

Continuing in the examination of negative instructional traits, the subject of teacher preference surfaced as a critical feature in the marginal achievers' school perceptions. Teachers who were disorganized, lost papers, or made promises they did not keep were unanimously criticized, again with the sense this sort of thing happened a great deal. More than the particular item or statement, for the students, this presented evidence of a teacher's ability to respond differently to students. Some students received preferential treatment; some did not. The choice was always the teacher's to make. According to the students, and, perhaps, evidenced in the lack of student support for the statement "When the respondent works hard, teachers praise the effort," a strong feeling emerged that the students did not see themselves as being in the group that would get preferential treatment, however that

preference manifested itself in the classroom. Small episodes took on great significance in their eyes.

One time, I had this teacher who said he would change my seat to the front of the room, because I told him these two girls kept talking all the time, and I'm not so great in math. So I asked him to change me, but I wanted him to wait a few days, and maybe change a few people's seats so I wouldn't be the only one, because that would be really bad. Well, he must have forgotten or something, because I sat there for six weeks, and he never moved me. Finally, I got a new seat, because he got mad at everybody and made a new seating chart. I ended up in a worse spot than before, but I never bothered to even ask him to change me, because I knew he didn't care enough about me to even remember the first time. So I didn't bother. I got a D from him, which was good, because I didn't have to take the class again.

David, a sophomore, concluded from this experience that teachers made decisions about students personally, they cared about them or did not care, and then acted accordingly. The critical feature seemed to be the acknowledgment that another student would have been treated differently and would have the seat changed promptly because of who s/he was. That person would have been viewed by the middle achieving student as a member of the high-achieving, high profile group favored in the eyes of the teacher. In their own eyes, the middle achievers did not see themselves in that preferred class. Yet there did not appear to be any bitterness or anger directed toward the high achievers. The attitude was more one of acceptance--this is how school is.

This presence of teacher preference or favoritism directed toward selected students was often a class where

students said they would produce enough to pass and no more--the C or D level of achievement. Acting on the assumption they would never be one of the "favored ones," this situation was viewed as a place where the marginal group would be in the safe, middle ground of C, and occasionally D, work. Herein, the marginal achievers "knew their place," and acted with instincts developed in the previous ten years of school.

Climate Issues: Level of
Interest in Course Content

Questions addressing class content were generally startup questions for the group sessions, since it was not an overly personal topic or one that would be too revealing for the students to discuss. As a rule, it was more difficult than anticipated to gain information about these topics, because the students were not in the habit of discussing their courses or the content in any sort of systematic way. Most had not given it much thought, and, they assured me repeatedly, they had never been asked. When presented with the general task of describing classes or content they liked or disliked, the conversation would drift quickly to the teachers who taught specific classes, rather than the content or the material.

There were no apparent patterns in the subjects the students liked or disliked. It cannot be said this group was more inclined to enjoy participatory classes such as art

or physical education or classes such as math or computers. Statements made by the students seemed to cover the spectrum of classes: "I like math, art, band. Pretty much all of my classes except history. It's too boring." "I can't do math. I love lit. I love to read." "I hate math--it's always the same: take notes, do the assignments."

Some interesting concepts *did* begin to surface, however, in an exploration for a possible pattern in classes which were more appealing to students. First, there was apparent consensus that much of the work they were asked to do in their classes was uninteresting and irrelevant. Megan stated,

Almost everything I do in school is completely boring and meaningless. Maybe if they asked me to do something halfway interesting, I'd be more involved, although I think I'd die of shock first.

Although the students were not always clear about what they considered to be a good curriculum, greater connection to their present lives and focused toward immediate use was viewed as both a dramatic difference as well as a great improvement over the current content.

As an example from her own experience, Megan offered her current English class.

I've always failed English. Doesn't mean I've always hated English, but I've always failed it. People who don't like to read aren't going to start because you give them a worksheet on a stupid story.

In his session, Clarence added to this theme with his comment, "Please tell me why we have to read the stuff we

read in American Lit? I don't think I'll ever read The Scarlet Letter to my children as a bedtime story."

When I suggested there might be other reasons to struggle through a complex story, even though it would not be used for children's reading, Clarence amended his feelings, but only slightly.

OK, I can see that when you're a junior in school they're not going to give you See Spot Run. But there are lots of other things we could read that have to do with "now," and not two hundred years ago stuff. Why can't they just let "us" choose, sometimes? How well would "you" do when someone is always telling you what to read? But that wouldn't happen to you, because in real life, you get to choose, most of the time. Is it going to make us want to read "more" when most of the time we have no choices at all? You tell me how that works, because I'd sure like to know. I've been doing this for many years now, and it still makes no sense.

The level of interest in the subject matter of any given class can certainly be enhanced by the teacher. However, the final arbiter interest and involvement is each individual student. For these marginal achieving students, the level of interest and involvement was consistently quite low in most of the courses they were required to take. When questioned further, the students indicated their coursework was primarily "General" in nature, e.g., General Math, General Science, Regular English, etc. One participant summed up his point of view, representing that of others,

Maybe if they gave me the kind of classes like Advanced English or an honors class, maybe something goes on in there that's more interesting. But those kind of classes aren't

meant for kids like me. I'm sort of a basic person, so I get the basic classes.

Level of Expectation and Challenge

Teacher/student climate variables emphasized the importance of the relational component in the classroom as a factor in how students felt in a class and how hard they might work for a teacher. The final research question addressed the level of expectation and challenge inherent in the coursework itself and as presented by a specific teacher.

Four required classes were examined from the NELS survey sample. Math, English, history, and science were presented to students from three different perspectives:

1. How often did they work hard?
2. How often were they asked to show understanding?
3. How often did they feel challenged?

The student responses are summarized in Table 7.

The responses to these three questions for each class illustrate an important link to a student's level of engagement and performance. If the level of expectation and challenge was too low, it could be hard to remain focused and the class might end up being boring, which was a common indication from the students. If the level of expectation and challenge was too high, the pressure could be too much for a student to handle. Either situation could cause a

student to withdraw their efforts to a level of performance which would earn a C or D grade.

Table 7
Level of Expectation in Required Classes
(NELS N=4,644)

Variable	% Never	% Rarely	% Often
<u>Class=Math</u>			
Show understanding	11.1	29.4	55.6
Work hard	6.1	16.0	74.0
Feel challenged	8.9	17.6	69.6
<u>Class=English</u>			
Show understanding	16.4	35.4	47.3
Work hard	5.6	18.0	75.4
Feel challenged	12.0	29.4	57.7
<u>Class=History</u>			
Show understanding	14.7	24.0	29.3
Work hard	5.2	13.5	49.3
Feel challenged	8.3	18.6	41.2
<u>Class=Science</u>			
Show understanding	15.2	32.4	42.7
Work hard	5.0	17.7	67.8
Feel challenged	7.9	19.6	62.9

For the purpose of reporting, for each of the three questions asked regarding level of expectation and challenge felt in the individual classes, the choices less than once a week and about once a week are reported as % Rarely, while a few times a week and almost every day are reported as % Often.

From these data, it appeared that a majority of the students believed they worked hard and felt challenged in their classes on a regular basis. The response choice "Show understanding" may have been interpreted as a weekly quiz or

assignments turned in for credit. Respondents may not have been thinking about more subtle forms of checks.

The above information might be viewed as evidence of regular engagement, yet two other considerations became obvious. First, while the majority of the respondents reported a reasonably high level of expectation and challenge in the classes, if we combine the response percentages for those who report Never feeling challenged, working hard, etc., and those who report Rarely, anywhere from 20-50% of the students claimed to be in classes where the level of expectation, and the accompanying need to produce at an acceptable standard was perceived as quite low. This would support the low levels of expectation and challenge the focus group students claimed were common features of their classes.

A second consideration was evident through examination of the level of expectation and challenge felt by the students and the grades they reported receiving in these same classes. In Table 8, grades are summarized according to students who claimed to be earning mostly As and Bs and those who reported mostly Cs and Ds. It was not possible from the data to determine the level of the class (e.g., Introductory, Advanced, etc.).

Table 8
Students' Self-Reported Grades in Required
Classes* (NELS $N=4,644$)

Class	% A-B	% C-D
Math	17.4	78.3
English	18.2	81.7
History	14.0	68.3
Science	13.0	84.3

*Responses for those not taking the course, missing responses, and those in classes that were not graded completed the percentages.

In all of the classes reported, less than 20% of the respondents claimed to be earning grades which suggested a high level of excellence, while 68% or higher were earning grades in the marginal achievement span. The apparent discrepancy between the efforts the students claimed to be making and the grades they earned in the end merits some examination. When asked to judge their own efforts and experiences, some of the students saw themselves as working hard and feeling challenged, etc., while other students perceived that a high level of engagement was rare for them. For those students who *did* see themselves as working hard and feeling challenged by the coursework, the resulting grades may have been received with a sense of disappointment, frustration, or, perhaps, routine acceptance. For those students who did not see themselves as working particularly hard, the resulting grades may have been seen as a match to their efforts, much like the student

who claimed to ". . . have brought it on myself."

Regardless of the student's self-evaluation of performance, however, the academic results were similar. Whether they worked hard or not, only a small minority of the students claimed to be earning As or Bs, while the majority of the students, claimed to be earning Cs and Ds.

School Characteristics Summary

The information collected from the School Characteristics section is summarized around four main points:

1. The size of a school, its location, and its SES were not variables which identified a specific profile of a school system or type of environment where marginal achieving students were more likely to be found. In the survey sample, students in the marginal achievement GPA span came from schools of all configurations.

2. Climate variables in a given classroom influenced a student's level of effort and production. Much of the coursework was perceived to be unrelated to the students' lives or to be of much interest. Therefore, student motivation was quite low. Teachers who were skilled in developing sincere personal relationships with the students were favored highly over a class situation where the students were treated impersonally or simply as one of a group, even if the class was a required subject.

3. There was a conflicting relationship between the students' self-perceptions of their level of effort in a class and the grades they received. While many students felt the teacher may not always have recognized their efforts, they believed they were working hard and were challenged sufficiently. However, the primary grade level was C or D, which indicated only a marginal level of achievement.

4. Finally, the concept of teacher preference or favoritism for one group over another surfaced as a significant finding. There was a specific perception held by the marginally achieving students that high achieving, high profile students were the favored or chosen group within a class, while the marginally achieving students neither received, nor did they seem to expect any special support or attention.

The lack of specific identifying characteristics, either of the students, themselves, or of the schools they attend, sustains the image of the marginal achiever as a student who could be anyone and found anywhere. However, emerging information of equal significance suggested a certain dynamic was occurring within the school between the students, who believed they were not in the "favored class" and geared down to a minimal level of effort, and school personnel (primarily, but not exclusively, teachers) who demonstrated in their daily behaviors there were favorites,

or students other than the marginal achievers, who received more attention and assistance. This dynamic at least *maintained* the marginally achieving student's experiences, and *may* have played a part in initiating these experiences as well. The nature of these experiences was explored in section three.

School Experiences

The section about Student Characteristics described the marginal achiever in terms of individual characteristics, while the section related to School Characteristics shared information regarding those school setting and climate variables that provided a context for the student's achievement. School Experiences combines the two entities--the students and the school setting--to describe the nature of marginal achieving students' school experiences, which formed the core of the research question. What was it like to go to school and earn C and D grades? How did these students behave and what was the response to them in return?

1. What was the distribution of positive interactions in the school environment, including recognition of achievement (e.g., awards), participation in school activities, etc.?

2. What was the distribution of negative interactions in the school environment, including rule infractions, referrals, consequences, etc.?

3. What were the self-reported student perceptions of their abilities as achievers?

4. What were the self-reported patterns in achievement over the student's lifetime?

To gain the broadest understanding possible of the marginal achieving student's school experiences, specific research questions for this segment addressed school interactions from both a positive and a negative perspective (RQ 1, 2). Within the established context of school achievement, the research questions focused on the students' own perceptions of their abilities as achievers--how did they evaluate their work now (RQ 3), and did they see any patterns in their level of performance and achievement? Was there ever a time when their profile was different (either better or worse) than at present (RQ 4)?

Positive School Interactions

Data indicate that the marginal achieving student does not experience positive school interactions on any sort of consistent basis. Regardless of gender, race, or SES, these students indicated a consistent absence of positive school recognition in a variety of standard school formats. From the NELs survey, the findings from nine diverse areas of student recognition are compiled in Table 9.

Table 9
Positive School Interactions: Student
Recognition (NELS N=4,644)

Variable	% Does <u>Not</u> Apply
Received a community service award	96.3
R won an academic honor	93.9
R elected officer of school class	93.3
Participated in voc./tech. competition	92.8
R participated in a sci./math fair	91.5
Received recog. for good grades	91.4
Received recog. for writing an essay	91.4
Received recog. for good attendance	88.5

It appears that the schools in which these students operated did little to recognize and/or reward their efforts. A full 93.9% of the students claimed they had never received an award recognizing an academic achievement. While it may be true that the marginally achieving students do not perform at a level of excellence typically worthy of awards, effort or improvement in an academic area, positive citizenship, etc., are other areas of student performance that are often acknowledged for motivation, as well as recognition purposes. Over two thirds of the respondents, 66.3%, claimed they had never won any sort of award at all. Only a modest 11.5% had won an award for something as simple as good attendance.

If these data reflect a lack of positive interaction from the school toward the student, there was a corresponding lack of involvement on the part of the

students in school-sponsored activities. Here, too, the data supported the statement that the marginal achieving student did not interact, on a regular basis, in many positive school-sponsored activities. Percentages from a wide variety of activities are compiled in Table 10, giving evidence of this lack of engagement in school.

Table 10

Positive School Interaction: Activity
Participation (NELS N=4,644)

Variable	% Did <u>Not</u> Participate
Played baseball/softball at school	85.5
Played basketball at school	82.4
Played football at school	82.3
Played soccer at school*	93.0
Participated on swim team at school*	96.7
Played other team sport*	87.0
Played an individual sport	80.1
Participated in cheerleading	95.1
Participated on pom-pom, drill team*	96.3
Participated in school band, orchestra	80.8
Participated in school play or musical	90.7
Participated in student government	96.7
Participated in academic honor society	99.2
Participated in school yearbook, newspaper	94.2
Participated in school service clubs*	92.2
Participated in school academic clubs	78.1
Participated in school hobby clubs*	93.3
Participated in school FTA, FHA, FFA	87.5

For the purposes of reporting, responses indicating a school that did not offer an activity were combined with the response Did Not Participate. In all cases, schools without activities accounted for less than 10% except as noted (*).

Fewer than one out of every five marginally achieving students were involved in a school sponsored activity, with

the interesting exception of participating in school academic clubs, such as Math Club, Spanish Club, etc. Beyond team sports, which usually require trying out and making the cuts to remain on a team, participating in service clubs, the school play, being a part of the newspaper staff, etc., are typical opportunities available for all students who wish to join. Even in these areas, the marginally achieving student did not show a high level of participation.

Clearly, these students did not spend a great deal of time involved in a school program after their classes ended for the day. This confirmed the previous conclusion which suggested that the students left to be with friends, go to a job, or just go home. Once their required academic responsibilities were completed, these students gave little time to their school, even in the areas which could constitute a positive interaction.

Negative School Interactions

The vast majority of the marginally achieving students rarely engaged in any behavior requiring school disciplinary action. At many levels, from classroom rules, to more serious policy questions that could lead to disciplinary referrals or school administered consequences, the marginally achieving students avoided negative sanctions. From the NELS data, the percentages of student involvement

in several levels of negative school interactions are summarized in Table 11.

Table 11
Negative School Interactions
(NELS N=4,644)

Variable	% Seldom	% Sometimes	% Often
<u>Class Readiness*</u>			
<u>How many times:</u>			
*R went to class w/o paper or pencil	87.4		12.6
R went to class w/o books	92.4		7.6
R went to class w/o HW done	73.5		25.5
<u>Getting in Trouble**</u>			
**R got in trouble	44.0	48.6	7.3
R late for school	20.4	62.1	17.6
R cut/skip classes	52.7	36.9	10.4
R was put on in-sch susp	82.5	16.7	.8
R was suspended out of sch	89.3	10.3	.4
R was transferred for disc action	99.2	.8	.1
R was arrested	95.1	4.5	.3

* For the purposes of reporting, response choices seldom and never were reported as Never, while often and usually were reported as Often.

** For reporting purposes, response choices 1-2 Times and 3-6 Times were reported as Sometimes, while Over 10 Times was reported as Often.

In examining Table 11, "Trouble" and "being in trouble" may have constituted different things to different students. For some students, a verbal reminder to "Be Quiet" may have qualified as trouble, while another student may have felt s/he is not in trouble until a referral had been written

demanding administrative action. The variable "R got in trouble" reflected this ambiguity. The other items, however, were quite clear in meaning, and the responses indicated a profile of the marginally achieving student as a person who avoided getting into trouble. This finding corroborated with the image presented in the literature, for marginal achievers kept their part of the classroom bargain by being routinely prepared and in compliance with school rules.

Student Abilities as Achievers

This section asked two main questions: What kind of a student are you? and How do you see your level of success? Many, like sophomore Casey, acknowledged a lack of motivation to work harder at their school work.

I'll work hard if I want to, if I like the class. I like my morning classes, but my afternoon classes I hate. We do poetry, and it's all tests, and she's hovering over you all the time, do this, do that. And she just wants you to do it for her, not for yourself, and she really doesn't put much into her classes. She just tells us to read and she never gives us class time. It doesn't make me want to work hard. I have a C in that class, and I have to get Cs and above to make my parents happy, and so I can drive. That's all I'm gonna get, because I'm not gonna put in extra effort. I'm not accomplishing anything. I could read the book myself.

Tina, a junior with a GPA of 1.90, offered her self-assessment from the vantage point of having been at two schools:

When I was at S (other school), I was like, let's be bad! And if you got bad grades, it was cool. When I got here, I made some friends who were different, and it's kept me out of trouble. I want to get good grades, and I've started to think a lot about my future. That's what I go for now, raising my GPA. But I'm a real daydreamer. I'm not real good at hangin' in there.

This lack of motivation to work harder or achieve at consistently higher levels of excellence was acknowledged by the students as a feature that characterized their school performance. However, students framed this lack of effort in the larger context that, within certain parameters, minimal efforts *could* still lead to success, as measured by passing a given class. In terms of academics, these boundaries could be very broad, allowing for a range of student attitudes, some of which bordered on disdain. Greg, a junior, stated flatly, "I have never worked hard since I've been in school." Currently in an alternative school program, Greg believed that he would have no trouble in passing his remaining classes and graduating on time. Another student, Robert, identified himself in less than flattering terms:

I'm a bad student. I like to distract others, sort of like, you know, a class clown. I think I probably annoy some teachers, but they know I'd never hurt anybody, so they leave me alone. I do what I have to do to get by, and I guess it must work, because I have never failed a class. It only gets hard at the end of the quarter, but then it's just for a few days, maybe a week, that I have to work hard.

Megan spotlighted a specific teacher as a good example of what school looks like to her:

My teacher acts like a fourth grader. I bypass her, and do what I need to do to get by. I know exactly how many classes I can miss, how many days I have to participate, to get a passing grade.

Several students commented that they realized their lack of performance would have to change if they were in a different structure, e.g., working a job, a different school program such as college, etc. Mandy, a TAG student, stated that she knew she would have to change, but in a different environment, she would be more willing to change. "If you could challenge classes, challenge *high school* in general, I'd be in college, right now. *Then I'd work harder.*"

This was an important point regarding the students' self-analysis of their work ethic. While they were clear their lack of effort would have to change under other, more rigorous circumstances, they returned continuously to the belief that their current academic standards would sustain them, and they would graduate with their class. A greater effort was not even necessary at this point, since, as Mark stated,

Ms. Summers, I don't think you realize that unless you're going to a big college somewhere, it's all pass/no pass. You don't have to work very hard in school, and you will still be able to do, basically, anything you want.

Patterns in Student Achievement

In trying to establish a larger context for these provocative responses, I raised the question of comparison by asking if there was ever a time when things were

different, either for the better or worse, than right now. Only Jerry could describe how he had pulled his grades up from straight Fs to become eligible to play basketball. At this point, he was passing five classes with 3 Cs, 2 Ds, and a B in PE. All of the other stories described some version of falling from a higher level of achievement to the present level of Cs and Ds. Two common themes in these scenarios were (a) the presence of some episode, from mild to significant, that caused the student's downfall, (b) coupled with a specific response from the school.

Within this theme of disruptive events, the transition from middle school to high school was often a difficult time for these students. Clarence recalled, "In my first quarter as a freshman, I started strong. I really wanted to do well in my classes. But it was all the same, and I started slacking off almost immediately." Pete lasted a little longer--all the way through his first year. "I did well as a freshman. I just understood everything. I did what I was supposed to do, and I didn't fool around. This year, everything just got so much harder."

Specific events in that first year had a powerful influence on the students. Two students recalled the impact of failing a class as freshman, and how the episodes changed them. For Tom, it was a higher level math class.

I flunked it, I know. I worked hard, but I just didn't get it, so they put me down. So I worked even harder to get back into the top track math, but they didn't put me up. I'm still in low math.

I wonder why I even bothered. I'm still in low math. All that work didn't pay off.

For Tina, it was freshman PE, which she had failed in her previous school.

When I got here, they put me in a class with the younger kids. Do you know what that does to me? It's like I have a record, and I can't escape it, no matter what I do. How many times do you have to say you're sorry for stuff you did when you were a freshman, and I don't even remember most of it now, anyway.

More serious events proved to be extremely disruptive in the students' academic careers. Brandon was trying to build new school habits after returning from a recent 30-day rehabilitation program for drug and alcohol dependence. Megan lost almost a month of regular assignments when her ex-boyfriend tried to commit suicide, and she was spending a great deal of her time with him and his family. Divorce and moving from one school to another were cited as being reasons why students lost significant ground at school. Whatever the nature of the event, common to the stories was the way the students were treated when they returned to their old routines. Brandon stated, "Teachers remember you as a failure, and you get labelled forever," a response that received immediate affirmation from the group. He continued,

When you fall behind, you lose your study skills, and you don't know how to get caught up. It's hard to stay focused when you keep losing ground, and you know you're going to fail.

Some students pointed to the school system as the main source of difficulty. "Don't ever expect help from the teachers to help you get caught up, either. When things go bad, you are on your own," stated Jerry, who spoke from the experience of having been a very poor student who was now experiencing some success in his classes. Pete, a sophomore, summarized the progression of events and feelings.

I have been a good student, and the teachers really liked me. I don't know, maybe I thought I could do the stuff without working very hard. Whatever happened, it all got a lot harder, and I really fell apart. Guess what? The teachers wrote me off. I guess they figured I had always taken care of myself, I could just fix myself without any help from them. I can't tell you how much it hurts when you find out they never really cared about you as a person, or they only cared when you were easy. Well, I've learned to keep a pretty low profile, now that I've messed up. No one expects anything from me now, so there's a lot less pressure. I don't need the spotlight. It's just not worth it to me, what you have to do and what you have to be to stay there.

Evidence of this isolation is supported by the NELS survey data which indicated that after returning from an absence, only 27.2% of the students claimed their teacher even asked where they had been. Strategies to help the students get caught up with the missing assignments, either with support from the teacher, other students, counselors, etc., were made available to these returning students less than 50% of the time. However, it was clear there were some good opportunities available outside of the school system. Megan summed up her experience in a matter-of-fact tone:

Last year, I failed a lot of classes, because I didn't try. I turned 16, and I realized I didn't want to drop out of school, but I'm so far behind, I can't take the classes I want. So I take psych classes at the college, because I can. I closed the doors here when I was younger.

Teacher Favoritism

The question surfaced regarding which students, if any, would receive substantial help from the system after they had lost ground or at any point in their school careers. Appearing again was the concept of favored students, typically high-achievers, who were perceived by the marginal achievers as "chosen ones" within their school. It was in this discussion of favoritism within the classroom that the concept of gender inequities was most apparent.

For the purpose of establishing clear terms, the students defined "success" as passing a given class. They did not expect enough assistance through teacher favoritism to receive more than their usual grades, which meant a C at best, or a D at worst. When asked if it was easier for girls to "skate" in a class, that is, to do the minimum amount of work and still pass based more on personality than product quality, the response was divided, with variations based on the gender makeup of the group. In Group A, the boys were adamant that girls had a decided edge in this unspoken class competition. They based their decision on a girl's outward appearance and her ability to "charm" a teacher. David related the following example:

In Mr. H's class, he has his favorites. Those girls sit there and do nothing, and they pass. They just laugh at his stupid jokes, and he loves it. It makes me sick, but I'd do it, too, if I thought I could get away with it. It doesn't work that way for guys, though.

In Group B, Pete commented on a similar dynamic between the young, male teacher of one of his classes and a group of senior girls who thought the teacher was very attractive.

It's like they're his fan club. They sit there and stare at him all period. I have never seen him yell at them, or do anything that might make them not think he was so terrific. It's like he's afraid they won't love him any more. It's so disgusting to watch this every day, but it's sort of interesting, too. It's like television, I swear.

Girls in the all-girl group at Site A had two perspectives representing agreement with the general statement that girls had an easier time of it and disagreement on the basis that boys had their angles, too. The difference between boys and girls, said the girls, was the girls' superior level of maturity and understanding. According to Sharon,

Boys are naturally immature. They goof around too much. A teacher will put a name on them immediately, *I don't like you*, and they won't pass. Girls are quiet, and they can get by.

Tina added,

Boys *could* do it if they wanted to, they just don't want to. They have their macho attitudes. Girls can adjust their attitudes. Girls are just so much more subtle than boys. They are at least two years ahead.

The system was not foolproof, however, and several girls highlighted some of the inconsistencies. According to Mandy,

. . . it depends on the girl. If she's rowdy and obnoxious, it's unlikely she'll pass, even if she tries to charm the teacher. But if she's calm and mellow, she'll have an easier time of passing.

Susan added that it depended on the gender of the teacher as well. "Female teachers usually know what a girl is up to if they try to be too nice."

In the interview group from Site B (which included three boys and one girl), Angie defended her gender after hearing the typical responses from the boys in her group.

I have a different perspective, because I am a girl. But my history teacher is a football coach, and I see guys who can be the teacher's pet, too. There's an advantage there. The teacher wants the kid to get good grades so they can stay on the team.

Angie's remarks caused the boys to respond in kind. David said, "It's definitely an advantage, because the coach knows that person as an individual." Mark added, "She's got a real point. My study hall teacher is a coach, and if you're not a wrestler, you're squat to him." The apparent theme was that having *some* quality to help distinguish a person in the eyes of the teacher was seen as a definite advantage. If you were an athlete, an attractive girl, etc., you had an identity in a class which was perceived as having value. This was in contrast to the marginal

achievers, who perceived themselves as having no value in the overall system.

School Experiences Summary

The School Experiences section produced some very provocative findings, which can be summarized according to five main points.

1. Data support the conclusion that the marginally achieving student was not regularly involved in most positive school interactions. For the most part, they did not receive positive recognition or awards from the school, and they did not remain on campus to participate in school-sponsored activities after their classes were finished for the day.

2. Marginally achieving students were not involved with minor rule infractions or major policy violations. Many indicated they were rarely, if ever, even late or unprepared for class. Only a very small percentage of the survey population had ever received any major consequences such as suspension.

3. The marginally achieving students in this study felt they were not working as hard as they could to realize their own potential. Under other, more rigorous circumstances, they knew they would probably have to work much harder to achieve success. However, there was a unanimous belief that the current performance level would be sufficient to carry the students through to graduation.

4. When these students lost ground in their classwork, due either to absences or disruptive circumstances, they received minimal support in their attempts to recover and reestablish their previous routines. The lack of support was viewed by students as a discretionary decision made by the teacher. They believed another, favored student, usually a high achiever, would have received whatever support s/he required.

5. Having a quality that distinguished a student positively in the eyes of the teacher was seen by the marginally achieving students as beneficial to secure good grades. Examples of such qualities could include being an athlete or physically attractive. While the marginal students viewed themselves as being as skilled as those people around them, they did not see themselves as being a part of the favored class of students, typically high achievers or high profile students. They did not believe they held to the same values as the school system, and they did not expect the support, privileges, or pressures associated with the high achiever position.

One of the overriding images of the study was the unshakable student belief that their current performance levels in school would be sufficient to earn a diploma, graduate with their class, and move on to a productive future. The repeated statements of this belief brought parents into the equation. Parental support (and its

influence on the performance of the marginal achieving student) was the basis of the fourth section of the research findings.

Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans

The final section of the research study examined the nature of the marginal achieving student's home situation, focusing on the level of parental influence in the student's school career. Four specific research questions are addressed in this section.

1. What were the student and parental expectations for the student's future schooling opportunities?

2. What were the dimensions of parental support of the student's school work?

3. What influence did these expectations and support behaviors have on the student's performance?

4. How did the students regard their future career opportunities?

We will first examine the level of educational expectations held by the primary family stakeholders, i.e., the student and the parents (RQ 1), and the support parents extended to help their students realize their school goals. What standards did the parents maintain for their children and what strategies did they use to help the students in relation to these expectations for school (RQ 2)? With this context established, what influence did those expectations

have in terms of school performance (RQ 3)? Finally, the connection between a student's school career and future plans was explored (RQ 4). Where do marginal achievers see themselves regarding future career choices?

Student and Parent Expectations

Marginally achieving students who were interviewed were confident that they would graduate with their class with a standard diploma. The NELS survey data upheld this claim, as noted in Table 12.

Table 12
Student Post High School Educational
Expectations (NELS N=4,644)

Response Choice	Percentage
Less than H.S. grad	.6
H.S. graduation only	14.3
<2 years trade school	6.6
2+ years trade school	12.7
<2 years of college	5.2
2/more years college	18.6
Finish college	28.7
Master's degree	6.8
Ph.D., M.D.	6.4

These responses represented the *students'* expectations, gathered when they were sophomores in high school, or approximately 16 years old. Whether or not any of these young people will actually complete a four-year college program or attain an advanced degree is a question only time

can answer. Most meaningful was the minimum standard which these students believed they could achieve. In only 39 cases out of 4,644 survey respondents did a student indicate s/he did not believe s/he would finish high school. This was solid verification of these expectations by those students interviewed, who maintained throughout the sessions that their current level of performance would be sufficient for them to graduate on time and earn a diploma. The relationship between the students' level of post high school aspirations and their parents level of education was statistically significant ($X^2 = 548-19$; $df = 40$; $p < = .01$; see Appendix I, #8).

Further exploration of the NELS data revealed that students perceived their *parents'* expectations for their post high school education to be consistent with their own level of aspirations. Students indicated they believed that both their mothers and fathers maintained the same expectation that, not only would their children graduate from high school, but there would be significant continuing opportunities after that (see Table 13).

Students clearly believed that their parents held a high level of expectation regarding their educational career. Again, the emphasis on college and post-baccalaureate studies *might* have been more indicative of a high school student's imagination rather than a purposeful educational plan. However, the same minimum

standard of graduation from high school was maintained whether the students were asked to respond according to what they believed or what their parents held as a basic educational expectation. In addition to the statistically significant pattern of responses in relation to the level of education a student's parents had achieved and parental post high school educational expectation (Father: $X^2 = 532.82$, $df = 45$; $p < .01$; Mother: $X^2 = 448.08$, $df = 45$; $p < .01$; see Appendix I, #9) as the SES of the family increased, expectations for student education showed a corresponding increase (Father: $X^2 = 568.70$, $df = 27$; $p < .01$; Mother: $X^2 = 465.07$, $df = 27$; $p < .01$; see Appendix I, #10).

Table 13

Parental Post High School Educational
Expectations: Std. Responses
(NELS $N=4,644$)

Response Choice	% Mother's Expectations	% Father's Expectations
Less than H.S. grad	.9	.8
Graduate from H.S.	6.1	6.0
Vocational after H.S.	11.1	9.8
Attend 2-yr college	7.1	6.3
Attend 4-yr college	10.2	9.6
Graduate from college	39.8	37.0
Post-grad education	12.4	10.4
Don't know	9.4	10.4
Parent doesn't care	1.3	2.4
Does not apply	1.7	7.4

These data supported the perspective that three of the major stakeholders in the marginally achieving student's life, both parents and the student her/himself, believed that the current academic performance and achievement profile of C and D level work would not only be sufficient to move the student forward toward graduation and a high school diploma, but that marginal high school performance did not act as a barrier to post high school educational opportunities. Many believed that marginally achieving high school students would pursue high aspiration educational options, with an emphasis on participation in a four-year college program.

Parental Academic Support Behaviors

This research also explored the type and level of support students claimed their parents provided to sustain the stated level of expectation they had for school achievement for the students. The variable responses were arranged according to level of commitment or involvement performing each activity might require (see Table 14). The items began with the lowest level of involvement (e.g., having a discussion--presumably at home or some other convenient location), and increased to home structures created to support the student's school career, such as checking homework. Finally, high-involvement parent

activities that took place at school (e.g., attending meetings, etc.) were listed.

Table 14

Parental Support Activities in the Student's
School Career: Std. Responses
(NELS)

Variable	% Often	% Sometimes	% Never
Discussed school activities	18.2	55.5	26.4
Discussed things studied in school	14.7	61.7	23.6
Discussed grades	42.5	48.9	7.6
Discussed transferring schools	6.3	22.5	71.2
Discussed prep for SAT/ACT	5.4	31.0	63.6
Discussed going to college	28.7	51.8	19.5
Parents check homework	23.0	31.0	46.0
Parents help with homework	8.5	37.2	54.2
Special privileges for good grades	18.0	36.8	45.2
Limit privileges for poor grades	23.9	32.6	43.6
Parents attend school meetings	10.0	43.1	53.4
Parent phone teacher or counselor	15.4	41.8	39.7
Parents attend school event	26.3	20.9	50.7
Parents act as school volunteer	5.3	13.5	78.2

For the purposes of reporting, responses were condensed. Sometimes and Once or Twice were reported as % **Sometimes**. Often and More than Twice were reported as % **Often**. Missing responses complete the percentages.

While it was not clear from the data exactly what the nature of the "discussions" might have been, it appears that what a student had learned in school, how s/he was doing in current classes, etc., were topics of conversation between students and parents. The data also indicated that discussing college opportunities was another consistent subject. However, preparing for the SATs or the ACTs, a

typical planning step for the college-bound, was not regarded as a regular a subject of parent-to-student conversation. This pattern might imply that most of the students were not planning to attend colleges that required those tests, or, as sophomores, that such a conversation was a bit premature. However, a general discussion about future educational options seemed to be a standard feature in the marginally achieving student's home environment.

Beyond discussion of post-secondary plans, Table 14 indicates that the level of parental involvement declines sharply. In terms of checking and/or helping with homework, and structuring home rules to support the student's school career and study obligations, there was a split between homes that provided such an environment and those that did not. Most pronounced was the reduced parental participation or involvement in support activities that occurred at the school, such as attending school meetings or events, even when those events could be of a sport or entertainment nature. Parent initiated phone calls to school personnel, for positive or negative reasons, did not occur on any regular basis.

While there was a relatively high level of parental expectation for education progress as perceived by the student respondents, there was a diminished level of parental involvement in the students' careers, either as demonstrated in at-home support behaviors or in higher

commitment, school-based activities. It was therefore important to explore the nature of this particular aspect of the parent/student relationship as it related to school achievement. Specifically, how did parental expectations function in the academic performance of the marginal achieving high school student?

The Nature of Parental
Influence for the Marginal
Achieving Student

According to the focus group participants, parental expectation, even at the lowest levels of verbal commitment and involvement, played a critical, yet complicated role in their levels of achievement and performance. While a complex set of factors may have combined to keep these students out of the ranks of the high track achievers, parental expectation may be one of, if not the key feature in understanding how the marginal achiever remained successfully afloat in the secondary system, rather than fall a notch further to being at-risk of not graduating. It was apparent that their parents' level of expectation had a profound influence on the students' levels of performance and achievement. There were many ways that parents supported the expectations that their children would indeed complete high school. A parent could be very involved in a student's progress but not attend school meetings. As Susan said, "My dad is a big part of my motivation. He's half of me. Parents have a lot of influence."

The anecdotes regarding parental involvement and how this factored into the students' experiences sorted into two categories: The first category concerned parental behaviors and responses that conveyed a general level of expectation. The second category, which centered on the effectiveness or ineffectiveness (as perceived by the students) of the strategies used by parents to motivate student performance, was defined for this group. Some significant patterns surfaced as the students described this component of parental influence in their lives.

Having a basic understanding of their parents' level of expectation proved to be very powerful motivation for these students to attend school and pass most, if not all, of their classes. Jerry stated, "Every day, my parents say, 'Do good in school.' If I said I was dropping out, they'd make me go. They only care about two things: curfew and me graduating." Brandon added,

My parents (father and stepmother) have high expectations. If I dropped out, I'd get kicked out of the house, and my father would be very disappointed. Bottom line, it's their house, so I go to school.

Finally, Robert suggested, "My parents would take me to jail and leave me there to teach me a lesson if I ever said I was dropping out."

For Peter, the perception of their expectations was tied to a mutual understanding between himself and his parents.

I get along with my parents. We treat each other with respect. They don't play a big role in helping me get homework done, but they'd be very disappointed if I dropped out. There's a big sense of commitment. I couldn't face them, I don't think I could live with myself for hurting them so much.

Clearly, parental expectation was a powerful component in the students' home environment. However, it is important to specify that while the sense of parental expectation seemed to provide sufficient motivation to *pass* a class, there was little evidence that their parents expected the students to achieve consistently at levels above a C grade.

For Janey, the expectation of Cs was accepted by both of her parents and Janey herself.

In school, they know I could get As if I applied myself. They insist I get Cs. Last year, I did get a D, but I was doing my hardest, and I got good comments, so they didn't do anything.

For Peter and Mark, the level of expectation was about the same. Peter said, "My dad knows it's hard for me to get As. I'm a middle student, so he expects me to get at least middle grades."

Mark's perspective was based on his parents behaviors that supported his C work.

I have an older brother at Lewis and Clark. He's the brain, but I felt pressure to measure up. But in my freshman year, my parents sat me down and encouraged me to look at alternatives to make me a better person. I have just never been able to function in a regular school, but I'm committed to school. If I get Cs, they're fine. Less than Cs, they'd probably talk to me.

Jacob's comments, perhaps, best summarized this student perception:

My parents were very disappointed in my freshman year. 'We know you can do better than that.' They hear but they don't listen. The classes are harder, and they don't realize that. But they don't ground me. As long as I make it through high school, they don't care.

To accommodate their expectations, parents had, in fact, applied a variety of the common strategies (see Table 14), with varying degrees of success in the student response. For some students, the influence of the routine parental discussions related to school was extremely motivating. Tina compared her school achievement with this involvement and without it.

My dad was always working and didn't pay much attention. Mom did when I was in grade school, but when I got to high school, she didn't bother. She's out of the picture now. My dad realizes I was neglected, and he's doing everything he can. He's excited for me, and he asks me how I'm doing. That's pushing me a lot.

Tight structure of privileges was another common option for parents to exercise as a motivator. According to Sharon, "My parents are 100% of my motivation. My brother has been grounded all year for bad grades. They control my social life." Although her parents had *not* included grounding in her experiences, Traci made the intriguing comment, "If my parents *had* grounded me when I was younger, I'd probably respect them more for trying to help me."

Angie's parents resorted to sending her to a psychologist who specialized in working with troubled

students. "All my parents wanted from me was Cs, but they sent me to a psychologist to see why I hated school so much, and why I wouldn't put in the effort to earn better grades." This strategy produced the desired effect of motivating Angie to pass her classes with mostly C and D grades.

Sometimes, parental influence produced results that reflected more harm than good. According to Megan, her father's efforts to motivate her were fruitless.

He's ex-military, and he tries to be compassionate, but it doesn't work. He makes a lot of empty threats, but it's so stupid, because I know he'll never carry them out. I do what I want.

For Tony, the inconsistency of his father's actions was frustrating and counterproductive to his efforts. "My dad is cool when the grades are good. As soon as he sees a bad grade, he says, 'You're grounded!' That does nothing, because I just get back at him by doing even worse." Rather than risk the punishment at his last report card, Tony used a strategy of his own. "I lied to him about my grades, so I didn't have to put up with it. He never checked, and I figured he wouldn't. It's just too hard to work for As."

Traci's perspective of her parents' influence showed an important shift in focus from her parents to herself.

My parents don't have much to say. I have a job (25 hours/week). I kind of work toward that. I want a diploma. I know so many people who got their GEDs. It's not the same. I don't know what I want to do, but I'm not throwing 11 years away. My parents think of me as responsible. It's pretty much up to me now.

As a junior, Traci's viewpoint reflected an evolution from the kind of extrinsic influence parents applied to an intrinsic level of student motivation, tied to the application of current school performance to future career benefits. Once that link was established in their minds, students began the process of transcending parental influence and achieving for their parents' sake, toward working for their personal satisfaction and future goals. As secondary students, the reality of a career beyond high school was close enough to be an influence on their current performance levels as they began to create plans for the future.

Future Career Opportunities

The marginally achieving students who participated in this study were fairly goal oriented as they considered their futures. Their plans reflected a mix of uncertainty about the present and the future and an attempt to sort out interests, skills, and options. Representing one teen extreme, opportunities to mow lawns at a funeral parlor (because it is quiet and no one will complain), going to Australia to search for cute guys, and being a high pick in the NBA draft were suggested as career plans.

On the more serious side, real estate school, training to be an EMT, the forestry program at the local community college, law enforcement, and physical therapy courses were described as choices well within reach in terms of GPA and

the availability and affordability of local programming options. Students had sufficient information from older siblings or friends to be somewhat knowledgeable about the requirements for entrance into these programs, and, from their perspective, they had a complete understanding of what it would take to be successful in the programs, as well.

The confidence factor was unanimously high for all of the participants that success in college after a marginal high school career was completely feasible. The students felt they had a clear understanding that the work would be harder and the need to apply more productive study behaviors toward their classes would be evident. There was no indication from any of the students that these performance and achievement adjustments could not or would not be made easily and gladly. Personal abilities did not appear to a concern to the students.

However, finances surfaced as a consideration that was directly pertinent to the students' current level of expectations regarding their future educational opportunities and held corresponding implications for their current levels of performance and achievement. Susan, who is interested in physical therapy, has a job at a local sports clinic and would like to pursue health services as a career option. Her financial circumstances have limited her post-secondary educational choices, which has limited her current academic performance as well.

My parents have told me that college is out of the picture, unless it's Mt. Hood. So my grades only have to be good enough to get into their programs, which is like about a 2.5 or something. I can do that easily. I would need to work harder for OSU or U of O, but there's no money for that, so why bother? I do the best I can in my classes, but I have a lot of other interests right now.

Kevin, a junior, intended to enter the forestry program, also at Mt. Hood Community College.

After that, I can transfer to OSU or wherever they have a program and get my four-year degree. My parents said I have to earn the money to go away to school, but they can swing a local school for the first two years. So I am working hard enough now to get into the program. I concentrate my efforts in science and math, and I do the absolute minimum in everything else to pass the class so I don't have to take it again. My parents told me as long as I get into the program, how I do it is my business. As long as I satisfy the entrance requirements, no one can say s*** about it.

Parent/Home Environment-- Future Plans Summary

The focus of this section differed somewhat from the previous three in that it examined an aspect of the marginal achieving student's profile and experiences *other* than the student her/himself. Here, the expectations, philosophies, and strategies of the *parents*, as perceived by the students, were studied. The findings from this section were summarized according to five main points.

1. Both parents and students maintained a solid belief the students would pass their classes and graduate on time with a standard diploma. This belief, together with a sense of responsibility to parents, was cited repeatedly by

students as a key reason why they had no intention of dropping out or considering leaving school prior to graduation.

2. While the level of expectation to pass classes was clearly established clearly, there was further evidence to suggest the parental expectations of these students did not exceed consistent student achievement at a C level. As long as the students were successful in moving forward in the system, as demonstrated by passing classes and receiving credit, students as well as parents believed this to be acceptable. Passing courses seemed to be the critical variable in this understanding.

3. Student and parents expected that the current level of academic performance would be sufficient, not only to finish high school, but also to link up to educational opportunities after high school, with an emphasis on four-year college programs. The higher the SES and level of parental education, the greater the expectation of significant post high school participation in an educational program, usually college.

4. Parent/student discussions about school were the most common form of support. Consistent verbal reinforcement of expectations was a powerful motivator to the students. Other behaviors (such as school contact or on-site participation) were less frequent forms of parental involvement.

5. Student participants expected that their current academic performance and achievement levels were well-suited to a variety of future career options. The reduced level of GPA requirements at many community colleges matched the practical concerns of the parental ability to finance a college education, making the local post secondary choices more plausible than other college or university options that carried more rigorous entrance requirements.

Data Summary

What are the characteristics of marginal achieving secondary students, and what is the nature of their high school experience?

Student Characteristics

One of the primary research goals of this study was to describe the characteristics of marginally achieving high school students who attend school and earn mostly C and D grades. After a substantive qualitative and quantitative research effort, there is no evidence to suggest that specific demographic characteristics can be used to identify these students. The portion of the student population that fell into the GPA range had broad representation on the basis of a variety of factors. Specifically, marginality is not a clear function of gender, race, SES, or any other single variable that was included in this study. The students involved in this study came from what appeared to

be stable home environments, with the majority of the students living in a two parent family structure.

The students in this study did not see themselves as being "lost" or "marginal." On the contrary, most of the students indicated a high level of personal self-esteem and faith in their abilities. They believed they were meeting the expectations held for them at school at an adequate level of achievement. However, despite this positive self-assessment, these students did not demonstrate high levels of engagement or achievement in their schoolwork or after school activities. Social activities such as talking on the phone or driving around with friends were emphasized, rather than more academic activities such as using a computer or reading for pleasure. For some students, working at a part time job provided an opportunity for increased performance expectations which the students met easily and willingly.

School Characteristics

There was no indication that any specific set characteristics that were attributed to school was more likely to foster marginality than another. Urban versus rural location, big school versus small school enrollment, or SES did not produce any significant differences in the phenomenon of marginality. Any student, in any type of school can be in the range of the marginal achiever.

Classroom climate factors did influence the level of effort and achievement for these students. While much of the curriculum was seen as being too unrelated to their lives to be motivating, the students felt that a teacher's instructional style had a profound effect on how they felt about a given class and how hard they worked. Teachers who were able to develop specific personal relationships with students were viewed as being favored highly over teachers who treated them impersonally or as if they were simply part of the crowd. It is important to note, however, that whether or not the students were in classes where they felt they were working hard and being challenged, the predominant grades earned were Cs and Ds.

Perhaps the most significant climate issue to emerge in the School Characteristics segment was the concept of teacher favoritism. The marginal achieving students believed that their teachers favored the high-profile, high achieving students and focused their instructional efforts on that group. Students in middle group did not seek or expect any special attention from their teachers.

School Experiences

Marginally achieving students were not involved in many positive school interactions. They had not earned awards or recognition for any school association such as academics, citizenship, attendance, etc., nor did they remain on campus to participate in school sports or activities. Still, from

a management perspective, the students showed no evidence of negative behaviors at any level. They were compliant with most of the typical classroom policies, including coming to class on time and being prepared.

There was clear validation of the image of these students as being "in the middle" of low and high track achievement standards. There were no data to support any inclination of these students to slip to a level where they would be at-risk of dropping out and not completing high school. On the contrary, these students believed they would be successful in completing secondary school with a standard diploma along with their graduating class. However, they were aware they were not making as strong an academic effort as they could, and under other circumstances, they would have to perform at higher levels of achievement and excellence. This adjustment was one the students felt could be made easily.

Continuing with the concept of teacher favoritism, when the marginal achieving students fell behind in school work, they believed they received minimal teacher support to help them reestablish themselves in the class. They believed a high-achieving student in the same situation of returning to school after an absence of any duration would have received ample assistance in understanding and completing missing assignments, etc. Having a quality to distinguish a student in the teacher's eyes was viewed as a very positive

situation. Examples of these qualities could include being an athlete, being an attractive female, etc. The marginal achieving students did not see themselves as having any of those qualities, nor did they believe their teachers saw them as having those qualities. They believed they occupied a place of lower value in the school system.

Parent/Home Environment--
Future Plans

While there was clear acknowledgment that their performance levels were marginal, students believed their current achievement levels would be sufficient to enable them to pass their classes and graduate with a standard diploma. The emphasis on passing a class is significant. According to the students' reports, they felt their parents expected them to work hard enough to earn Cs and Ds, since that would earn the credit. However, the students did not feel their parents expected them to work harder or earn higher grades on any consistent basis.

Further, the students reported that their parents expectations matched their own for post-secondary educational options. The predominant expectation for these marginally achieving students was they would complete high school and go on to a variety of educational opportunities, with the emphasis on attending a four-year college program. This was especially true for high SES students and students whose parents had a higher level of education. To support

these expectations, the students reported their parents used a variety of behaviors. The most powerful support came from regular parent/student discussions about school. Parent involvement in school-based activities such as attending meetings or volunteering showed far less parent participation.

These expectations for post-secondary education matched a variety of career options selected by the students. Many of them were aware of local community college and university requirements for program entrance. Finances were a significant factor in influencing a student's future career plans as well as current academic performance. Since students were unable to afford tuition at a major college, local community colleges were a more viable option. The reduced financial burden was matched, in most cases, by reduced expectations for a student's GPA. This factor caused many of the students to acknowledge their current academic performance as being marginal yet sufficient to satisfy the entrance requirements for many community college programs.

After they had gained entrance to one of these programs, the students claimed they would begin to work harder, either for success in that program or for the ability to transfer to a more rigorous program at another college or university. However, while they were still in high school, the students believed their current performance

levels met their expectations, as well as those of their parents and teachers.

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to take an initial step in bridging the gap of understanding about this phenomenon of marginality by seeking information from the students themselves. Through a blend of qualitative and quantitative research techniques, distinctive details became available about the types of students who exist "in the middle" and how they perceive their particular experiences in high school. The results of this research have significant implications, both for the practitioners who serve these students as they proceed through secondary school, as well as those educators who are engaged in the larger work of reshaping school policies and systems to better meet the challenges of educating for the 21st century. The findings of this study, and the implications for secondary education, are discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, SIGNIFICANCE, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

This chapter discusses the results of the research study and present conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data. The limitations of the study are shared in addition to the significance of its contribution to secondary education and recommendations for future research.

Discussion of Results

The objective of this research study was to examine the marginally achieving secondary school population of students whose cumulative GPAs were in the range of 1.5 to 2.5, to describe the specific characteristics of these students as individuals and the general nature of their high school experiences. Although marginally achieving students have been acknowledged in the literature as being a standard segment of a secondary school's population, these students are described primarily by exclusion from the other levels of achievers, i.e., they are not in the top track of high profile, high achieving students bound for college, and they are not in the low track of students at-risk of not

completing their work for a high school diploma and dropping out of school. The marginally achieving student is described typically as the one most likely to get lost in the system, because they are ". . . the middle-of-everything kid, the unspecial kind of kid" (Powell et al., 1985, p. 173), the sort of student most in danger of not being served effectively by the educational system in which s/he exists.

While many school stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, parents, and the students themselves acknowledged that these middle-achieving students existed in large quantities within a school and were generally overlooked and poorly served in the system, there was little specific information regarding what features characterized these students as individuals or described the nature of their experiences as they moved through four years of high school. The purpose of this study was to provide some definition and understanding of the characteristics and experiences of this student population.

Information describing the marginally achieving student group is critical in light of a national school reform agenda focused on increasing the level and quality of achievement and skill students can master and bring forth into the workplace. Nationwide, educational organizations are grappling with the implications of a growing perspective that, more than any other time in history, the economic success of our country depends on increasing dramatically

the caliber of skills and capacities our nation's high school graduates possess as they move from high school into the workforce.

Recently, a four-part television series entitled Challenge to America (Smith, 1994) examined the differences between American systems for business and industry, levels of productivity, and education, and comparable systems in Germany and Japan. Moderator Hedrick Smith made the following statement:

The Germans and Japanese push students pretty equally, keeping them all well motivated as they move into high school. The American system of tracking works well for the brightest and most affluent. They get pushed to the hilt, and pointed toward the world's best universities. But a lot of American kids get the message they're not meant for school, and so they stop trying. So while America leads at the top, it also leads at the bottom, with huge numbers of dropouts. But what about the majority, the average kids, the mid-kids, that 70% who won't finish college, the backbone of our future workforce? Preparing the mid-kids for high-tech jobs is the key to a high standard of living in the 21st Century. So how are we doing?

If a part of the national educational objective is to increase the performance of the workforce, and marginally achieving students represent a substantial portion of that future population, then such an undertaking demands as much clarity about the characteristics, experiences, and needs of these students as can be provided to ensure the best fit of programs and service options. Yet a focus on marginally achieving students has been conspicuously absent in the literature. This portion of the student population has been

poorly defined for too long. Without specific knowledge of who these students are and how they perceive their experiences in high school, it is difficult to envision how restructured systems will provide a better match to their educational needs and further them in securing the skills and abilities they will need for a successful, productive future in the 21st Century.

To provide such a focus on the marginally achieving secondary student, this study included a quantitative analysis of the responses of a sample group of 4,644 sophomores in the grade range of 1.5-2.5 GPA drawn from the National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS). Student responses to approximately 165 variables were sorted into four categories for examination: Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans.

There was sufficient evidence from current literature to suggest certain students had different, diminished educational experiences by virtue of certain demographic characteristics such as gender (Chapman, 1988; Delamont, 1990; Gough, 1976; Reis, 1991; Sadker & Sadker, 1982; Stitt, 1988), race (National Institute of Education, 1977; Hare, 1987; Haw, 1991; Schofield, 1989; Simms, & Contreras, 1980), and SES (Hauser, 1971; Meier, Stewart, & England, 1989; Weis, 1988). These variables were highlighted in the study

to explore how these features were factored into the phenomenon of marginality, if at all.

These data were combined with the interviews from five focus groups of local high school sophomores and juniors, totaling 22 students. The interviews were conducted in May, 1993, and sorted according to the same four categories of inquiry as the NELS data. The combination of descriptive data targeted the characteristics and experiences of marginally achieving secondary students and produced the following eight major findings:

1. No demographic variables used in this study, including gender, race, or SES, could be identified as significant correlates of the marginal achieving secondary student. Two-parent family structures were reported by 79.4% of the sample respondents, and generally positive feelings of self-esteem and faith in their abilities were reported by more than 90% of the students. While they did not typically participate in high-engagement activities after school, some students did work at part-time jobs and accepted easily their performance expectations.

2. No demographic characteristics used in this study could be identified as descriptors of any school structure more likely to foster marginality. However, "climate" issues specifically related to curriculum and instruction had an important impact on the students and their level of performance. While the academic material was often too

irrelevant to be motivating to the students, teachers who were able to establish a personal bond with the students were preferred over teachers who were viewed as favoring other, high achieving or high-profile students.

3. At school, marginally achieving students were not particularly visible in their school's system of rewards or sanctions. They did not earn awards or recognition in any of the typical categories of school acknowledgment such as academics, attendance, or citizenship. They were compliant with policies regarding school and classroom rules and expectations.

4. Although student grades reflected only mediocre achievement, there was strong support for the statement that these students had no intentions of dropping out of school. The students believed their parents held the same expectation that they would at least graduate from high school with a diploma.

5. Marginally achieving students saw themselves as having little value within the school organization. They believed high achieving or high profile students were more valued by their teachers as evidenced by their perceptions of the increased allocation of teacher time and attention.

6. Even though they were earning primarily Cs and Ds in their high school coursework, the students maintained they would have little trouble being successful in a college program, and most intended to pursue either two or four year

programs after graduation from high school. They reported that their parents held the same beliefs. There was a significant relationship between a family's SES or the educational level of the parents and the expectation that students would pursue post-secondary educational options. Increases in SES or educational level led to increases in the level of post-secondary schooling students were expected to attain.

7. The students reported that the primary parental academic support behavior was student/parent discussions about school. Beyond this level of discussion, students indicated their parents did not routinely participate in activities to support students' academic efforts, such as helping with homework or communicating with teachers. Students claimed their parents acted as though they did not expect them to earn grades higher than C or D, and, in some cases, this was a stated expectation. The primary focus for the students was on passing each class on the way to securing a diploma.

8. The students acknowledged that their GPA standings were too low for many college or university systems, but were acceptable for entrance into community college programs. Future plans and career expectations were considered as the students matched their academic progress to program availability, cost, and entrance requirements. However, attendance in college, specifically in a four-year

program, at some point in their educational careers was the expectation of the majority of the students.

These eight findings form the basis of the conclusions discussed in the following segment. Following the established format of the four categories of inquiry, Student Characteristics, School Characteristics, School Experiences, and Parent/Home Environment--Future Plans, the conclusions have been sorted according to the same areas and will be addressed in that order.

Conclusions

Student Characteristics

While the lack of specific demographic variables may fail to create the level of definition of marginal achieving students that was sought originally in this study, several important conclusions can be drawn from the data. The literature refers to these students as "lost" and "invisible," which seems to convey a sense of student weakness or frailty. The students did not see themselves this way. They saw themselves as being as capable and worthy of those around them, and they felt good about who they are.

Framed in this generally positive self-perception, marginal achievement can be viewed as a path these students walked as they made their way through senior high school. It is important to note the choice was between high

achievement and middle achievement. Low achievement, or slipping down to a level where passing classes was in jeopardy, was not a consideration for these students. On the other hand, high achievement represented a level of effort, focus, and commitment these students were not willing to make toward their schoolwork at this time in their lives. Marginal achievement represented a path through safe, middle ground toward their acknowledged goal of earning the high school diploma.

School Characteristics

Similar to the lack of defining variables for the students, there were no specific variables, such as geographic location or enrollment size, to define a certain school environment that fostered marginality. However, the school climate issues that surfaced were critical in the understanding of this phenomenon. The students did not see themselves as being invisible or lost when they were asked to assess their own abilities. However, they *did* see themselves as being less valued in the larger school system, particularly when it came to relationships with teachers.

The school work they were asked to complete was often seen as irrelevant and did not inspire the students to work any harder than necessary to pass a given class. In addition to this lack of motivation as reflected in the content, the students saw themselves as having less value within the school system than their high-profile,

high-achieving peers, which further deflated their willingness to work any harder than they felt was required to pass a class. They did not expect any sort of positive recognition or any of the assistance that was routinely afforded to the high achieving students.

These students believed that school was geared toward meeting the needs of the high-achieving students and not their needs. Consequently, the holding power of the school was fairly weak for them. When their compulsory obligation to attend school was over at the end of each day, these students either went home or left to go to jobs where they felt they had a role, responsibility, and value.

School Experiences

"The bargain" (Sedlak et al., 1986) was endorsed in both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the study. The marginal achievers followed the path of least resistance by attending school almost every day, staying out of trouble, and producing enough work to pass their classes. Although they were not challenged to achieve at higher levels of excellence, neither were they detained on their march through high school toward a diploma.

For these students, their path represented a credible avenue to the principle outcome, which was the attainment of the high school diploma. Further, in contrast to their high achieving peers, the marginally achieving student was under less pressure and had more time and energy to channel toward

other activities besides schoolwork. There was no limelight or school recognition for them, but they accepted the lack of public approval as a price to be paid for a relatively easy route to the diploma.

The power of that diploma cannot be overemphasized. From the study, there was no evidence to suggest that the students would fail to get the diploma. However, the emphasis was clearly on *attainment* rather than *quality* of their work. At this time in their school careers, the students did not see the issue of higher standards or increased quality as being a required part of the process in attaining the diploma.

Parent/Home Environment--
Future Plans

All of the evidence gathered regarding student perceptions of their parents' expectations for their schooling and their future options supported the notion of attainment of the diploma as the critical measure of success. Students reported their parents did not behave as if they expected them to achieve at higher levels of excellence. Passing classes with Cs and Ds was acceptable, although perhaps not desirable, as long as progress toward a diploma was maintained. When they described their future plans, the students believed that their current level of performance would not inhibit credible educational options after graduation. This added further support for the

student perspective that their path would enable them to connect to a variety of educational and career options, and their lives would not "dead end" after high school.

From the data collected in this study, it was evident that the students regarded marginal achievement, C and D level work, as a credible path to attaining the high school diploma, and they perceived the behaviors of their teachers and their parents as supporting them at that level of achievement, but no higher. As one junior boy stated, "If getting a D was such a problem for the teachers, then why can you still get a D and get credit? If they really didn't want you to get Ds, then they shouldn't let Ds be OK." The students accepted their position in the system as one of low value but also low stress. The end for them was still a diploma, and the end justified the means.

Limitations to the Study

There are three main limitations to the study that need to be addressed. First, by using student data as the sole source of information, some questions are raised. It is impossible to be certain the data reported in the survey or in the focus groups is completely accurate, although this is probably a concern with many data-collection techniques. However, in the case of asking students to self-assess their status as marginally achievers, or to acknowledge the discrepancies between their performance and that of their

high achieving peers, some "face-saving" responses may have been introduced, either consciously or unconsciously.

This uncertainty prompts a key question: When the perspectives of other constituencies, such as teachers and parents, are introduced into the study, how might the overall understanding of marginality change? While it is certainly appropriate to focus on students as a primary stakeholder in the study, without the inclusion of these other viewpoints, this can only be acknowledged as a first step, rather than an exhaustive study of a complex subject.

A second limitation arose from the size of the participant pool for the focus groups, which were smaller and fewer in number than was originally intended. Focus groups reach a point of saturation when the researcher can accurately predict the general nature of the participants' responses (D. L. Morgan, personal communication, April 19, 1994). This state was, in fact, reached with the number of students and the number of groups included in this study. However, larger numbers of students might have enabled greater flexibility in arranging students into specific group configurations according to "break characteristics" (Knodel, 1993, p. 39) such as gender or race, which might have produced different responses related to some of the key demographic variables in the study. Also, more groups representing a wider range of school classifications or other geographic locations might have contributed to

increased generalizability. This would have necessitated a study on a much larger scope than was feasible at this time.

The final limitation to the study reflects concerns about having one specific researcher conduct the focus groups. I am a white, female assistant principal. Students may have been reacting to me, or not reacting, in a particular fashion based on race, gender or job title. Morgan and Krueger (1993) assert that it is not always necessary, and in some cases it is not desirable, to have a moderator with highly developed, professional skills in leading focus groups. However, they continue, it is false to suggest

. . . that anyone can lead a focus group. The moderator is the instrument in a focus group interview. If the moderator, as the data-collection instrument, is not prepared, not attentive or not skillful, then the results will be just as bad as in a poorly prepared survey questionnaire. (p. 6)

Since there were no other options available for the students, it is impossible to know if the students would have responded differently to someone else in the facilitator role, or to know if the responses as they stand in this study represent the richest, most accurate data available from the student perspective about marginal achievement.

Significance to Educational Leadership

The results of this study are particularly beneficial in two areas in the field of educational leadership: client/student identification and educational reform issues. First, this study begins to define for practitioners the characteristics and experiences of marginal achieving students by gathering information from those very students. The literature cited to describe these students reflects the practice of attempting to describe a student population or phenomenon on the basis of the experiences or perceptions of selected individuals, usually, adult school personnel.

This study represents the exploration of individual student perspectives in combination with quantitative data gathered according to sound research practice. Using the national database of information in conjunction with the context data from the local focus groups moves the results of this study toward the generalizability that is a desirable feature of any research. Readers of this study will undoubtedly recognize the descriptions of those marginally achieving students who walk in the halls of their own schools, regardless of public or private status, size of enrollment, or geographic location. Recognition is a critical first step if changes are to be made to increase the level of value, expectation, and quality in the experiences of the marginally achieving student.

Also, although its student focus has been cited as a limitation of the study, that same feature gives a voice to these students, often the most overlooked stakeholders of all. Routinely, school decisions are made, policies are set, and programs are created without input from the students for whom the work is intended. In the case of the marginally achieving student, this reflects the exclusion from school consideration and resource allocation they have come to expect. Still, a student perspective is critical if the needs of this population are to be addressed in a substantive, positive manner.

With the student perspective as its primary focus, the results of this study will give practitioners a greater awareness of the characteristics and experiences for the marginally achieving students and how those students perceive many of the opportunities made available to them in a secondary program. This information becomes an important filter in the processes of policy formation and action, as well as program design, at the secondary level.

A second area of educational practice that will benefit from this study is the reform effort based on the components of Oregon's Educational Act for the 21st Century, or HB 3565 (1991). These findings give practitioners some important factors to consider as increased investment is made in school restructuring, specifically, efforts related to the secondary level.

Briefly, HB 3565, passed by the Oregon legislature in 1991, represents a blueprint to restructure Oregon's educational systems to produce graduates who are "able to connect learning to know with learning to do . . . [and can demonstrate] mastery of learning outcomes which will meet world class standards" (Oregon Department of Education, 1993, p. 2) by the year 2010. While many features of the bill have been called into question, the basic tenets of the secondary portion of the bill represent a shift from an educational system based on seat time and the accumulation of courses taken over four years to a system that will routinely call upon students to *demonstrate* that they have, in fact, learned the principles of the core subject areas (math, science, language, etc.) and can apply those learnings to real-life problem solving situations around them at a much higher level of performance and excellence than the current system demands.

With the increased understanding of the characteristics and experiences of the marginally achieving student that this study provides, the implications of the bill can be considered for this portion of the population. There is nothing to suggest this segment of the student population could not be successful when the standards of achievement are raised. In fact, there are indicators to the contrary, including the students' own acknowledgment that they are not

working up to their potential and would work much harder under other circumstances.

Also, recalling the high value these students placed on attaining a diploma, as long as the change in standards did not alter their perception that the value of the diploma is worth the work, there is no evidence to support the belief they would value the diploma any less because they had to work harder to get it. If a part of the reform effort is an attempt to restore credibility to the diploma, thus *increasing* its value, the knowledge that the marginally achieving student is already very focused on attaining the diploma *could* lead to the desired situation of the students increasing their level of performance to reach the new established standard for attainment.

However, while this may appear to be a positive match between the intentions of the bill and the goals of the marginally achieving student, it would be a critical error to underestimate the magnitude of the discrepancy that exists currently between the level of performance anticipated in the reform movement, as evidenced in performance-based work and assessment opportunities, senior projects, etc., and the current level of performance and expectation exhibited in the experiences of marginal achieving students. This discrepancy must be addressed from the standpoints of behavior and expectation.

While HB 3565 (1991) is designed to restructure educational opportunities for *all* students, for the marginally achieving student, this bill represents a quantum leap in performance expectations. Historically, these students have made a successful showing in high school primarily on the basis of attendance and compliance rather than academic performance. HB 3565 has targeted this very scenario as one that is no longer acceptable if students intend to earn a diploma and move into the job market as productive, employable citizens. Put simply, these marginally achieving students will no longer be able to "do school" the way they have always done it.

While there is nothing to suggest that these students would not be able to achieve at higher levels of performance and excellence, there is a great deal to suggest that such a change will be extremely complicated due to the pervasive nature of marginality. The work of retraining these students to exhibit different academic *behaviors* may fall short of the desired level of success if they are not simultaneously taught to hold different *expectations* for themselves and for the systems in which they function.

However, such a change will require that serious attention be paid to the people who participate in that system along with the students, specifically teachers and parents. The following seven-point proposal incorporates the key learnings from this study and addresses both the

need to increase the level of professional awareness regarding the characteristics and experiences of marginally achieving students and the need to bring about key changes in the secondary instructional model to better serve these students.

Point #1: Communicate Findings

Increasing the level of awareness regarding the marginally achieving student is a critical first step in bringing about a positive change. Due, in part, to the lack of clarity regarding this population, teachers and other school professionals may or may not have acknowledged them as being "casualties" of the current secondary educational system. Sharing the findings of this study with school staff members, Site Councils, school boards, and community members would begin to build a foundation of knowledge regarding these students. Stakeholders need to be made aware that the current level of academic quality for these students is probably much lower than most people realize and no longer can remain an acceptable standard in today's changing marketplace.

Point #2: Offer Data Collection Options to Teachers

For teachers and other school personnel, data collection and analysis techniques, such as those made popular by Kerman and Martin (1980) through TESA (Teacher

Expectations and Student Achievement) and GESA (Gender Expectations and Student Achievement)--are tools to help practitioners increase their understanding of personal patterns for their instructional behaviors in the classroom. These techniques include teacher identification of students they perceive to be high, low, and middle achievers, followed by an objective scoring of how often the teacher calls on each student, responds with praise or criticizes a student, how much wait time is given to allow a student to think about an answer, etc. Some people may be unconsciously placing students in the classroom or selecting students for participation following patterns that have become second nature, and they need objective data to help them unravel the features of those patterns and begin replacing them with new, more inclusive behaviors. By individualizing this understanding of how each teacher plays a role in "the bargain" that defines a key aspect of marginality, and by exchanging some of the current curricular and instructional practice with techniques that counter the marginal scenario, a basis for understanding and support for these "invisible" students can be built.

Point #3: Staff Development
in Student Engagement
Techniques

Increased levels of awareness and concern can lead to a *commitment* for change, but from that commitment must come the modification of the current instructional service model

if marginally achieving students are to experience an increase in the quality of their educational opportunities. Staff development opportunities must be made routinely available for teachers to learn new techniques to increase the level of student engagement in their classes.

From the research focus groups, it was clear that the students responded to good teaching techniques and relevant, motivational material. Many of the concepts described in HB 3565 (1991) describe the type of classroom setting that would be highly invitational and engaging to the marginal achieving student. As outlined in the bill, the principles of the Certificate of Initial Mastery are based upon applying core learnings to real-life situations, a scenario the students claimed was exactly what was missing in much of the current work they were required to cover. In addition to the real-life application, opportunities to work with student colleagues on tasks that were based on performance or "doing," rather than exclusively pencil and paper oriented tasks that valued "remembering," represented a rigorous challenge these students felt would be motivating and educational.

Examples of this type of instructional orientation needed to increase student engagement and achievement are becoming more evident in many school districts in Oregon as the work of moving toward becoming 21st Century schools continues. In Alsea High School, for example, students work

in teams with representatives from the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Forestry Service to study the area surrounding their school. Core content instruction in language arts, math, social studies, science, etc., is based upon concurrent studies of water currents, fish and river plant life, the economic structure of the area, conservation practices, etc. By participating in tasks that apply academic concepts to the world around them, students may find the relevance and motivation the focus group participants claimed would increase their level of engagement and performance.

At Gresham High School, students in the Freshman Focus program of Language Arts and Science conduct community-based research studies on topics of their choice including sexual harassment, teen alcohol and drug use, career expectations, etc. Their findings are presented to audiences of their peers or at selected community sites such as local middle school classrooms. This permits critical opportunities for increased levels of student engagement and the demonstration of learning in a real world setting.

Point #4: Staff Development
in Student Assessment
Strategies

Another area that has important implications for the marginal achieving student is student assessment. Current reform efforts related to student assessment have led teachers to examine not only what work is assessed but how

such data are collected and valued. Rather than traditional evaluation models featuring the exclusive use of pencil and paper/objective tests focusing on information recall, new techniques create a more authentic or performance-based setting for students to demonstrate and apply what they have learned.

Performance assessment . . . requires students to actively accomplish complex and significant tasks, while bringing to bear prior knowledge, recent learning, and relevant skills to solve realistic or authentic problems. Exhibitions, investigations, demonstrations, written or oral responses, journals, and portfolios are examples of the assessment alternatives . . . (Herman, Aschbacher, & Winters, 1992, p. 2)

Such techniques may have a very powerful, positive impact on the academic achievement patterns of marginal achieving students, for at least two reasons:

First, all strategies that enable teachers to respond to the work of *individual* students stand to decrease the opportunities for students to be able to merely attend without achieving; to progress without producing. Students will have less opportunity to fade out of the spotlight at regular assessment points through the year. As an example, at Cottage Grove High School, students can earn a Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) only after they have presented their collected work samples from a student portfolio to a CIM board consisting of teachers, parents, and community members for approximately one half hour. Although this represents a tremendous resource commitment to

the 200+ students who will be presenting, this change in behavior on the part of the Cottage Grove school community conveys the message that every *student* is valued and that performance of certain tasks is now the measure of school success.

Second, assessment strategies that enable all students to become valued participants in the acknowledgment and examination of student performance will help to break the cycle of reduced expectations that pervades the phenomenon of marginality. Student self-assessment models or inclusion in group process are examples of powerful techniques that may serve to develop within the marginally achieving population the belief that they are valued as individual learners and within the classroom community.

For instance, at Milwaukie High School, freshmen and sophomore students are assigned to a resource class that meets every other day. The classes are small in number and focus on helping students to be noticed in the larger system. Work in this program is not graded, and students share academic progress information with teachers and peers who respond with praise, advice, etc., depending on the student need. By emphasizing the *process* of communicating about school matters, and de-emphasizing the evaluative aspect in a safe, collaborative environment, students can begin to identify their strengths and areas for growth in the academic setting.

The Cottage Grove and Milwaukie High School examples represent another key feature of some of the alternative assessment strategies that are becoming more prevalent as the concepts of authentic work and assessment are translated into current practice. By incorporating participants outside of the school into the process of teaching and learning, whether those participants are other students, other teachers, community members, etc., a critical external check is introduced into the system. This need to report out to other stakeholders may serve to increase the awareness, productivity, and accountability of all of the participants. If it is true that it will be much more difficult for marginally achieving students to "hide" in the school system, so it may be for marginal teachers who will no longer be able to simply close the door and do as they please.

Point #5: Staff Development
in the Creation of Assessment
Rubrics

All strategies that include the establishment of rubrics to teach students about standards of excellence and gradations of quality (Marzano, Pickering, Whisler, Kendall, Mayeski, & Paynter, 1993) will further assist in changing the patterns for a population whose levels of expectation and performance have been uniformly low.

Rubrics are sets of criteria that describe levels of performance or understanding. Rubrics provide students with expectations about what will be

assessed as well as standards that need to be met. Rubrics provide "road signs"--information about where they are in relation to where they need to be. (pp. 13)

For the first time, many marginally achieving students will be introduced to the notion that there are levels of quality that apply to the work they produce that have little, if anything, to do with the fact that they attended school on a regular basis or that they were pleasant in class. The establishment of scoring rubrics will help students to see what level of quality is expected of them, and what level of quality will no longer be acceptable. By producing these rubrics at the beginning of a project, students can begin to work toward the new, higher level of expectations.

As an illustration, at Centennial High School, the development of a Senior Project (Barrett, 1991) has caused the staff to "work backwards" into their curriculum to see what skills and what experiences students need at the freshmen, sophomore, and junior levels to enable them to reach the level of quality expected in the culminating activity (McDonald, Smith, Turner, Finney, & Barton, 1993) that is a requirement for high school graduation. Students are working with teacher and student-developed rubrics, from their initial projects in the ninth grade through the final demonstration as seniors, to increase familiarity with the increased expectations demanded in their work. They are experiencing regularly that 60% accuracy of a subject

knowledge test just is not sufficient to pass a class any more.

Point #6: Communicate
with Parents

Such communication and retraining of teachers will take time and a concerted effort if the undertaking to reform Oregon's school system is to reach its goals. If HB 3565 (1991) is successful in raising performance and achievement expectations to a higher level, there are certain implications for the parents of the marginal achieving students, and the results of this study should be communicated to them, as well.

As this study has indicated, marginally achieving students did not see their parents holding higher expectations than the completion of high school with a diploma. Along with their children, it seemed the parents had developed a set of expectations that reflected their knowledge of what it would take for a student to move through the system to that goal. As long as the students passed their classes, there was a clear message that C and D level work would be tolerated. If this scenario is no longer be acceptable, parents will need to be apprised of the increase in standards along with a rationale for the change. Although this study represents part of such a rationale for change, it may be more difficult to convince parents who see a guaranteed path to a diploma for their

children become more challenging at the same time it becomes more credible.

Point #7: Communicate
with Students

Finally, it is imperative we change the ways in which we communicate with the students who attend our schools. One of the key findings of this study is that marginally achieving students were so accustomed to being left out of the communication flow, they no longer expected to be asked anything of significance related to school.

The suggestions for increasing the expectations and standards reflected in the current reform movement represent significant changes for *all* students, including the marginally achieving population. However, this student group is comfortable with a student/school relationship that requires little effort on their part and yet still results in a diploma.

The current reform efforts represent a major change, or the negotiation of a whole new student/school bargain. Students must be brought into the dialogue as soon and as often as possible. Student surveys or informal focus groups can be used to communicate and gather student opinions or ideas about the workings of their school. Forums through leadership classes are another vehicle for students to gain a voice, as well as an arena to develop avenues to gather and value student input.

Communication efforts of this nature reflect the key findings of this research. Increased awareness of the experiences and needs of the marginally achieving student is a part of the evidence that significant secondary school reform is needed. No student should be able to graduate with a standard diploma representing time spent rather than principles learned and applied, and no student should be able to leave high school without having had significant experiences in placing her/his skills and interests into the wider framework of the world beyond high school.

However, the philosophy of reform does not have to be grounded in "job training" for marginally achieving students. The critical issue is the consistent enhancement of the quality of their experiences, so they can begin to see their value within their school organization and the benefits of their increased participation. Communication with teachers, parents, and students must occur if the reform efforts are to be effective in increasing standards for *all* students. For marginally achieving students, this examination of expectations and practice is essential if the patterns of marginality are to change.

Recommendations for Further Research

Future researchers would do well to consider using the parent and teacher survey information available in the NELS database to examine the perspectives of these other

constituencies in addition to those of the students, as investigated in this study. By using the same database, cross-tabulations could be employed to discover any connections between the responses of the students and those of the other respondents. The inclusion of these data would represent an important expansion by providing an important check of the student perspective described in this study.

Also, the focus group methodology could be replicated to include school personnel and parents. As in this study, that anecdotal information could be combined with the quantitative data to provide a rich view of the perspectives of those stakeholders. In combination with the student perspective, such information would form a substantive description and analysis of a complex population.

The data from the focus groups included in this study provided a critical source of contextual information. If any replication is to be undertaken, focus groups in a variety of geographical locations would address the issue of representation to a greater extent than was feasible in this study. At the same time, group facilitators who were not affiliated with the school sites might prove to be beneficial to the quality of the material, since group participants would have no associations which might influence their responses.

Summary

This study was undertaken to describe a student population that had been largely undefined in the overall secondary school system by examining the responses of the students themselves. Marginally achieving students had created a special niche for themselves by adopting the expectations and behaviors of "onlookers" rather than "participants" in high school. They watched the greatest share of the opportunities, teacher time, support, and recognition go to the high-achieving, high-profile student group, in which they had no part. For the marginal achiever, as long as they attended school on a regular basis, made no trouble for their teachers, and submitted work of passable quality, they would receive a high school diploma. Upon receipt of the diploma, they could move on to the portion of their lives where they could make choices that reflected their talents and ambitions, choices that did not seem to be available to them in the high school setting.

If reform efforts in Oregon are to match the goal of increased engagement and achievement for all students, it is necessary to match those restructuring efforts to the needs of the student populations served in our schools. This research study has begun the process of describing marginally achieving secondary students to provide the sort of descriptive information practitioners require to ensure

the best fit of policies, program designs, and instructional methodologies for the clients they serve.

References

- American Association of School Administrators. (1991). America 2000: Where school leaders stand. Arlington, VA: Author.
- Barrett, A. (1991, May 30). Students make a final quest for knowledge. The Oregonian, p. 1.
- Bidwell, C. E. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J. E. March (Ed.), The handbook of organizations (pp. 972-1,022). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Boyer, E. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Butler-Por, N. (1987). Underachievers in school: Issues and intervention. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd.
- Chapman, A. (1988). The difference it makes: A resource book on gender for educators. Boston: National Association of Independent Schools.
- Cray-Andrews, M. (1989). School failure: Whose loss? Preventing School Failure, 34(1), 35-40.
- Cusick, P. A. (1973). Inside high school: The student's world. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, Winston.
- Cusick, P. A. (1983). The egalitarian ideal and the American high school. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Delamont, S. (1990). Sex roles and the school (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Glasser, W. (1990). The quality school: Managing students without coercion (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Perennial.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goodlad, J. I., & Keating, P. (Eds.). (1990). Access to knowledge: An agenda for our nation's schools. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

- Gough, P. (1976). Sexism: New issue in American education. Bloomington: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Hampel, R. L. (1986). The last little citadel: American high schools since 1940. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Hare, B. R. (1987). Structural inequality and the endangered status of black youth. Journal of Negro Education, 86(1), 100-10.
- Hauser, R. M. (1971). Socioeconomic background and educational performance. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Haw, K. F. (1991). Interactions of gender and race: A problem for teachers? A review of emerging literature. Educational Research, 33(1), 12-21.
- Herman, J. L., Aschbacher, P. R., & Winters, L. (1992). A practical guide to alternative assessment. Alexandria, VA: The Regents of the University of California.
- Herriott, R. E., & St. John, N. H. (1966). Social class and the urban school: The impact of pupil background on teachers and principals. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Johnston, W. B. (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty-first century. Indianapolis: U.S. Department of Labor, Hudson Institute.
- Judson, G. (1992, December). Lost in the middle. The New York Times-Special Edition, p. 1.
- Kerman, S., & Martin, M. (1980). TESA: Teacher expectations and student achievement. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Knodel, John. (1993). The design and analysis of focus group studies: A practical approach. In D. L. Morgan (Ed.), Successful focus groups: Advancing the state of the art (pp. 35-50). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Krueger, R. A. (1988). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). The good high school: Portraits of character and culture. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

- Magaziner, I. (1990). America's choice: High skills or low wages! Executive Summary. Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D., & McTighe, J. (1993). Assessing student outcomes. Aurora, CO: McREL Institute.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., Whisler, J. S., Kendall, J. S., Mayeski, F., & Paynter, D. E. (1993). Authentic assessment. Aurora, CO: McREL Institute.
- McDonald, J. P., Smith, S., Turner, D., Finney, M., & Barton, E. (1993). Graduation by exhibition: Assessing genuine achievement. Providence, RI: Brown University.
- McNeil, L. M. (1988). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge.
- Meier, K. J., Stewart, J., Jr., & England, R. E. (1989). Race, class, and education: The politics of second-generation discrimination. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Morgan, D. L. (1988). Focus groups as qualitative research. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Morgan, D. L., & Krueger, R. A. (1993). When to use focus groups and why. In D. L. Morgan (Ed.), Successful focus groups: Advancing the state of the art (pp. 3-19). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- National Center on Education and the Economy. (1990). America's choice: High skills or low wages! The report of the commission on the skills of the American workforce. Rochester, NY: Author.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A national at risk: The imperative for educational reform (S6059-S6065). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Council of La Raza. (1992). State of Hispanic America 1991: An overview. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Institute of Education. (1977). Desegregation and the education concerns of the Hispanic community-conference report. Washington, DC: Author.
- Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- O'Neil, J. (1992). On tracking and individual differences: A conversation with Jeannie Oakes. Educational Leadership, 50(2), 18-21.
- Oregon Department of Education. (1993). Schools for the 21st century. Salem: Author.
- Oregon Educational Act for 21st Century Schools, HB 3565. (1991).
- Parish, J. G., & Parish, T. S. (1989). Helping underachievers succeed. Reading Improvement, 26(1), pp. 71-78.
- Parnell, Dale. (1985). The neglected majority. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Perrone, V. (1985). Portraits of high schools. Lawrenceville: Princeton University Press
- Powell, A. G., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. K. (1985). The shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Reich, R. B. (1990, Summer). New economic realities. What's next: A newsletter of emerging issues and trends, 12, pp. 1-2.
- Reis, S. M. (1991). The need for clarification in research designed to examine gender differences in achievement and accomplishment. Roeper Review, 13(4), 193-198.
- Sadker, M. P., & Sadker, D. M. (1982). Sex equity handbook for schools. New York: Longman.
- Salamon, L. M. (1991). Overview: Why human capital? Why now? In D. W. Hornbeck & L. M. Salamon (Eds.), Human and America's future: An economic strategy for the 90's (pp. 1-39). Baltimore: John's Hopkins University Press.
- Schofield, J. W. (1989). Black and white in school: Trust, tension, or tolerance? New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sedlak, M. W., Wheeler, C. W., Pullin, D. C., & Cusick, P. A. (1986). Selling students short: Classroom bargains and academic reform in the American high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Simms, R. L., & Contreras, G. (Eds.). (1980). Racism and sexism: Responding to the challenge. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Sinclair, R. L., & Ghory, W. J. (1987). Reaching marginal students: A primary concern for school renewal. Chicago: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Sizer, T. R. (1964). Secondary schools at the turn of the century. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Sizer, T. R. (1992). Horace's school: Redesigning the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Smith, H. (Producer-Director). (1994). Challenge to America. Washington, DC: Hedrick Smith Productions and WETA.
- Stitt, B. A. (1988). Building gender fairness in schools. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Weis, L. (Ed.). (1988). Class, race, and gender in American education. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wolfie, J. A. (1991). Underachieving gifted males: Are we missing the boat? Roeper Review, 13(4), 181-184.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO DR. KATTERLE

March 15, 1993

To: Dr. Zeno Katterle

From: Aeylin K. Summers

Re: Doctoral Research Request

Dr. Katterle:

This letter is a formal request for permission to conduct the student interview portion of my doctoral study in the Barlow-Gresham School District. The following information addresses three areas of concern: benefits to the school district, student protocol issues, and procedures.

Benefits to the school district

The centering research question of this study is: What are the characteristics of marginal achieving secondary students, and what is the nature of their school experiences? The purpose of this study is to gather more precise information regarding the student achievement profiles of "middle track" students -typically students who earn C's and D's. We know a great deal about high and low achievers. However, despite the fact that some literature suggests middle track achievers represent 50-70% of a typical high school, we do not have a clear perspective regarding what types of students are in this portion of the total population.

As school professionals, if we knew more about which types of students ended up in the middle track, and if we understood more about the nature of their school experiences, we would have a better opportunity to shape on-going school restructuring efforts to meet the needs of these students with the intent to increase their level of engagement and achievement.

Qualitative information will be gathered through school site focus group interviews with high school sophomores who are middle track achievers. For this study, students who are in a GPA range of 1.25-2.00 will be selected from the focus groups. Part of the interview guide will include questions regarding how these students feel schools would need to be in order for them to truly engage, which is important data to be considered by anyone who is involved in the work of making schools more engaging and more effective for students. All of this information will be made available to school district personnel.

Student Protocol Issues

Students appropriate for this study will be identified through the counseling departments of each high school. Students will be invited to participate with a letter sent home to their parent/guardian. This letter will include a parent and a student permission form, which must be examined by the Portland State University Human Subjects Research Review Committee. Students who are able to participate in the study will be guaranteed complete anonymity. They will be interviewed at their home school site in groups of about 5-6 students, which should lessen some of their anxieties and make them feel more comfortable with the research setting. Students will be given opportunities to respond to questions regarding their school experiences and how they think schools need to change. All student information will be reported with coded names, and the school district will not be identified. The group interviews should take approximately one hour per session.

Procedures

1. An application to the Human Subjects Committee must be completed and advanced before any actual interviewing can begin. This particular study represents little, if any, risk to the students.
2. Upon advancement by the university committee, I will be able to contact the counseling departments of the two schools to identify pools of potential interview candidates (students in the 1.25-2.00 GPA range).
3. After a pool of approximately 75 students has been identified at each school, I will mail the letters and permission slips home to the students. This packet will include a statement that all students included in the pool may not need to be interviewed.
4. Interview groups and times will be arranged. At this time, 2:05-3:00 after school each day during a one week time period appears to be the best research timeframe. This will minimize disruption to the instructional day for both students and teachers. I hope to have everything in place to conduct these interviews during the last two weeks of April, 1993.
5. Respond with thank you letters to all students and parents who were available to participate and to those who are actually involved in the focus groups.

I believe this information will be extremely useful to school district personnel at all levels, and I will make the

findings available. I would appreciate the opportunity to work in the Barlow-Gresham School District, and I will comply with any procedural requests or address any concerns you may have. Jim Carlile is a member of my dissertation committee, and he may have additional suggestions which would improve the quality of this work. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further information. Thank you, Dr. Katterle, for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Aeylin Summers

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

March 22, 1993

To: Principals Linda Jessell and John Miner,
Gresham and Barlow High Schools

From: Aeylin K. Summers

RE: Doctoral Research Request

Ms. Jessell and Mr. Miner:

This is a formal letter to request permission to conduct the student interview portion of my doctoral study at Gresham and Sam Barlow High Schools. I have secured permission from Dr. Zeno Katterle already. My purposes with this letter are to a) provide some basic background data regarding the research study, b) outline the protocol for the study, and c) request permission to interview students in both high schools.

a) The centering research question of this study is: What are the characteristics of marginal achieving secondary students, and what is the nature of their school experiences? The purpose of this study is to gather more precise information regarding the student achievement profile of a "middle track" student- typically a student who earns Cs and Ds. We know a great deal about high and low track achievers. However, despite the fact that some literature suggests middle track achievers represent 50-70% of a typical high school, we do not have a clear perspective regarding what types of students are in this portion of the total population.

As school professionals, if we knew more about which types of students ended up in the middle track, and if we understood more about what school has been like for them, we would have a better opportunity to consider on-going school restructuring efforts in light of this information. For example, are middle track students more accurately described as at-risk students with some extra component(s) (e.g. personality traits, home or school environmental factors) that keep her/him engaged, even at a marginal level, rather than force the student to drop out? If so, what are those components, and can they be emphasized, supported, expanded, etc.? Are middle track achievers more oriented toward high track capability yet they lack some critical component(s)? Again, what are these components, and how can this information be used to advantage?

b) Students appropriate for this study will be identified through the counseling departments of each high school.

Students will be invited to participate with a letter sent home to their parent/guardian. This letter will include a parent and a student permission form, which must be examined and approved by the Human Subjects Research Review Committee at Portland State University. Students who are able to participate will be guaranteed complete anonymity. They will be interviewed at their home site in groups of about 5-6 students, which should lessen some of their anxieties and make them feel more comfortable in the research setting. Students will be given opportunities to respond to questions regarding their school experiences and how they think schools need to change. All student information will be reported with coded names, and the school district will not be identified. The group interviews should take approximately one hour per session after school.

c) I would appreciate the opportunity to conduct the interviews with students at Gresham and Barlow High Schools. I do not think the process will be overly intrusive or disruptive to the school day. Also, the information will be made available to the faculty of both schools for further consideration. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at #666-8033 (W) or #282-3818 (H).

Sincerely,

Aeylin K. Summers

APPENDIX C

CONSENT LETTER AND PERMISSION FORM

Research Project- April-May, 1993

To: Parents/guardians of selected sophomore and junior students

From: Aeylin Summers

I am an assistant principal at Gresham High School, and I am a graduate student at Portland State University. I am working currently on the research component of my doctorate in Educational Administration. To complete this research, I will be interviewing approximately 25 high school students at each of the Gresham and Barlow High School sites. Students selected for the interviews will be sophomores and juniors with mid-range GPA's. The purpose of the interviews will be to get information from these students regarding their school experiences and what schools would have to be like for them to be motivated to achieve at higher levels of engagement and excellence. This data about schools will be made available to all district personnel.

Here are some key points about the study:

- *All student information will remain completely anonymous. Names will be coded and school names will not be mentioned.
- *All information will be kept confidential by the investigator, and the students will be asked to keep the discussion confidential, as well.
- *There are no physical, mental, or emotional risks to the students at all.
- *All interviews will take place in a group setting of about 5-6 students.
- *Interviews will be conducted at the home school site.
- *Interviews will take about an hour at lunch time.
- *All students who are willing to participate may not be interviewed.

I cannot interview any student without a signed parent/guardian and a student permission form on file. If you consent to having your child participate, please complete the permission slip and have your child return it to the contact person at each site. Thank you very much for your cooperation. I am looking forward to the study and interviewing the students.

Parent/Guardian and Student Consent Form

I, _____, agree to have my child take part in this research project on mid-range GPA high school students. I understand that the study involves being a part of a group of students who, for about one hour, will be asked some questions about their school experiences. Ms. Aeylin Summers has informed me that the purpose of the study is to gain information about how schools would have to change to motivate middle achieving students. My child may not receive any direct benefit from taking part in this study, however, the study may help to increase knowledge that will help others in the future.

Ms. Summers has offered to answer any questions I may have about the study and what my child is expected to do. She has promised that all information given will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law, and that the names of all people in the study will be kept confidential by the researcher. I understand that my child does not have to take part in this study, my child can withdraw from the study, and that this will not affect any of her/his grades or relationship with Gresham or Barlow High School in any way.

Parent/Guardian and Student Consent

I have read and understand the above information and agree to have my child take part in this study.

Parent Signature

Date

I have read and understand the above information and agree to take part in this study. **Please complete the reverse side.**

Student Signature

Date

If you have any concerns or questions about this study, please contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Research Review Committee, Office of Grants and Contracts, 105 Neuberger Hall, Portland State University, (503) 725-3417.

APPENDIX D

STUDENT INTERVIEW INFORMATION SHEET

Student Information Sheet

Please fill out the information on this sheet. Thanks!

Gender_____ Age_____ Year in School_____

Where are you from originally?_____

How long have you gone to this school?_____

Have you ever gone to another high school? If yes,
where?_____

Tell me about the people in your family? How many, what
number are you, etc._____

Do you participate in any after school sports or activities?
If yes, please list them.

List some of the things you like about school.

List some of the things you dislike about school.

Do you have a job outside of school? If yes, where and how
many hours a week do you work?

APPENDIX E

STUDENT FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Focus Guide-Student Interview Questions

Research Question: What are the characteristics of marginal achieving secondary students, and what is the nature of their school experiences?

Student Demographic/Background Data (On card)

Gender? Age?
 Where from originally? Where do you live now? Years in area?
 Family Information (number of siblings, birth order)
 Years/months at this school?
 Extra-curricular activities in which you participate?

Curriculum

"We're going to talk for a while about school, and we're going to think about it in two parts- first the classes and the coursework, then the teachers. Let's start by thinking about classes you have taken."

Which classes have you enjoyed the most? (Specify level-i.e. Algebra 2)

What are the characteristics of classes you have enjoyed?

Which classes have you enjoyed the least?

What are the characteristics of classes you have enjoyed the least?

Which are some of the most memorable classes you have taken? Why were they memorable?

Which are the classes where you believe you learned the most material that you will remember?

Which classes covered material that will be important to you for the rest of your life?

Describe how material is presented in some of your current classes.

Instruction

"Now, let's think about the teachers in these classes. You might have one particular teacher in mind, or you may have a few in mind, and you can talk about things these people have in common."

What are some of the characteristics of teachers whose classes you have enjoyed? Describe a particular teacher (no names).

Describe what a teacher does in a class you enjoyed.

What are some of the characteristics of teachers whose classes you have not enjoyed? Describe a particular teacher (no names).

Describe what a teacher does in a class you did not enjoy.

What are some of the characteristics of teachers where you learned a lot of the material? Describe a teacher (no names).

Describe what a teacher does in a class where you learned a lot.

Personal School Experiences

"No matter which class or which teacher you have, YOU are always the student. Think about yourself as a student."

Describe yourself as a student. What has school been like for you, in general?

Was there ever a time when you experienced a great deal of success in school? Describe that experience or time.

Was there ever a time when you did much worse in school? Describe that time or experience.

What was your level of success last year, compared to this year (e.g. "I'm doing about the same, a little better, worse, etc.")

How do you account for this?

Is your level of success what you expected of yourself?

Are you satisfied with your level of success? Are you a marginal student?

Are you working as hard as you could in school?

Could you work harder at school than you are currently working?

What would make you work harder at your school work?

How do you decide how much work to do in a given class?

In which of your classes, if any, do you put in your best effort (i.e. pay attention, do all of the assignments, ask questions, stay prepared, etc.)?

How do you account for your effort in this class?

What would make you put in this kind of effort in every class?

(**Focus=school? parents? self? teachers?)

School Environment

"Now, I want you to think about school, in general, not one particular class or teacher."

Besides go to classes, what do you do at school (e.g. see friends, play sports)?

What do you look forward to the most? What is your favorite part of the school day? Why?

What do you look forward to the least? What is your least favorite part of the school day? Why?

Do you feel like you are a part of your school? How do you fit in to your school?

Who are some of the people at school you believe you could ask for help with school work or school-related issues (Problems? Schedules?)

How often do you seek help from these people?

What accounts for how often you seek help from these people?
 How often do you get sent to the principal's or assistant
 principal's office for disciplinary meetings?
 Typically, why would you be sent?
 Do you make appointments to see your counselor? How often
 do you see her/him? Why would you go?
 Do you think your teachers like you? Why or why not?
 Do you ever talk to your teachers about non-school subjects?
 Why or why not?
 If yes, what do you talk about?
 Do you believe your teachers care about you as a person? Why
 or why not?
 How do teachers act when they care about you? When they
 don't?

Home Environment

What do you do after school?
 How many waking hours are you at home every day after
 school?
 Do you talk to your parent/guardian about school? How
 often?
 What kinds of items do you discuss about school?
 Do you seek help from your parent/guardian regarding school
 and school issues? Why or why not?
 What kinds of things do your parents/guardians say about
 school?
 Do you plan to graduate from high school?
 How important is it to you to graduate with your class?
 Do you have plans for yourself after high school? Describe
 your plans.
 How much influence do your parents/guardians have over your
 future plans?
 How much influence do sisters, brothers, or other family
 members have over your school decisions? Describe this
 influence.

Future/Projection Questions

"I'm going to ask you some questions about stuff you may
 never have even thought about. I want to hear about how
 you see your future."
 Do you have any future plans right now? College? Job?
 Would you be ready to graduate at the end of this
 (sophomore) year?
 If you were going to receive a certificate at the end of
 tenth grade that says you are ready to choose a career
 path, would you know what to choose to study?
 Can you see as benefits to this idea (choose at the end of
 tenth)? What?

What do you think of these ideas? Do you think they would make you work harder or make a greater effort in school?

- longer school day/year?
- shorter school day/year?
- couldn't get a work permit without a diploma?
- employers advertised a higher wage for high school graduates
- fewer subjects to study every day? more block scheduling?
- more choices of electives?
- more extra-curricular opportunities all year long?
- system where you couldn't earn less than a C? (If lower grade, get an Incomplete till the grade = at least a C or better)
- system where you needed to show/demonstrate what you knew, sometimes with paper/pencil test, sometimes with projects?
- system where you took classes related to a career/job?
- system where you took classes part-time at the high school, part-time at a community college or university?
- system where you went to school part-time and worked part-time?

Describe what you think school would have to be like for you to want to come to school and where you would work pretty hard at your schoolwork.

Segments=curriculum, instruction, school environment

What else do you think would help you to make a big effort and work hard in school? Is there anything else that school people could do? Parents?

APPENDIX F

NELS QUESTIONNAIRE--1988 FOLLOW-UP

**NATIONAL EDUCATION
LONGITUDINAL STUDY
OF 1988**

NORC-4492
Form Approved
OMB No. 1850-0593
App. Exp. 1/91

FIRST FOLLOW-UP

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Prepared for: U.S. Department of Education
National Center for Education Statistics

By: NORC, A Social Science Research Center
University of Chicago

USES OF THE DATA

The data from the survey will be used by educators and by federal and state policy makers to address important issues facing the nation's schools: educational standards, curriculum tracking, dropping out of school, the education of the disadvantaged, the needs of language minority students, incentives for attracting students to the study of science and mathematics, and the features of effective schools.

CONFIDENTIALITY

As a matter of policy, the National Center for Education Statistics is concerned with protecting the privacy of individuals who participate in voluntary surveys. We want to let you know that:

1. Section 406 of the General Education Provisions Act (20-USC 1221e-1) and Public Law 100-297 allow us to ask you the questions in this questionnaire.
2. We are asking you these questions in order to gather information about what happens to students as they move through high school and make decisions about what they are going to do after high school.
3. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer; however, we hope that you answer as many questions as you can.
4. Your responses will be combined with those of other students, and the answers you give will never be identified as yours.

[illegible]

The public reporting burden for collection of this information is estimated to average three hours (180 minutes), including one hour for the questionnaire, one and one-half hours for the Cognitive Test, and up to one-half hour for distributing materials and giving instructions. Send comments regarding this collection of information, or any other aspect of this collection of information, to: U.S. Department of Education, Information Management and Compliance Division, Washington, D.C. 20202-4651 and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project, Washington, D.C. 20503.

The Self-Description Questionnaire is copyrighted by Herbert Marsh and used by permission. No reproduction of the Self-Description Questionnaire may be made without permission of the owner.

The purpose of this survey is to collect information that will allow teachers and educators to better understand students' various experiences in high school.

This questionnaire is not a test. We hope you will answer each question truthfully, because we need your answer. You may skip any question you do not wish to answer.

MARKING DIRECTIONS

- Use only a soft lead pencil (No. 2 is best).
- Make dark marks that fill the oval.
- Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray markings of any kind.

CORRECT MARKS

INCORRECT MARKS

EXAMPLE: 1. Will marks made with ballpoint or felt-tip pen be properly read?

☐ Yes

☒ No

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE READ EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY.

It is important that you follow the directions for responding to each kind of question. These are:

A. (MARK ONE)

What is the color of your eyes?

(MARK ONE)

- Brown ☐
 Blue ☐
 Green ☒
 Another color ☐

If the color of your eyes is green, you would fill in the third oval.

B. (MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

Last week, did you do any of the following?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

- See a play ☐
 Go to a movie ☒
 Attend a sporting event ☒

If you went to a movie and attended a sporting event last week, you would fill in the two ovals as shown.

C. (MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

Do you plan to do any of the following next week?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

- | | Yes | Not
Sure | No |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. Visit a relative | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b. Go to a museum | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| c. Study at a friend's house | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

If you do not plan to visit a relative, are not sure about going to a museum next week, and plan to study at a friend's house, you would fill in one item on each line as shown.

D. (QUESTION WITH A SKIP)

a. Do you eat sweet foods?

(MARK ONE)

- Yes ☐ → GO TO b
 No ☐ → SKIP TO c

b. Do you brush your teeth after eating sweet foods?

(MARK ONE)

- Yes ☐
 No ☐

c. Last week, did you do any of the following?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

- See a play ☐
 Go to a movie ☐
 Attend a sporting event ☐

NAME:

WHEN WE SAY PARENT(S), MOTHER, OR FATHER, ANSWER FOR THE PARENT/GUARDIAN OR STEPPARENT WITH WHOM YOU LIVE.

3A. Is your father's address and telephone number the same as yours?

(MARK ONE)

- No ☐ → GO TO 3B 30
 No, my father is no longer living ☐ → SKIP TO Question 4A
 Yes ☐ → SKIP TO Question 4A

3B. Please fill in your father's name and address in the space below. If you have both a father and a male guardian, write in the name of the one whom you live with most of the time.

NAME:

Last 23-41/ First 42-50/ Middle 57-71/

ADDRESS:
 Number Street 01-07/ 08-12/

ADDRESS CONTINUED:
 Apartment Number 43-77/

City 01-07/ 08-12/ State 23-39/ ZIP Code 35-44/

TELEPHONE: ()
 Area Code Telephone Number 35-44/ He does not have a telephone ☐ 45-46/

4A. Please write in the name, address, and telephone number of a relative or close friend who does not live with you.

NAME:

Last 47-59/ First 01-07/ 08-12/ Middle 23-37/

ADDRESS:
 Number Street 35-72/

ADDRESS CONTINUED:
 Apartment Number 05-13/

City 43-52/ State 43-54/ ZIP Code 55-65/

TELEPHONE: ()
 Area Code Telephone Number 05-17/ He/She does not have a telephone ☐ 15/

4B. What is your relationship to this person?

(MARK ONE)

A close friend ☐ 19
A relative ☐

5. What grade are you in?

☐
20

(MARK ONE)

9th grade ☐ 21
10th grade ☐
11th grade ☐

6A. What school will you be attending in 12th grade?

☐
22

(MARK ONE)

Same school as now ☐ 23
New school ☐

6B. If new school (write in):

☐
24

Name

(PLEASE PRINT FULL NAME OF SCHOOL)

25-26

City

State

65-74

75-76

Office Use Only

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

PART 2 — YOUR SCHOOL EXPERIENCES AND ACTIVITIES

7. How much do you agree with each of the following statements about your current school and teachers?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Students get along well with teachers	4	3	2	1
b. There is real school spirit	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Rules for behavior are strict	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Discipline is fair	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Students make friends with students of other racial and ethnic groups	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Other students often disrupt class	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. The teaching is good	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Teachers are interested in students	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. When I work hard on schoolwork, my teachers praise my effort	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. In class I often feel "put down" by my teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. In school I often feel "put down" by other students	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. I don't feel safe at this school	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. Disruptions by other students get in the way of my learning	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Misbehaving students often get away with it	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. Some students are recognized by their school or community. In the first half of the school year, did you win any of the following awards or were you recognized for doing well or participating in certain activities?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. I have not won any awards or received recognition	☐
b. Elected officer of a school class	☐
c. Won an academic honor	☐
d. Participated in a science or math fair	☐
e. Received special recognition for good attendance	☐
f. Received special recognition for good grades or honor roll	☐
g. Received special recognition for writing an essay or poem	☐
h. Named most valuable player on a sports team	☐
i. Received a community service award	☐
j. Participated in vocational/technical skills competition	☐

9. In the first half of the current school year, how many times did any of the following things happen to you at school?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Never	Once or Twice	More than Twice
a. I had something stolen from me at school	0	1	2
b. Someone offered to sell me drugs at school	☐	☐	☐
c. Someone threatened to hurt me at school	☐	☐	☐
d. I got into a physical fight at school	☐	☐	☐

How many times did the following things happen to you in the first half of the current school year?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

1-2 3-6 7-9 Over
Never times times times times

- a. I was late for school 0 .. 1 .. 2 .. 3 .. 4
- b. I cut or skipped classes ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐
- c. I got in trouble for not following school rules ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐
- d. I was put on an in-school suspension ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐
- e. I was suspended or put on probation from school ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐
- f. I was transferred to another school for disciplinary reasons ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐
- g. I was arrested ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐ .. ☐

11. Do you feel it is "OK" for you to ...

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

No Yes

- a. Work hard for good grades? 2 1
- b. Ask challenging questions? ☐ .. ☐
- c. Solve problems using new and original ideas? ☐ .. ☐
- d. Help other students with their schoolwork? ☐ .. ☐

12. How often do you feel it is "OK" for you to ...

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

Never Rarely Some-times Often

- a. Be late for school? 4 3 2 1
- b. Cut a couple of classes? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- c. Skip school for a whole day? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- d. Cheat on tests? .. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- e. Copy someone else's homework? .. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- f. Get into physical fights? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- g. Belong to gangs? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- h. Make racist remarks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- i. Make sexist remarks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- j. Steal belongings from school, a student, or a teacher? .. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- k. Destroy or damage school property? .. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- l. Smoke on school grounds? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- m. Drink alcohol during school day? .. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- n. Use illegal drugs during school day? .. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- o. Bring weapons to school? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- p. Abuse teachers physically? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- q. Talk back to teachers? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- r. Disobey school rules? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

13. In the first half of the current school year, about how many days were you absent from school for any reason?

(MARK ONE)

- None 1 → SKIP TO Question 17
 1 or 2 days 2
 3 or 4 days 3
 5 to 10 days 4
 11 to 15 days 5
 16 to 20 days 6
 21 or more 7

14. What was the main reason for your last absence from school?

(MARK ONE)

- I had to care for a member of my family or close friend 1
 I was sick 2
 My family was on vacation 3
 I didn't feel like going to school 4
 I was worried about my safety going to or in school 5
 I had to get a job to help my family 6
 I had problems with a teacher or other adult in school 7
 I had problems with another student or group of students 8
 I wanted to spend time with my friends who are not in school 9
 I wasn't prepared for a test or class assignment 10
 I couldn't keep up with my school work 11
 I felt I didn't belong at school 12
 I don't remember 13

15. Which of the following happened on your last absence from school?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	No	Yes	Don't Know
a. The school did not do anything 2		1	3
b. Someone from school called my home 0	0	0	0
c. Someone from school visited my home 0	0	0	0
d. The school sent a letter to my home 0	0	0	0
e. The school made me see a counselor 0	0	0	0

16. When you came back to school after your last absence, which of the following happened?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

- a. My teachers helped me catch up on the work I missed 1
 b. Other students helped me catch up on the work I missed 1
 c. Someone else helped me 1
 d. I didn't need to catch up on work 1
 e. When I came back to school, a teacher was mad at me or put me down in class 1
 f. A teacher, counselor, or other adult in the school asked me where I'd been 1
 g. I fell behind 1

17. After this school year (1988-89), about how many more years do you think it will take you to graduate from high school?

(MARK ONE)

- 1 year 1
 2 years 2
 3 years 3
 4 years 4
 More than 4 years 5
 Don't know 6

- 18A. How sure are you that you will graduate from high school?

(MARK ONE)

- Very sure I won't graduate 1
 I probably won't graduate 2
 I'll probably graduate 3
 Very sure I'll graduate 4

- 18B. How sure are you that you will go on for further education after you leave high school?

(MARK ONE)

- Very sure I won't go 4
 I probably won't go 3
 I'll probably go 2
 Very sure I'll go 1

For each term you were enrolled in school, did you ...

(MARK "YES" OR "NO" FOR EACH TERM)

- a. Attend the first two weeks of school?
- b. Enroll in a special program (dropout prevention work study, peer tutoring, etc.)?
- c. Pass to the next term/grade?

Fall of 1983		Spring of 1984		Fall of 1984	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	2	1	2	1	2
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

20. Which of the following best describes your present program?

(MARK ONE)

- General high school program 1
- College prep, academic, or specialized academic (such as Science or Math) 2
- Vocational, technical, or business and career
- Industrial arts/Technology education 3
- Agricultural occupations 4
- Business or office occupations 5
- Marketing or Distributive education 6
- Health occupations 7
- Home economics occupations 8
- Consumer and homemaking education 9
- Technical occupations 10
- Trade or industrial occupations 11
- Other specialized high school program (such as Fine Arts) 12
- Other 13
- I don't know 14

21. What is the main reason you are taking the following subjects?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	I'm not taking it this term	It was required	I wanted to take it	My parents requested it	My teachers recommended it	My friends suggested it	My school assigned me to it
a. Math	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. History	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

22. From the beginning of ninth grade to the end of this school year, how much coursework will you have taken in each of the following subjects? Count only courses that meet at least three times (or three periods) a week for at least one half year. Also include summer school classes taken in 1988 or 1989 that counted for one half year or more.

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	None	$\frac{1}{2}$ Year	1 Year	$1\frac{1}{2}$ Years	2 Years
a. General Math	0	1	2	3	4
b. Pre-Algebra	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Algebra I	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Geometry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Algebra II	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Trigonometry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Pre-Calculus	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Calculus	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Consumer/Business Math	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Other Math	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

23. From the beginning of ninth grade to the end of this school year, how much coursework will you have taken in each of the following subjects? Count only courses that meet at least three times (or three periods) a week for at least one half year. Also include summer school classes taken in 1988 or 1989 that counted for one half year or more.

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	None	$\frac{1}{2}$ Year	1 Year	$1\frac{1}{2}$ Years	2 Years
a. General Science	0	1	2	3	4
b. General Physical Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Biology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Earth Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Chemistry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Principles of Technology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Physics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Other Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

24. From the beginning of ninth grade to the end of this school year, how much coursework will you have taken in each of the following subjects? Count only courses that meet at least three times (or three periods) a week for at least one half year. Also include summer school courses taken in 1988 or 1989 that counted for one half year or more.

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	None	$\frac{1}{2}$ Year	1 Year	$1\frac{1}{2}$ Years	2 Years
a. English (including literature, composition, language arts)	0	1	2	3	4
b. World History	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. U.S. History	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Geography	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Government or Civics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Economics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Foreign Language	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Art	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Music	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Drama	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Religious Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Physical Education (Gym)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Family Life Studies (Sex Education)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. Psychology/Sociology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Computer Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

25. From the beginning of ninth grade to the end of this school year, how much coursework will you have taken in each of the following subjects? Count only courses that meet at least three times (or three periods) a week for at least one half year. Also include summer school classes taken in 1988 or 1989 that counted for one half year or more.

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	None	$\frac{1}{2}$ Year	1 Year	$1\frac{1}{2}$ Years	2 Years
a. Computer Education	0	1	2	3	4
b. Consumer Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Home Economics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Shop (industrial arts, auto mechanics)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Typing/Word Processing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Agriculture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Career Exploration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Computer Literacy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

26. In each of your current classes, how often are you asked to show that you really understand the material, rather than just give an answer?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not Taking This Subject	Never	Less Than Once a Week	About Once a Week	A Few Times a Week	Almost Every Day
a. Math	0	1	2	3	4	5
b. English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. History	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

27. In each of your current classes, how often do you try as hard as you can?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not Taking This Subject	Never	Less Than Once a Week	About Once a Week	A Few Times a Week	Almost Every Day
a. Math	0	1	2	3	4	5
b. English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. History	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

28. In each of your current classes, how often do you feel really challenged to use your mind?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not Taking This Subject	Never	Less Than Once a Week	About Once a Week	A Few Times a Week	Almost Every Day
a. Math	0	1	2	3	4	5
b. English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. History	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

29. In your most recent or current SCIENCE classes, how often do/did you ...

(IF YOU HAVE NOT TAKEN A SCIENCE CLASS, DARKEN THE OVAL AND SKIP TO QUESTION 31.)

Have not yet taken a science class ☐ → GO TO Question 31

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Very Rarely	Once a Month	Once a Week	Almost Every Day	Every Day
a. Review the work from the previous day?	1	2	3	4	5
b. Make your own choice of science topic or problem to study?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Copy the teacher's notes from the blackboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Write up reports of laboratory and practical work?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Use a book or other written instructions that show you how to do an experiment?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Make up your own problems and work out your own methods to investigate the problems?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Design and conduct experiments or projects on your own?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Use computers to write up experiments or reports?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Use computers for collecting and/or analyzing data?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Use computers to do calculations?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Use computers for models and simulations?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Listen to the teacher lecture?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Discuss career opportunities in scientific and technological fields?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. Watch the teacher demonstrate or lead you in an experiment or systematic observation?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

30. In your most recent or current SCIENCE class, how much emphasis does/did the teacher place on the following objectives?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	None	Minor Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Major Emphasis
a. Increasing your interest in science	0	1	2	3
b. Learning and memorizing science facts, rules, and steps	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Preparing you for further study in science	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Thinking about what a problem means and the ways it might be solved	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Showing you the importance of science in daily life	☐	☐	☐	☐

31. In your most recent or current MATHEMATICS class, how much emphasis does/did your teacher place on each of the following objectives? (IF YOU HAVE NOT TAKEN A MATHEMATICS CLASS, DARKEN THE OVAL AND SKIP TO QUESTION 33.)

Have not yet taken a mathematics class ☐ → GO TO Question 33

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	None	Minor Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Major Emphasis
a. Increasing your interest in mathematics	0	1	2	3
b. Learning and memorizing facts, rules, and steps	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Preparing you for further study in math	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Thinking about what a problem means and ways it might be solved	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Showing you the importance of mathematics in daily life	☐	☐	☐	☐

32. In your most recent or current MATH class,
how often do/did you...

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

- | | Never | Some-
times | Often |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Review the work from the previous day? | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. Use books other than text books? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Copy the teacher's notes from the blackboard? .. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Do story problems or problem-solving activities? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Use computers? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. Use hands-on materials or models? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. Use calculators? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. Participate in student-led discussions? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| i. Explain your work to the class orally? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

33. In your most recent or current VOCATIONAL course, how much emphasis did/does your teacher place on the following objectives?

Have not taken a vocational course..... ☐

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

- | | None | Minor
Emphasis | Moderate
Emphasis | Major
Emphasis |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Teaching you skills you can use immediately .. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. Teaching you facts, rules, and steps | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Helping you understand how scientific ideas and mathematics are used in work .. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Thinking about what a problem means and the ways it might be solved | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. Helping you to understand mathematical and scientific ideas by helping you to manipulate physical objects (tools, machines, lab equipment) ... | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

34. Have you ever been in any of the following kinds of courses or programs in high school?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	No	Yes
a. Remedial English (sometimes called basic or essential).....	2	1
b. Remedial Mathematics (sometimes called basic or essential).....	☐	☐
c. Bilingual or bicultural program	☐	☐
d. English as a Second Language program	☐	☐
e. Advanced placement program	☐	☐
f. Special program for the educationally handicapped	☐	☐
g. Special program for the physically handicapped	☐	☐
h. Dropout prevention program	☐	☐

35. Have you received information on the following topics in your current school?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	No	Yes
a. Family life or sex education.....	2	1
b. AIDS education	☐	☐
c. Alcohol or drug abuse education....	☐	☐

Overall and in the following subjects, about how much time do you spend on homework EACH WEEK, both in and out of school? (MARK ONE IN EACH COLUMN)

a. Total time spent on homework

	In School	Out of School
None	0	0
1 hour or less	1	1
2-3 hours	2	2
4-6 hours	3	3
7-9 hours	4	4
10-12 hours	5	5
13-15 hours	6	6
Over 15 hours	7	7

b. Time spent on mathematics homework

	In School	Out of School
Not taking math class	0	0
None	1	1
1 hour or less	2	2
2-3 hours	3	3
4-6 hours	4	4
7-9 hours	5	5
10-12 hours	6	6
13-15 hours	7	7
Over 15 hours	8	8

c. Time spent on science homework

	In School	Out of School
Not taking science class	0	0
None	1	1
1 hour or less	2	2
2-3 hours	3	3
4-6 hours	4	4
7-9 hours	5	5
10-12 hours	6	6
13-15 hours	7	7
Over 15 hours	8	8

d. Time spent on English homework

	In School	Out of School
Not taking English class	0	0
None	1	1
1 hour or less	2	2
2-3 hours	3	3
4-6 hours	4	4
7-9 hours	5	5
10-12 hours	6	6
13-15 hours	7	7
Over 15 hours	8	8

e. Time spent on History homework

	In School	Out of School
Not taking History class	0	0
None	1	1
1 hour or less	2	2
2-3 hours	3	3
4-6 hours	4	4
7-9 hours	5	5
10-12 hours	6	6
13-15 hours	7	7
Over 15 hours	8	8

f. Time spent on homework for all other subjects

	In School	Out of School
Not taking other classes	0	0
None	1	1
1 hour or less	2	2
2-3 hours	3	3
4-6 hours	4	4
7-9 hours	5	5
10-12 hours	6	6
13-15 hours	7	7
Over 15 hours	8	8

37. In a typical day, how many class periods do you spend in a study hall?

(MARK ONE)

- None 0
 One 1
 Two 2
 Three 3
 Four 4
 Over four 5

GO TO
Question 38

38. How important are good grades to you?

(MARK ONE)

- Not important 1
 Somewhat important 2
 Important 3
 Very important 4

GO TO Question 39

39. For each of the school subjects listed below, mark the statement that best describes your grades from the beginning of ninth grade until now.

(MARK ONE FOR EACH SUBJECT BELOW)

	Math	English	History	Science
Does not apply to me — I have not taken any classes in this subject yet	1	1	1	1
Mostly A's	2	2	2	2
About half A's and half B's	3	3	3	3
Mostly B's	4	4	4	4
About half B's and half C's	5	5	5	5
Mostly C's	6	6	6	6
About half C's and half D's	7	7	7	7
Mostly D's	8	8	8	8
Mostly below D	9	9	9	9
Does not apply to me — my classes are not graded	10	10	10	10

MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE GIVEN ONE ANSWER FOR EACH SUBJECT ABOVE.

40. How often do you come to class WITHOUT these things?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

Never Seldom Often Usually

- a. Pencil or paper 4 3 2 1
 b. Books 0 0 0 0
 c. Your homework done 0 0 0 0

41A. Please mark all that apply for EACH interscholastic activity and/or intramural activity that you have participated in THIS SCHOOL YEAR.

INTERSCHOLASTIC means your school team competes with other school teams

SCHOOL INTRAMURAL means the teams are within your own school

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY ON EACH LINE)

	School Does Not Have	Did Not Participate	Participated in Intramural Sports	Participated on a Junior Varsity/Freshman Team	Participated on a Varsity Team	Participated as a Captain/Co-captain
a. Baseball/softball	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Basketball	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Football	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Soccer	0	0	0	0	0	0
e. Swim team	0	0	0	0	0	0
f. Other team sport (hockey, volleyball, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	0
g. Other individual sport (cross-country, gymnastics, golf, tennis, track, wrestling)	0	0	0	0	0	0
h. Cheerleading	0	0	0	0	0	0
i. Pom-pom, drill team	0	0	0	0	0	0

418. Please mark one for each activity that you have participated in THIS SCHOOL YEAR.

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

Clubs or Groups	School Does Not Offer	Did Not Participate	Participated	Participated as an Officer
a. Band, orchestra, chorus, choir, or other music group ...	1	2	3	4
b. School play or musical	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Student government	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. NHS or other academic honor society	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. School yearbook, newspaper, or literary magazine	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Service clubs (AFS, Key club)	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Academic clubs (Art, Computer, Engineering, Debate/Forensics, Foreign languages, Science, Math, Psychology, Philosophy, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Hobby clubs (photography, chess, frisbee, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. FTA, FHA, FFA or other vocation education or professional club	☐	☐	☐	☐

42. In a typical week, how much total time do you spend on all SCHOOL-SPONSORED extracurricular activities?

(MARK ONE)

- None (0)
 Less than 1 hour per week (1)
 1-4 hours per week (2)
 5-9 hours per week (3)
 10-19 hours per week (4)
 20 hours or more per week (5)

43. How much additional reading do you do each week on your own outside of school — not in connection with schoolwork? (Do not count any school-assigned reading.)

(MARK ONE)

- None (0)
 1 hour or less per week (1)
 2 hours (2)
 3 hours (3)
 4-5 hours (4)
 6-7 hours (5)
 8-9 hours (6)
 10 or more hours a week (7)

44. How often do you spend time on the following activities outside of school?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Rarely or Never	Less Than Once a Week	Once or Twice a Week	Every Day or Almost Every day
a. Visiting with friends at a local hangout	1	2	3	4
b. Using personal computers	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Working on hobbies, arts, or crafts on my own	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Reading for pleasure	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Going to the park, gym, beach, or pool	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Playing ball or other sports with friends	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Attending youth groups or recreational programs	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Volunteering or performing community service	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Driving or riding around (alone or with friends)	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Talking with friends on the telephone	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Talking or doing things with your mother or father	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Talking or doing things with other adults	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Taking classes: music, art, language, dance	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. Taking sports lessons: karate, tennis, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. Attending religious activities	☐	☐	☐	☐

45. During the school year, how many hours a day do you USUALLY watch TV or videotapes? ANSWER BOTH A AND B BELOW.

(MARK ONE) (MARK ONE)
 A B
 On weekdays On weekends

Don't watch TV	0	0
Less than one hour a day	1	1
1-2 hours	2	2
2-3 hours	3	3
3-4 hours	4	4
4-5 hours	5	5
Over 5 hours a day	6	6

PART 3 — YOUR PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

46. How important is each of the following to you in your life?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

☐

Not Somewhat Very
Important Important Important

a. Being successful in my line of work	1.	2.	3.
b. Finding the right person to marry and having a happy family life	☐	☐	☐
c. Having lots of money	☐	☐	☐
d. Having strong friendships	☐	☐	☐
e. Being able to find steady work	☐	☐	☐
f. Helping other people in my community	☐	☐	☐
g. Being able to give my children better opportunities than I've had	☐	☐	☐
h. Living close to parents and relatives	☐	☐	☐
i. Getting away from this area of the country	☐	☐	☐
j. Working to correct social and economic inequalities	☐	☐	☐
k. Having children	☐	☐	☐
l. Having leisure time to enjoy my own interests	☐	☐	☐
m. Getting away from my parents	☐	☐	☐

47. What do the following people think is the most important thing for you to do right after high school?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Does
Not
Apply	Go
to
college	Get a
full-
time
job	Enter a
trade
school or an
apprenticeship
program	Enter
military
service	Get
married	They
think I
should
do what
I want	They
don't
care	I
don't
know
a. Your father	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
b. Your mother	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Your friends	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. A close
relative	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. School
counselor	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Your favorite
teacher	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Coach	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

48. How far in school do you think your father and your mother want you to go? (BE SURE TO ANSWER BOTH A AND B BELOW FOR PERSONS WITH WHOM YOU LIVE OR WITH WHOM YOU HAVE REGULAR CONTACT.)

(MARK ONE) (MARK ONE)
A B
Father Mother

Does not apply	☐	(9)
Less than high school graduation	☐	1
Graduate from high school, but not go any further	☐	2
Go to vocational, trade, or business school after high school	☐	3
Attend a two-year college	☐	4
Attend a four-year college	☐	5
Graduate from college	☐	6
Attend a higher level of school after graduating from college	☐	7
Don't know	☐	8
Parent doesn't care	☐	9

49. As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will get?

(MARK ONE)

- Less than high school graduation (1)
High school graduation only (2)

Vocational, trade, or business school after high school:

- Less than two years (3)
Two years or more (4)

College program:

- Less than two years of college (5)
Two or more years of college (including two-year degree) (6)
Finish college (four- or five-year degree) (7)
Master's degree or equivalent (8)
Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced professional degree (9)

50. Have you taken or are you planning to take any of the following tests in the next two years?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	1	2	3	4	5
	Never thought about it	Don't plan to take	Yes, this year	Yes, next year	Yes, in 2-3 years

- a. Pre-SAT test 1 .. 2 .. 3 .. 4 .. 5
- b. College Board (SAT) Scholastic Aptitude Test 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0
- c. (ACT) American College Testing test 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0
- d. Advanced Placement (AP) test 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0
- e. Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0
- f. Preliminary American College Testing Test (PACT) 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0 .. 0

51. Do you plan to go to college after you graduate from high school?

(MARK ONE)

- No, don't plan to go to college (1)
— SKIP TO Question 53
- Yes, right after high school (2)
- Yes, after staying out of school for one year (3)
- Yes, after staying out of school for over a year (4)
- Don't know (5)

52. How important is each of the following in choosing a college you plan to attend?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important
--	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

- a. College expenses (tuition, books, room and board) 1 .. 2 .. 3
- b. Availability of financial aid such as a school loan, scholarship, or grant 0 .. 0 .. 0
- c. Availability of specific courses or curriculum 0 .. 0 .. 0
- d. Reputation of the college in athletic programs 0 .. 0 .. 0
- e. Social life at the college 0 .. 0 .. 0
- f. Able to live at home and attend the college 0 .. 0 .. 0
- g. Able to live away from home 0 .. 0 .. 0
- h. A religious environment 0 .. 0 .. 0
- i. A low crime environment 0 .. 0 .. 0
- j. Job or employment placement record of college graduates 0 .. 0 .. 0
- k. Reputation of college in academic programs 0 .. 0 .. 0
- l. Easy admission standards 0 .. 0 .. 0

53. Which of the categories below comes closest to describing the job or occupation that you expect or plan to have right after high school and when you are 30 years old? Even if you are not sure, mark your best guess.

(MARK ONE FOR EACH COLUMN)

	Job after high school	Job at 30
--	-----------------------------	-----------------

CLERICAL such as bank teller, bookkeeper, secretary, typist, mail carrier, ticket agent (1) 1

CRAFTSMAN such as baker, automobile mechanic, machinist, painter, plumber, telephone installer, carpenter (2) 2

FARMER, FARM MANAGER (3) 3

HOMEMAKER OR HOUSEWIFE ONLY (4) 4

LABORER such as construction worker, car washer, sanitary worker, farm laborer (5) 5

MANAGER, ADMINISTRATOR such as sales manager, office manager, school administrator, buyer, restaurant manager, government official (6) 6

MILITARY such as career officer, enlisted man or woman in the Armed Forces (7) 7

OPERATIVE such as meat cutter, assembler, machine operator, welder, taxicab, bus, or truck driver (8) 8

PROFESSIONAL such as accountant, artist, registered nurse, engineer, librarian, writer, social worker, actor, actress, athlete, politician, but not including school teacher (9) 9

PROFESSIONAL such as clergyman, dentist, physician, lawyer, scientist, college teacher (10) 10

PROPRIETOR OR OWNER such as owner of a small business, contractor, restaurant owner (11) 11

PROTECTIVE SERVICE such as detective, police officer or guard, sheriff, fire fighter (12) 12

SALES such as salesperson, advertising or insurance agent, real estate broker (13) 13

SCHOOL TEACHER such as elementary or secondary (14) 14

SERVICE such as barber, beautician, practical nurse, private household worker, janitor, waiter (15) 15

TECHNICAL such as draftsman, medical or dental technician, computer programmer (16) 16

NOT PLANNING TO WORK (17) 17

OTHER (18) 18

DON'T KNOW (19) 19

PART 4 — LANGUAGE USE

54. Is any other language besides English spoken in your home?

No 2 → SKIP TO Question 62
Yes 1

55. What other language is spoken in your home?

(MARK ONE)

Spanish 1
Chinese 2
Japanese 3
Korean 4
A Filipino language 5
Italian 6
French 7
German 8
Greek 9
Polish 10
Portuguese 11
Vietnamese 12
Cambodian 13
Other 14

55A. Is this your native language (the first language you learned when you were a child)?

No 2 → SKIP TO Question 58
Yes 1 → GO TO Question 58B

55B. How well do you do the following?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not At All	Not Very Well	Well	Very Well
a. Understand your native language...	4	3	2	1
b. Speak your native language...	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Read your native language...	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Write your native language...	☐	☐	☐	☐

56. How often do you speak to your parents in English about your homework or other school work?

(MARK ONE)

Does not apply — we don't talk about homework 1
Never in English 2
Sometimes in English 3
About 1/2 the time in English 4
Always or most of the time in English 5

57. How well do you do the following?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not At All	Not Very Well	Well	Very Well
a. Understand spoken English ...	4	3	2	1
b. Speak English ...	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Read English ...	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Write English ...	☐	☐	☐	☐

58. Since the beginning of the ninth grade, have you received special help in reading, writing, or speaking English?

(MARK ONE)

No 2 → SKIP TO Question 62
Yes 1

58. Was the special help in the form of ...

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. Individual (one-to-one) tutoring? (1)
b. A small group? (1)
c. A large group other than your regular class? (1)
d. English as a Second Language? (1)
e. Bilingual education? (1)

59. How often did you work on the following in these classes or activities?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
a. Listening to English tapes ...	4	3	2	1
b. Improving English speaking skills ...	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Reading English ...	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Writing English ...	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Other activities ...	☐	☐	☐	☐

60. Do you think your English skills have improved in the following areas as a result of these special classes or activities?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not At All	Some- what	A Great Deal
a. Understanding spoken English ...	4	1	2
b. Speaking English ...	☐	☐	☐
c. Reading English ...	☐	☐	☐
d. Writing English ...	☐	☐	☐

PART 5 — YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT YOURSELF AND YOUR ATTITUDES

62. How do you feel about each of the following statements?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I feel good about myself	4	3	2	1
b. I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. In my life, good luck is more important than hard work for success	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. I feel I am a person of worth, the equal of other people	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. I am able to do things as well as most other people	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Every time I try to get ahead, something or somebody stops me	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. My plans hardly ever work out, so planning only makes me unhappy	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. I feel useless at times	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. At times, I think I am no good at all	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. When I make plans, I am almost certain I can make them work	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. I feel I do not have much to be proud of	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. Chance and luck are very important for what happens in my life	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. I feel emotionally empty most of the time	☐	☐	☐	☐

63. Choose the answer that is best for you.

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	False	Mostly False	More False Than True	More True Than False	Mostly True	True
a. My parents treat me fairly	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. I learn things quickly in English classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. I have good friends who are members of my own sex	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Mathematics is one of my best subjects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. English is one of my best subjects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. I do not like my parents very much	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. I get good marks in English	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. I get a lot of attention from members of the opposite sex	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. I get along well with my parents	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. I have always done well in mathematics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. I make friends easily with girls	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. I make friends easily with boys	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m. My parents are usually unhappy or disappointed with what I do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n. I'm hopeless in English classes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o. I do not get along very well with girls	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
p. I do not get along very well with boys	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
q. I get good marks in mathematics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
r. It is difficult to make friends with members of my own sex	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
s. I do badly in tests of mathematics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
t. I'm not very popular with members of the opposite sex	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
u. My parents understand me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

64. Think about how you see your future. What are the chances that ...

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Very Low 1	Low 2	About Fifty-Fifty 3	High 4	Very High 5
a. You will graduate from high school?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. You will go to college?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. You will have a job that pays well?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. You will be able to own your own home?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. You will have a job that you enjoy doing?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. You will have a happy family life?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. You will stay in good health most of the time?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. You will be able to live wherever you want in the country?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. You will be respected in your community?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. You will have good friends you can count on?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k. Life will turn out better for you than it has for your parents?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l. Your children will have a better life than you had?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

65. When you compare your first year in high school to the year before that, do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Courses were harder in high school	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Teachers were stricter in high school	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. School rules were more strictly enforced in high school	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. It was more difficult to make friends in high school	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. I felt more alone in high school	☐	☐	☐	☐

66. Do you agree with the following statements about why you go to school?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I think the subjects I'm taking are interesting and challenging	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. I get a feeling of satisfaction from doing what I'm supposed to do in class	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. I have nothing better to do	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Education is important for getting a job later on	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. It's a place to meet my friends	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. I play on a team or belong to a club	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. My teachers care about me and expect me to succeed in school	☐	☐	☐	☐

67. Most people think about how other people see them. How do you think other students see you?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not At All	Some- what	Very
a. As popular	☐	☐	☐
b. As athletic	☐	☐	☐
c. As socially active	☐	☐	☐
d. As a good student	☐	☐	☐
e. As important	☐	☐	☐
f. As a trouble-maker	☐	☐	☐
g. As part of the leading crowd	☐	☐	☐
h. As not fitting in any group	☐	☐	☐

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND HOW YOUR FRIENDSHIPS RELATE TO YOUR LIFE.

61. Do you have any close friends now who were also your friends when you were in the eighth grade?
(MARK ONE)

No 2
Yes 1

62. Altogether, how many of your close friends have dropped out of school without graduating?
(Do not include those who have transferred to another school.)

(MARK ONE)

None of them 0
Some of them 1
Most of them 2
All of them 3

70. Among the friends you hang out with, how important is it to ...

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Very important
--	----------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

a. Attend classes regularly?	1	2	3
b. Study?	0	0	0
c. Play sports?	0	0	0
d. Get good grades?	0	0	0
e. Be popular/well-liked by students?	0	0	0
f. Finish high school?	0	0	0
g. Have a steady boyfriend/girlfriend?	0	0	0
h. Be willing to party, get wild?	0	0	0
i. Continue their education past high school?	0	0	0
j. Participate in religious activities?	0	0	0
k. Do community work or volunteer?	0	0	0
l. Have a steady job?	0	0	0

71. Of all the people you know personally, young or adult, think about the person you admire the most. How would you describe this person?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

This person:

a. Is popular	1
b. Is honest	1
c. Dresses well	1
d. Is intelligent	1
e. Understands me	1
f. Drives a nice car	1
g. Has an important job	1
h. Makes a lot of money	1
i. Is good at sports	1
j. Thinks about important things the way I do	1
k. I do not admire anyone — SKIP TO Question 73.	1

72. What is your relationship to that person and what is his or her age?

(MARK ONE)

	15 or younger	16-18 years old	19-25 years old	26 or older
--	------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------------

A friend	1	2	3	4
My mother/father	8	8	8	8
A relative	9	10	11	12
Spouse/boyfriend/ girlfriend	13	14	15	16
Other	17	18	19	20

73. Think about the people with whom you spend most of your time. What age group are they in?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. 13 or younger	1
b. 14-15 years old	1
c. 16-17 years old	1
d. 18-19 years old	1
e. 20-21 years old	1
f. 22-25 years old	1
g. 26 and older	1

QUESTIONS 74-76. LIKE ALL ITEMS IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, ARE VOLUNTARY. WE HOPE YOU WILL ANSWER EVERY QUESTION, BUT YOU MAY SKIP ANY QUESTION YOU DO NOT WISH TO ANSWER. THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND HOW YOUR RELATIONSHIPS RELATE TO YOUR OTHER IN-SCHOOL AND OUT OF SCHOOL EXPERIENCES.

74. Do you think it is important to be married before having sexual intercourse?

(MARK ONE)

Not important	1
Somewhat important	2
Very important	3

75. Would you consider having a child if you weren't married?

(MARK ONE)

No	3
Maybe	2
Yes	1
Don't know	4

76. Do you have any children of your own?

0

(MARK ONE)

No, I don't	3
No, but I am expecting one	2
Yes, I do	1

QUESTIONS 77 THROUGH 80 ARE VOLUNTARY. WE HOPE YOU WILL ANSWER EVERY QUESTION. BUT YOU MAY SKIP ANY QUESTION YOU DO NOT WISH TO ANSWER.

77. How many cigarettes do you usually smoke in a day?

(MARK ONE)

- I don't smoke at all 0
 Less than 1 cigarette a day 1
 1 to 5 cigarettes a day 2
 About 1/2 pack a day 3
 More than 1/2 pack but less than 2 packs a day 4
 Two packs a day or more 5

NEXT WE WANT TO ASK YOU ABOUT DRINKING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES INCLUDING BEER, WINE, WINE COOLERS, AND LIQUOR.

78. On how many occasions (if any) have you had alcoholic beverages to drink?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

- | | 0
Occasions | 1-2
Occasions | 3-19
Occasions | 20-
Occasions |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. In your lifetime | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. During the last 12 months | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. During the last 30 days | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

79. Think back over the LAST TWO WEEKS. How many times have you had five or more drinks in a row? (A "drink" is a glass of wine, a bottle of beer, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink).

(MARK ONE)

- None 0
 Once 1
 Twice 2
 Three to five times 3
 Six to nine times 4
 Ten or more times 5

80A. On how many occasions (if any) have you used marijuana (grass, pot) or hashish (hash, hash oil)?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

- | | 0
Occasions | 1-2
Occasions | 3-19
Occasions | 20+
Occasions |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. In your lifetime | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. During the last 12 months | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. During the last 30 days | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

80B. On how many occasions (if any) have you taken cocaine in any form (including "crack")?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

- | | 0
Occasions | 1-2
Occasions | 3-19
Occasions | 20-
Occasions |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. In your lifetime | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. During the last 12 months | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. During the last 30 days | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

PART 6 — BACKGROUND INFORMATION

NOTE: The following three questions pertain to fundamental freedoms of expression. These questions will provide helpful information for the interpretation of survey results. If you have any reservations about answering these questions, please remember that you may leave them unanswered.

81. What is your religious background?

(MARK ONE)

- Baptist 1
- Methodist 2
- Lutheran 3
- Presbyterian 4
- Episcopal 5
- Pentecostal 6
- Other Protestant 7
- Roman Catholic 8
- Eastern Orthodox 9
- Mormon 10
- Other Christian 11
- Jewish 12
- Moslem 13
- Eastern Religion (Buddhist, Hindu, Tao) 14
- Other Religion 15
- None 16

82. In the past year, about how often have you attended religious services?

(MARK ONE)

- More than once a week 1
- About once a week 2
- Two or three times a month 3
- About once a month 4
- Several times a year or less 5
- Not at all 6

83. Do you think of yourself as a religious person?

(MARK ONE)

- No, not at all 3
- Yes, somewhat 2
- Yes, very 1

PART 7 — MONEY AND WORK

84. Are you currently employed or have you ever been employed?

(MARK ONE)

- Never employed 1 → SKIP TO Question 89
- Not employed now but was employed during this school year 2
- Not employed this school year but was employed last summer 3
- Was employed prior to last summer 4
- Currently employed 5

85. How many hours do/did you usually work a week on your current or most recent job?

(MARK ONE)

- 0-10 hours a week 1
- 11-20 hours a week 2
- 21-30 hours a week 3
- 31-40 hours a week 4
- Over 40 hours a week 5

86. How many of those hours are/were on the weekend (Saturday or Sunday)?

(MARK ONE)

- 0-5 hours on weekends 1
- 6-10 hours on weekends 2
- 11-15 hours on weekends 3
- 16-20 hours on weekends 4
- Over 20 hours on weekends 5

87. What kind of work do/did you do for pay on your current job or most recent job? (Do not include work around your own house. If more than one kind of work, choose the one that paid you the most per hour.)

(MARK ONE)

- Lawn work or odd jobs 1
- Fast food worker 2
- Waiter or waitress 3
- Newspaper route 4
- Babysitter or child care 5
- Camp counselor or life guard 6
- Farm worker 7
- Factory worker 8
- Manual laborer 9
- Store clerk, salesperson 10
- House cleaning 11
- Construction work 12
- Office or clerical worker 13
- Hospital or health worker 14
- Other 15

88. How much do/did you earn per hour on your current or most recent job?

(MARK ONE)

- Less than \$2.50 per hour 1
- \$2.50 to \$3.34 2
- \$3.35 to \$3.99 3
- \$4.00 to \$4.99 4
- \$5.00 to \$5.99 5
- \$6.00 to \$6.99 6
- \$7.00 to \$7.99 7
- \$8.00 to \$8.99 8
- \$10.00 per hour or more 9

PART 8 — YOUR FAMILY

89. Do you have a twin brother or sister?

No 2
Yes 1

90. How many older brothers and sisters do you have (including adopted, step-, or half-)?

	Brothers (MARK ONE)	Sisters (MARK ONE)
None	0	0
One	1	1
Two	2	2
Three	3	3
Four	4	4
Five	5	5
Six or more	6	6

91. How many younger brothers and sisters do you have (including adopted, step- or half-)?

	Brothers (MARK ONE)	Sisters (MARK ONE)
None	0	0
One	1	1
Two	2	2
Three	3	3
Four	4	4
Five	5	5
Six or more	6	6

92. Which of the following people live in the same household with you?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. Father	1
b. Stepfather	1
c. Other adult male (foster father, guardian, other)	1
d. Mother	1
e. Stepmother	1
f. Other adult female (foster mother, guardian, other)	1
g. Husband/wife	1
h. Boyfriend/girlfriend	1
i. My child or children	1

93. How many of the following people live in the same household with you?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	None	1	2	3	4	5	6 or More
a. Brother(s) (including adopted, step- or half-)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Sister(s) (including adopted, step- or half-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Grandparent(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Other relative(s) (under 18)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
e. Other relative(s) (18 or over)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
f. Non-relative(s) (under 18)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
g. Non-relative(s) (18 or over)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

94. How many of your brothers and sisters (including adopted, step-, or half-) left high school before graduating?

(MARK ONE)

I don't have any brothers or sisters 1
 None are in high school yet 2
 None left school 3
 One left school 4
 Two or more left school 5

95. Do you babysit or take care of your own child, younger brothers or sisters or other relatives?

(MARK ONE)

Does not apply 3 → SKIP TO Question 98
 No 2 → SKIP TO Question 98
 Yes 1

96. On the average, how many hours per day are you responsible for their care?

(MARK ONE)

Less than 1 hour 1
 More than 1, less than 3 hours 2
 More than 3, less than 5 hours 3
 More than 5, less than 7 hours 4
 More than 7, less than 10 hours 5
 More than 10 hours a day 6

97. In a typical month, how many school days do you miss because of taking care of your own child or your brothers and sisters?

(MARK ONE)

Does not apply 5
 None 0
 1-2 days 1
 3-6 days 2
 7-9 days 3
 10 days or more 4

98. Is there anyone in your family with whom you don't get along?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. I get along with all the people in my family... 1
 b. Father 1
 c. Other male guardian (stepfather or foster father) 1
 d. Mother 1
 e. Other female guardian (stepmother or foster mother) 1
 f. Brother(s) (including step- or half-) 1
 g. Sister(s) (including step- or half-) 1
 h. Grandparent(s) 1
 i. Other relative(s) (children or adults) 1

99. Lots of things happen in families that may affect young people. In the last 2 years, have any of the following happened to your family?

(MARK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. My family moved to a new home 1
 b. One of my parents got married 1
 c. My parents got divorced or separated 1
 d. My mother lost her job 1
 e. My father lost his job 1
 f. My mother started to work 1
 g. My father started to work 1
 h. I became seriously ill or disabled 1
 i. My father died 1
 j. My mother died 1
 k. A close relative died 1
 l. One of my unmarried sisters got pregnant 1
 m. One of my brothers or sisters dropped out of school 1
 n. My family went on welfare 1
 o. My family went off welfare 1
 p. My family stayed on welfare the past two years 1
 q. A family member became seriously ill or disabled 1
 r. My family was homeless for a period of time 1
 s. None apply 1

100. How often do your parents do the following?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

Never Rarely Sometimes Often

- a. Check on whether you have done your homework 4 3 2 1
- b. Help you with your homework 0 0 0 0
- c. Give you special privileges because of good grades 0 0 0 0
- d. Limit privileges because of poor grades 0 0 0 0
- e. Require you to do work or chores around the home 0 0 0 0
- f. Limit the amount of time you can spend watching TV or playing video games 0 0 0 0
- g. Limit the amount of time you go out with friends on school nights 0 0 0 0

101. In a typical week, what is the latest you can stay out on SCHOOL NIGHTS (Sunday-Thursday)?

(MARK ONE)

- Not Allowed Out 0
- No later than 8:00 1
- No later than 9:00 2
- No later than 10:00 3
- No later than 11:00 4
- No later than 12:00 5
- As late as I want 6

102. How much do your parents try to find out about ...

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

Don't Know Not At All Just a Little Some A Lot

- a. Who your friends are? 1 2 3 4 5
- b. Where you go at night? 0 0 0 0 0
- c. How you spend your money? 0 0 0 0 0
- d. What you do with your free time? 0 0 0 0 0
- e. Where you are most afternoons after school? 0 0 0 0 0

103. Do your parents know the parents of your closest school friends?

(MARK ONE)

- No 1
- Yes, some parents 2
- Yes, many parents 3
- Don't know 4

104. In your family, who makes most of the decisions on each of the following topics?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

- | | My
parent(s)
decide
them-
selves | My parent(s)
decide
after
discussing
it with me | We
decide
together
after
discussing | I decide
after
discussing
it with my
parent(s) | I
decide
by
myself |
|---|--|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| a. How late at night I can stay out | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. |
| b. Which friends I can spend time with | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. What classes I take in school | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Whether I have a job | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. At what age I can leave school | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. How I spend my money | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| g. Whether I can date | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| h. Whether I should go out for a school sport | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| i. Whether I should be in other school activities | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| j. Whether I should go to college | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

105. In the first half of this school year, how often have you discussed the following with either or both of your parents or guardians ...

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Never	Sometimes	Often
a. Selecting courses or programs at school?	1.	2.	3.
b. School activities or events of particular interest to you?	☐	☐	☐
c. Things you've studied in class?	☐	☐	☐
d. Your grades?	☐	☐	☐
e. Transferring to another school?	☐	☐	☐
f. Plans and preparation for the ACT or SAT tests?	☐	☐	☐
g. Going to college?	☐	☐	☐

106. In the first half of the school year, how often did either of your parents or guardians do any of the following?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Never	Once or Twice	More than Twice	I don't Know
a. Attend a school meeting	☐	☒	☒	☒
b. Phone or speak to your teacher or counselor	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Attend a school event in which you participated	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Act as a volunteer at your school	☐	☐	☐	☐

107. In the first half of the school year, how often did any of the following things happen to you?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	Never	Once or Twice	More than Twice
a. My parents received a warning about my attendance	☐	☒	☒
b. My parents received a warning about my grades	☐	☐	☐
c. My parents received a warning about my behavior	☐	☐	☐

108. How true are the following statements for you and your parent(s)?

(MARK ONE ON EACH LINE)

	False	Mostly False	More False Than True	More True Than False	Mostly True	True
a. My parent(s) trust me to do what they expect without checking up on me	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. I often do not know WHY I am supposed to do what my parent(s) tell me to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. I often count on my parent(s) to solve many of my problems for me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. I think that I will be a source of pride to my parent(s) in the future	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. My parents get along well with each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. When I grow up and have a family, it will be similar to my own	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

109. Did you run away from home for a week or more at any time during the last 2 years?

No 2

Yes 1

110. Please fill in today's date:

MONTH		DAY						YEAR
☐ Jan	☐ July	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05	☐ 06	☐ 1989 ☐ 1990 ☐ 1991
☐ Feb	☐ Aug	☐ 07	☐ 08	☐ 09	☐ 10	☐ 11	☐ 12	
☐ Mar	☐ Sep	☐ 13	☐ 14	☐ 15	☐ 16	☐ 17	☐ 18	
☐ Apr	☐ Oct	☐ 19	☐ 20	☐ 21	☐ 22	☐ 23	☐ 24	
☐ May	☐ Nov	☐ 25	☐ 26	☐ 27	☐ 28	☐ 29	☐ 30	
☐ June	☐ Dec	☐ 31	☐ 32	☐ 33	☐ 34	☐ 35	☐ 36	

APPENDIX G

NELS CATEGORIES

Figure 1-3: NELS:88 base year key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

I. Social capital/Parent involvement/ Community involvement	II. Equity/Access/Choice	III. School effectiveness
ISSUES Active parental involvement, school policies and environment related to parental involvement, parental choice in school, parental networks and interactions	ISSUES Academic programs, school climate, admissions practices, relationship between elementary school experiences and secondary education access, SES and ethnicity, teaching quality and practices, A.P., honors, and remedial classes, student choices	ISSUES Influence on outcomes of size of school; student body ethnicity and SES level; school type and affiliation; school climate, and staff and curricular attributes
STUDENT 34 Education level of parents 37 Parent participation at school	STUDENT 20 Language use 31 A-D Race, ethnicity 57-59 School climate 66 Advanced courses 68 Gifted/talented programs	STUDENT Cognitive test scores 81 Self-reported grades
SCHOOL 37 Test results provided to parents 46 Available extracurricular activities 47 School climate and policy enforcement	SCHOOL 4 Type 5 Major program orientation 13 Ethnicity 14 Percentage in single-parent homes 15 Percentage LEP (limited English) 16 Remedial and special programs 24 Assignment of students to the school 25-28 Admission procedures 33 Percentage receiving financial aid 34 Family ability to pay for tuition 35 Eighth-grade scores used for high school admission 39 Minimum academic instruction required 40 Gifted/talented program	SCHOOL 2 School enrollment 6 Length of school year 10 Nominated tenth grade 11 Average daily attendance 12 Drop-out, migration rate 17 Number of full-time teachers 18 School structure for instruction 19 Teacher base salary 21 Teacher degree level 38 Retention reasons 45 Bilingual classes 47 School climate 48 School policies 49 Discipline and other problems

Figure 1-3 (cont.): NELS:88 base year key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

I Social capital/Parent involvement/ Community involvement	II. Equity/Access/Choice	III. School effectiveness
PARENT	PARENT	PARENT
30 Parent education level	10 Race/ethnicity	34,80 SES level
45 Parent request to retain child in school	34,80 SES level	57 School contact with parent
54,56 Parent involvement in course selections	38 Child's attendance at pre-school	74 Parent opinion of school's effectiveness
57 School contact with parent about child	48 Child's participation in special programs	75 Parent satisfaction with school curriculum
58 Parent contact with school about child	52 Child in gifted/talented program	76 Parent opinion of child's schooling future
59 Parent participation in school organizations	70 Computer in home	
61 Outside community activities with child	82 Money for educational expenses	
62 Parent knowledge of child's friends and their parents	84 Money earmarked for student's PSE	
63 Non-school activities of child	22 Language spoken at home	
66 Parent time talking with child about school		
67 Talk with child about high school plans		
68 Talk with child about PSE plans		
69 Parent time helping child with homework		
85 Parent involvement with financial aid and scholarships		
TEACHER	TEACHER	TEACHER
III-26 Problems with school policies as related to student, community, and parent: drugs, weapons, assault, robbery, vandalism, etc	I-11 Teacher perception of student as a language minority student	I,2-9 Teacher rating of student's academic performance and participation in class
III-30 Teacher time spent communicating with parents	I-12 Teacher perception of student as LEP	II-3 Class size
III-31 How many students' parents does teacher talk to	II-16 Teaching practices in the classroom	II-14 Teacher adequacy
	II-17, Teaching methods in the classroom for 29 specific subjects	III-8 Highest academic degree held
	III-4 Years of teaching experience	III-10 Major and minor fields of highest degree
	III-6 Type of teaching certificate	III-18 Employment status in the school system
	III-19 Amount of in-service education	III-28 Number of days absent from teaching
	III-21 Instruct in gifted/talented program	III-29 Number of supervisory visitations
	III-27 Holding a second job	III-33 Use of computers for student instruction
	III-30 Time spent outside school hours on activities such as planning classes, correcting papers, coordinating curriculum, etc.	
	III-32 Percentage of students using computer for instructional material	

Figure 1-4: NELS:88 first follow-up key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

I. Equity/Access/Choice	II. Cognitive growth	III. Tracking dynamics and correlates	IV. Process of dropping out
ISSUES Academic programs, school climate, admissions practices, SES and ethnicity, equal teaching quality and practices, A.P. and honors courses, remedial classes, student choices	ISSUES Tracking, coursetaking, involvement, language proficiency, teacher quality, school climate, textbooks, parental involvement, family structure	ISSUES Coursetaking, grouping, decision making, cognitive growth, differential assignment, dropping out, achievement, attitudes, social relations, college and employment opportunities	ISSUES School achievement, attendance, behavior, attitudes toward school, social relations, family structure and characteristics
STUDENT	STUDENT	STUDENT	STUDENT
19 Attend start/pass each term	13 Days absent	20 HS program	13 Days absent
20 HS program	18A Certainty will graduate	49 Educational expectations	18A Certainty will graduate
	19 Attend start/pass each term	53 Occupational expectations	19 Attend start/pass each term
	20 HS program		20 HS program
	46 Important things in life		46 Important things in life
	49 Educational expectations		49 Educational expectations
	53 Occupational expectations		53 Occupational expectations
	92-93 Who else lives in house		76 Have any children of own
	97 Absences because babysit		92-93 Who else lives in house
	99 Major family events		97 Absences because babysit
			99 Major family events
SCHOOL	SCHOOL	SCHOOL	SCHOOL
11 HS program enrollment	1-4 School size, type	11 HS program enrollment	24-25 Days to be truant, D-out
24-25 Days to be truant, D-out	11 HS program enrollment	29 % Students LM or LEP	29 % Students LM or LEP
29 % Students LM or LEP	30 % Receive special services	30 % Receive special services	30 % Receive special services
35 # Teachers	35 # Teachers	54 Admission practices	35 # Teachers
43 Ethnicity of teachers	43 Ethnicity of teachers	61 Use homogenous grouping	45 Teachers assigned ESL
45-46 Teachers assigned ESL; certified	45-46 Teachers assigned ESL; certified	62 Who affects stud. placement	61 Use homogenous grouping
54 Admission practices	54 Admission practices	75 Math/sci. courses offered	75 Math/sci. courses offered
61 Use homogenous grouping	61 Use homogenous grouping		82 Have D-out prevent. program
62 Who affects stud. placement	62 Who affects stud. placement		84 Why studs. in D-out program
75 Math/sci. courses offered	70 Coursework requirements		
76 # AP courses offered	75 Math/sci. courses offered		
82 Have D-out prevent. program	76 # AP courses offered		
84 Why studs. in D-out program	82 Have D-out prevent. program		
	84 Why studs. in D-out program		

Figure 1-4 (cont.): NELS:88 first follow-up key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

I. Equity/Access/Choice	II. Cognitive growth	III. Tracking dynamics and correlates	IV. Process of dropping out
TEACHER	TEACHER	TEACHER	TEACHER
II-16 Division of class time	I-11 Language minority (LM)	I-3 Track of class	I-22 Student at risk of D-out
III-2 Teacher ethnicity	I-12 Limited-English prof. (LEP)	I-4 Level of students in class	IV-8 Who helps teacher
	II-3 Track of class	I-5 Class enrollment	
	II-4 Level of students in class	II-20 M If Algebra I, topics	
	II-5 Class enrollment	II-22 M If Algebra II, topics	
	II-16 Division of class time	II-24 M If Geometry, topics	
	II-20 M If Algebra I, topics	II-21 S If Biology, topics	
	II-22 M If Algebra II, topics	II-23 S If Chemistry, topics	
	II-24 M If Geometry, topics	II-20 H If U.S. Hist., topics	
	II-21 S If Biology, topics	II-21 H If World Hist., topics	
	II-23 S If Chemistry, topics	II-20 E If English, topics	
	II-20 H If U.S. Hist., topics	III-4 Years teaching	
	II-21 H If World Hist., topics		
	II-20 E If English, topics		
	III-1 Teacher gender		
	III-2 Teacher ethnicity		
	III-4 Years teaching		
	III-6 Employment status		
	III-7,8 Type certification		
	III-9 Highest degree held		
	IV-8 Who helps teacher		

Figure 1-4 (cont.): NELS:88 first follow-up key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

I. Equity/Access/Choice		II. Cognitive growth		III. Tracking dynamics and correlates		IV. Process of dropping out	
DROPOUT		DROPOUT		DROPOUT		DROPOUT	
28	Who tried to prevent D-out	6	HS program	16	HS program	6	Why left school
36	Important things in life	19	Why chose classes	19	Why chose classes	7	When last attended school
38-39	Educ./occ. expectations	20	Grades received	20	Grades received	8-9	What grade in then; pass
41	Home language not English	22	Days absent	41	Home language not English	10	Name and address last school
44	English ability	36	Important things in life	44	English ability	11	Plans to get HS diploma
		38	Educational expectations			16	HS program
		41	Home language not English			19	Why chose classes
		44	English ability			20	Grades received
		74	Hours work			22	Days absent
		77	Wage			27	Major student events
		86	Who else lives in house			28	Who tried to prevent D-out
		92	Absences because babysit			29	School response to D-out
						30	Parent response to D-out
						36	Important things in life
						38-39	Educ./occ. expectations
						41	Home language not English
						44	English ability
						52	# Friends drop out
						63	Have children of own
						74	Hours worked
						76-77	Job type; wage
						86	Who else lives in house
						92	Absences because babysit

Figure 1-4 (cont.): NELS:88 first follow-up key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

V. Transition patterns from 8th to 10th grade	VI. School effectiveness	VII. Parental and community involvement
ISSUES Movement across private/public school sectors, family migration, track placement, differences in experience of school environment, school size, moral climate and organizational ethos of school	ISSUES School size, SES level, school sector, school climate, principal and teacher autonomy, staff job satisfaction, textbooks, curricular offerings, teacher quality, student performance and growth, student persistence and school-leaving	ISSUES Active parental involvement, school policies and attitudes related to parental involvement, parental choice in school, parental networks and interactions, student performance, remain in school
STUDENT 19 Attend start/pass each term 20 HS program	STUDENT 18A Certainty will graduate 19 Attend start/pass each term 39 Self-reported grades 49 Educational expectations	STUDENT 13 Days absent 99 Major family events
SCHOOL 54 Admission practices	SCHOOL 1-4 School size, type 11 HS program enrollment 24-25 Days to be truant, D-out 29 % Students LM or LEP 30 % Receive special services 35 # Teachers 43 Ethnicity of teachers 45-46 Teachers assigned ESL; certified 54 Admission practices 61 Use homogenous grouping 62 Who affects stud. placement 70 Coursework requirements 75 Math/sci. courses offered 76 # AP courses offered 82 Have D-out prevent. program 84 Why stud. in D-out program	SCHOOL 84 Why studs. in D-out program

Figure 1-4 (cont.): NELS:88 first follow-up key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

V. Transition patterns
from 8th to 10th grade

TEACHER

DROPOUT

- 10 Last school
- 11 Plans for HS diploma

VI. School effectiveness

TEACHER

- II-20 M If Algebra I, topics
- II-22 M If Algebra II, topics
- II-24 M If Geometry, topics
- II-21 S If Biology, topics
- II-23 S If Chemistry, topics
- II-20 H If U.S. Hist., topics
- II-21 H If World Hist., topics
- II-20 E If English, topics
- III-6 Employment status
- III-7,8 Type certification
- III-9 Highest degree held
- IV-8 Who helps teacher

DROPOUT

- 19 Why choose classes
- 29 School response to D-out
- 38 Educational expectations
- 44 English language proficiency

VII. Parental and community
involvement

TEACHER

DROPOUT

- 30 Parent response to D-out
- 41 Home language not English
- 88 Who else lives in house

Figure 1-6: Documentation available for use with NELS:88 base year data files

Figure 1-4 (cont.): NELS:88 first follow-up key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

V. Transition patterns from 8th to 10th grade	VI. School effectiveness	VII. Parental and community involvement
ISSUES Movement across private/public school sectors, family migration, track placement, differences in experience of school environment, school size, moral climate and organizational ethos of school	ISSUES School size, SES level, school sector, school climate, principal and teacher autonomy, staff job satisfaction, textbooks, curricular offerings, teacher quality, student performance and growth, student persistence and school-leaving	ISSUES Active parental involvement, school policies and attitudes related to parental involvement, parental choice in school, parental networks and interactions, student performance, remain in school
STUDENT 19 Attend start/pass each term 20 HS program	STUDENT 18A Certainty will graduate 19 Attend start/pass each term 39 Self-reported grades 49 Educational expectations	STUDENT 13 Days absent 99 Major family events
SCHOOL 54 Admission practices	SCHOOL 1-4 School size, type 11 HS program enrollment 24-25 Days to be truant, D-out 29 % Students LM or LEP 30 % Receive special services 35 # Teachers 43 Ethnicity of teachers 45-46 Teachers assigned ESL; certified 54 Admission practices 61 Use homogenous grouping 62 Who affects stud. placement 70 Coursework requirements 75 Math/sci. courses offered 76 # AP courses offered 82 Have D-out prevent. program 84 Why stud. in D-out program	SCHOOL 84 Why studs. in D-out program

Figure 1-4 (cont.): NELS:88 first follow-up key questionnaire items related to educational policy in education research

V. Transition patterns
from 8th to 10th grade

TEACHER

DROPOUT

- 10 Last school
- 11 Plans for HS diploma

VI. School effectiveness

TEACHER

- II-20 M If Algebra I, topics
- II-22 M If Algebra II, topics
- II-24 M If Geometry, topics
- II-21 S If Biology, topics
- II-23 S If Chemistry, topics
- II-20 H If U.S. Hist., topics
- II-21 H If World Hist., topics
- II-20 E If English, topics
- III-6 Employment status
- III-7,8 Type certification
- III-9 Highest degree held
- IV-8 Who helps teacher

DROPOUT

- 19 Why choose classes
- 29 School response to D-out
- 38 Educational expectations
- 44 English language proficiency

VII. Parental and community
involvement

TEACHER

DROPOUT

- 30 Parent response to D-out
- 41 Home language not English
- 86 Who else lives in house

Figure 2-1: Content areas in NELS:88 base year questionnaires

Content category	Student	Parent	Teacher	School
Constitutional factors	Student sex, birthdate	Responding parent's sex, birthdate	Teacher sex, birthdate	
Race/ethnicity	Self-reported race/ethnicity	Parent's race/ethnicity	Teacher's race/ethnicity	School (student/faculty) race/ethnic composition
Home characteristics	Number of brothers and sisters	Number of brothers and sisters marital status of parents religion practiced at home, language spoken at home	Student health and language use.	Percent of students in single-parent homes, percent with limited-English proficiency
Socioeconomic status	Parental occupation and education, items in home	Parent occupation, income, education		
Work status	Jobs or chores done for pay	Parental employment status	Teacher employment status	
Opinions, attitudes, and values	Self-concept, locus of control		Teacher impressions of sampled student	
School characteristics				School type, major program orientation, days in school year, class periods in days
School atmosphere	Self-reported attitude toward alcoholism, illegal drugs, and other problems in school; school discipline in classes	Parent's attitudes toward atmosphere, standards, and policies	Teacher perceptions of drug use, verbal and physical abuse of teachers, and other problems in school	Teacher morale, structure and competitiveness of grades, physical conflicts of students, robbery, thefts, and verbal abuse
School work	Self-reported tardiness, absenteeism, homework, attitudes towards mathematics, social studies, and science	Contact from school about student's performance and curriculum, help given by parent to child with homework, use of computer in the home	Homework assigned, instructional methods and materials used, student tardiness and absenteeism, content areas covered	Student tardiness, absenteeism, degree to which students are expected to do homework

Figure 2-1 (cont.): Content areas in NELS:88 base year questionnaires

Content category	Student	Parent	Teacher	School
School performance	Self-reported grades, performance on NELS:88 cognitive test battery	Parental expectations for child's grades	Teacher impression of student achievement	
Guidance	Student-reported availability of counseling (for education plans, jobs, careers, drug abuse, etc.) given by school employee, adult relative, or friend	Parent talks at home with child about school, high school plans, or homework		Availability of guidance counseling for students in school
Special programs	Participation in special programs (e.g., gifted and talented, special education, bilingual, or ESL)	Physical and mental limitations of students, special services rendered (e.g., for gifted and talented student)	Teacher involvement and satisfaction with gifted and talented programs	Special services (e.g., gifted and talented programs)
After school supervision	Parental supervision	Parental supervision, after-school childcare arrangements		
Involvement with community	Family life, cultural experience, participation in neighborhood programs	Family life, activities in community (e.g., borrows books from library, attends concerts, museums, participates in community-based groups)		
After school activities	Extra-curricular activities, outside school classes and clubs	Student enrollment in outside school clubs		
Life goals, educational and occupational	Student and parent expectations of how far in school student will advance, student's desired occupation	Parental expectations of educational attainment of child		
Financial assistance		Proposed financial aid for future education		Percent of students receiving aid in school

	Teacher sex, birthdate			
	Teacher race/ethnicity			School (student/faculty) race/ethnic composition
	Others in household, number of brothers and sisters, own child, religion, language use	Others in household, number of brothers and sisters, own child, religion, language use	Student language use and health	Percent of students in single-parent homes, percent with percent with limited English English proficiency
nds	Family relationships and events, parental school involvement, attributes of friends	Family relationships and events, parental school involvement, attributes of friends	Parental school involvement	Parental school involvement
	Work status, type, hours, and pay	Work status, type, hours, and pay	Teacher work status, outside work	Teacher pay, degrees, work status, and certification
ides,	Self-concept, locus of control	Self-concept, locus of control	Teacher impressions of student	
				School type, structure, grades, locale, courses and programs, departments, periods, days
here	School climate, problems in school, level of discipline	School climate, problems in school, level of discipline	School climate, problems in decision-making processes, satisfaction with teaching	Problems in school, disciplinary actions taken, teacher morale, grading
	Program, coursework, homework, teacher practices, self-reported tardiness, absenteeism, suspension, and arrests	Program, coursework, homework, teacher practices, self-reported tardiness, absenteeism, suspension, and arrests	Instructional methods and materials, content areas covered, track of class, homework, tardiness, absenteeism	Track composition, student tardiness and absenteeism

Figure 2-2 (cont.): Content areas in NELS:88 first follow-up questionnaires

Content category	Student	Dropout	Teacher	School
School performance	Self-reported grades, NELS cognitive test scores	Self-reported grades, NELS cognitive test scores	Student achievement	
Special programs	Participation in special programs	Participation in special programs		Programs offered, level of participation
After school activities	Participation in school-related and non-school-related activities	Participation in school-related and non-school-related activities, activities since left		
Life goals, educational and occupational	Educational and occupational expectations and preparation, others' expectations, important things in life	Educational and occupational expectations and preparation, others' expectations, important things in life, why left school		

Figure 3-1: Longitudinal sample design of NELS:88

All BY Dropouts were added to the BYi sample and were automatically considered eligible for F1

Figure 4-1: First follow-up data collection phase diagram

PHASE 1 Tracing

Subsampling of Students -- 8/89

Selection of 21,000 students in 1,068 schools

PHASE 2 School Cooperation

Figure 4-1 (cont.): First follow-up data collection phase diagram

PHASE 3 Data Collection

1990-1991

- 1. Student Questionnaire (in-person)
- 2. Dropout Questionnaire (in-person)
- 3. Modified Student Questionnaire (telephone)
- 4. Modified Dropout Questionnaire (telephone)
- 5. Cognitive Test Battery (in-person)

*Cognitive test administration attempted at all in-person survey sessions

Figure 4-1 (cont.): First follow-up data collection phase diagram

MSQ Modified Student Questionnaire (telephone)
 ADQ Abbreviated Student Questionnaire (telephone or in person)
 ADU Abbreviated Dropout Questionnaire (telephone or in person)

Figure 7-1: Guide to data file linkage for NELS:88 base year and first follow-up

Longitudinal and Household Studies Branch (LHSB) NELS:88 Publications

RELEASED ANALYSIS REPORTS.

Hafner, A.; Ingels, S.J.; Schneider, B.; and Stevenson, D.L. *A Profile of the American Eighth Grader*, June 1990; NCES 90-458.

Hoachlander, E.G. *A Profile of Schools Attended by Eighth Graders in 1988*, September 1991; NCES 91-129.

Bradby, D. *Language Characteristics and Academic Achievement: A Look at Asian and Hispanic Eighth Graders in NELS:88*, February 1992.

RELEASED E.D. TABULATIONS.

Rasinski, K.A.; and West, J. *NELS:88: Eighth Graders' Reports of Courses Taken During the 1988 Academic Year by Selected Student Characteristics*, July 1990; NCES 90-459.

Rock, D.A.; Pollack, J.M.; and Hafner, A. *The Tested Achievement of the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 Eighth Grade Class*, April 1991; NCES 91-460.

RELEASED USER'S MANUALS/TECHNICAL REPORTS.

Ingels, S.J.; Abraham, S.; Rasinski, K.A.; Karr, R.; Spencer, B.D.; Frankel, M.R.; Owings, J.A. *NELS:88 Base Year Data File User's Manuals:*

PARENT COMPONENT: March 1990; NCES 90-466

SCHOOL COMPONENT: March 1990; NCES 90-482

TEACHER COMPONENT: March 1990; NCES 90-484

STUDENT COMPONENT: March 1990; NCES 90-464*

Spencer, B.D.; Frankel, M.R.; Ingels, S.J.; Rasinski, K.A.; and Tourangeau, R. *NELS:88 Base Year Sample Design Report*, August 1990; NCES 90-463.

Rock, D.A.; and Pollack, J.M. *Psychometric Report for the NELS:88 Base Year Test Battery*, April 1991, NCES 91-468.

Kaufman, P.; Rasinski, K.A.; Lee, R.; and West, J. *Quality of Responses of Eighth-Grade Students to the NELS:88 Base Year Questionnaire*, September 1991; NCES 91-487.

* contains a codebook with frequency distributions for the full (24,599) 1988 participating cross-sectional sample.

Ingels, S.J.; Rasinski, K.A.; Frankel, M.R.; Spencer, B.D.; and Buckley, P.B. *NELS:88 Base Year Final Technical Report*, 1990; Chicago: NORC.

FORTHCOMING LHSB NELS:88 REPORTS/E.D. TABULATIONS/USER'S MANUALS.

Ingels, S.J.; Scott, L.A.; Lindmark, J.T.; Frankel, M.R.; Myers, S.L.; and Wu, S.
NELS:88 First Follow-Up Data File User's Manuals:

STUDENT COMPONENT	February 1992; NCES 92-030
SCHOOL COMPONENT	March 1992
DROPOUT COMPONENT	April 1992
TEACHER COMPONENT	May 1992

A Profile of American Eighth Grade Math and Science Instruction: NELS:88 Teachers, Schools, and Students (Estimated Release April 1992).

NELS:88 Base Year Parent Descriptive Report (Estimated Release April 1992).

Portrait of the At-Risk Eighth Grader (Estimated Release May 1992).

NELS:88 Transition Patterns Experienced by Students as They Move from Eighth Grade to Tenth Grade (Estimated Release December 1992).

NELS:88 First Follow-Up Student Profile: descriptive summary of the American tenth-grader. (Estimated Release April 1992).

NELS:88 First Follow-Up Final Technical Report (includes base year ineligible survey report) (June 1992).

Comparison of NELS:88 1990 Sophomores and HS&B 1980 Sophomores. (Estimated Release December 1992).

NELS:88 First Follow-Up Dropout Descriptive Report (Estimated Release September 1992).

<u>Question Number</u>				<u>Question Wording</u>
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
7a	12a	59a	--	In school students get along well with teachers
7b	12b	59b	--	In school there is real school spirit
7c	12c	59c	--	In school the rules for behavior are strict
7d	12d	59d	--	In school discipline is fair
7e	12e	--	--	In school there are interracial friendships
7f	12f	59e	--	In school other students often disrupt class
7g	12g	59f	--	In school the teaching is good
7h	12h	59g	--	In school teachers are interested in students
7i	12i	59h	--	In school when I work hard teachers praise me
7j	12j	59i	--	In school I often feel put down by teachers
7k	12k	--	--	In school I often feel put down by students
7l	12l	59j	--	In school most of my teachers listen to me
7m	12m	59k	66f*	In school I don't feel safe
7n	12n	59l	--	In school disruptions get in the way of my learning
7o	12o	59m	--	In school misbehaving students often get away with it
9a	--	57a	--	Times at school I had something stolen from me
9b	--	57b	--	Times at school someone offered to sell me drugs
9c	--	57c	--	Times at school someone threatened to hurt me
9d	--	55f	--	Times at school I got into a physical fight
10a	15a	--	--	Times I was late for school
10b	15b	--	--	Times I cut or skipped classes
10c	15c	--	--	Times I got into trouble for not following school rules
10d	15d	--	--	Times I was put on in-school suspension
10e	15e	--	--	Times I was suspended or put on probation from school
10f	15f	--	--	Times I was transferred for disciplinary reasons
10g	15g	--	--	Times I was arrested
11a	13a	--	--	Feel it is OK to work hard for good grades
11b	13b	--	--	Feel it is OK to ask challenging questions
11c	13c	--	--	Feel it is OK to solve problems using new ideas
11d	13d	--	--	Feel it is OK to help others with their homework
12a	14a	--	--	Feel it is OK to be late for school
12b	14b	--	--	Feel it is OK to cut a couple of classes
12c	14c	--	--	Feel it is OK to skip school for a whole day
12d	14d	--	--	Feel it is OK to cheat on tests
12e	14e	--	--	Feel it is OK to copy someone else's homework
12f	14f	--	--	Feel it is OK to get into physical fights
12g	14g	--	--	Feel it is OK to belong to gangs
12h	14h	--	--	Feel it is OK to make racist remarks
12i	14i	--	--	Feel it is OK to make sexist remarks
12j	14j	--	--	Feel it is OK to steal from school, a student, or a teacher
12k	14k	--	--	Feel it is OK to destroy or damage school property
12l	14l	--	--	Feel it is OK to smoke on school grounds

* Question is not identical across survey instruments, but may be made comparable by collapsing response categories.

<u>Question Number</u>				<u>Question Wording</u>
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
12m	14m	--	--	Feel it is OK to drink alcohol during the school day
12n	14n	--	--	Feel it is OK to use illegal drugs during the school day
12o	14o	--	--	Feel it is OK to bring weapons to school
12p	14p	--	--	Feel it is OK to abuse teachers physically
12q	14q	--	--	Feel it is OK to talk back to teachers
12r	14r	--	--	Feel it is OK to disobey school rules
13	22	--	--	Days absent last semester
14	23	--	--	Main reason for my last absence
15a	24a	--	--	On my last absence the school did not do anything
15b	24b	--	--	On my last absence someone from school called my home
15c	24c	--	--	On my last absence someone from school visited my home
15d	24d	--	--	On my last absence the school sent a letter to my home
15e	24e	--	--	On my last absence the school made me see a counselor
16a	25a	--	--	When I returned my teachers helped me catch up
16b	25b	--	--	When I returned other students helped me catch up
16c	25c	--	--	When I returned someone else helped me
16d	25d	--	--	When I returned I didn't need to catch up
16e	25e	--	--	When I returned a teacher was mad at me or put me down
16f	25f	--	--	When I returned an adult in the school asked where I'd been
16g	25g	--	--	When I returned I fell behind
18A	--	46	3*	How sure I am that I will graduate from high school
18B	--	47	--	How sure I am that I will go on for further education after HS
20	16	49	1	High school program
26a	18a	--	--	How often challenged to use mind in math
26b	18b	--	--	How often challenged to use mind in English
26c	18c	--	--	How often challenged to use mind in history
26d	18d	--	--	How often challenged to use mind in science
34a	--	--	13a	Ever been in remedial English
34b	--	--	13b	Ever been in remedial mathematics
34c	--	--	13e	Ever been in a bilingual or bicultural program
34f	--	--	13h	Ever been in a program for the emotionally handicapped
34g	--	--	13i	Ever been in a program for the physically handicapped
36b	--	79a	--	Time spent each week on math homework
36c	--	79b	--	Time spent each week on science homework
36d	--	79c	--	Time spent each week on English homework
36e	--	79d	--	Time spent each week on social studies homework
36f	--	79e	--	Time spent on homework each week for all other subjects
39	--	81*	--	Grades in specific subject areas
40a	--	78a	16a	How often come to class without pencil or paper
40b	--	78b	16b	How often come to class without books
40c	--	78c	16c	How often come to class without homework done

* Question is not identical across survey instruments, but may be made comparable by collapsing response categories

Question Number				Question Wording
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
41Aa-g	--	82b,c*	34a*	Participation in sports
41Ah	--	82d*	34b*	Participation in cheerleading
41Ba	--	82e,f*	34d,e*	Participation in band, orchestra, chorus, or other music group
41Bc	--	82r*	--	Participation in student government
41Bd	--	82o*	--	Participation in academic honor society
41Be	--	82p,q*	--	Participation in school yearbook or newspaper
41Bg	--	82h-m*	34g*	Participation in academic clubs
41Bh	--	--	34f*	Participation in hobby clubs
41Bi	--	82u*	34h*	Participation in vocational education or professional clubs
43	--	80	--	Additional reading each week
44a	34a	--	47a	How often visit with friends at a local hangout
44b	34b	--	--	How often use personal computers
44c	34c	--	--	How often work on hobbies, arts, or crafts
44d	34d	--	47b	How often read for pleasure
44e	34e	--	--	How often go to park, gym, beach, or pool
44f	34f	--	--	How often play ball or other sports with friends
44g	34g	--	--	How often attend youth groups or recreational programs
44h	34h	--	--	How often volunteer or perform community service
44i	34i	--	47d	How often drive or ride around
44j	34j	--	47e	How often talk with friends on the telephone
44k	34k	--	--	How often talk or do things with mother or father
44l	34l	--	--	How often talk or do things with other adults
44m	34m	--	--	How often take classes: music, art, language, dance
44n	34n	--	--	How often take sports lessons: Karate, tennis, etc.
44o	34p	--	--	How often attend religious activities
45A	35A	42A	48	Hours watch TV on weekdays
45B	35B	42B	--	Hours watch TV on weekends
46a	36a	--	61a	Important in my life to be successful in my line of work
46b	36b	--	61b	Important in my life to find the right person to marry
46c	36c	--	61c	Important in my life to have lots of money
46d	36d	--	61d	Important in my life to have strong friendships
46e	36e	--	61e	Important in my life to be able to find steady work
46f	36f	--	--	Important in my life to help others in my community
46g	36g	--	61g	Important in my life to give my children better opportunities
46h	36h	--	61h	Important in my life to live close to my parents
46i	36i	--	61i	Important in my life to get away from this area
46j	36j	--	61j	Important in my life to work to correct inequalities
46k	36k	--	61k	Important in my life to have children
46l	36l	--	61l	Important in my life to have leisure time to enjoy interests
46m	36m	--	--	Important in my life to get away from my parents
47a	--	--	50a	What father thinks I should do after high school

* Question is not identical across survey instruments, but may be made comparable by collapsing response categories

*BY:FI:Student Component
Data File User's Manual*

<u>Question Number</u>				<u>Question Wording</u>
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
47b	--	--	50b	What mother thinks I should do after high school
47e	--	--	50c	What counselor thinks I should do after high school
47f	--	--	50d	What teacher thinks I should do after high school
48A	37A	48A	--	How far in school father wants me to go
48B	37B	48B	70	How far in school mother wants me to go
49	38	45	69	How far in school I think I will get
51	--	--	112	Plan to go to college when graduate; how soon
53	39	52	68	Job category expect or plan to be in at age 30
54	41	21	--	Any language other than English spoken at home
55 ¹	42	18,22	11,15 ²	What other language is spoken in home
55A	42A	--	--	Whether it is my native language
55Ba	42Ba	--	--	How well understand native language
55Bb	42Bb	--	--	How well speak native language
55Bc	42Bc	--	--	How well read native language
55Bd	42Bd	--	--	How well write native language
57a	44a	27a	19a ²	How well understand English
57b	44b	27b	19b	How well speak English
57c	44c	27c	19c	How well read English
57d	44d	27d	19d	How well write English
58	45	--	--	Received special help in reading, writing, or speaking English
62a	46a	44a	62a	I feel good about myself
62b	46b	44b	--	I don't have enough control over the direction of my life
62c	46c	44c	62b	In my life, good luck is more important than hard work
62d	46d	44d	62c	I feel I am a person of worth, the equal of other people
62e	46e	44e	62d	I am able to do things as well as most other people
62f	46f	44f	62e	When I try to get ahead, somebody or something stops me
62g	46g	44g	62f	My plans hardly ever work out; planning makes me unhappy
62h	46h	44h	62h	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself
62i	46i	44i	--	I feel useless at times
62j	46j	44j	62j	At times I think I am no good at all
62k	46k	44k	62k	I am almost certain I can make my plans work
62l	46l	44l	62l	I feel I do not have much to be proud of
62m	46m	44m	--	Chance and luck are very important in my life
62n	46n	--	--	I feel emotionally empty most of the time
63a	47a	--	--	My parents treat me fairly
63b	47b	--	--	I learn things quickly in English classes
63c	47c	--	--	I have good friends who are members of my own sex

¹ Questions 55 and 55A should be combined in order to achieve comparability with language items in HS&B and NELS:88 base year. If the answer to 55A is "Yes", then question 55 would be comparable to HS&B items 11 and 15, and NELS:88 base year Q. 18 and 22. If the answer to Q.55A is "No", then Q.55 can only be compared to HS&B Q.15 and NELS:88 base year Q.22.

² Questions 11, 15, and 19 are not from the main HS&B Sophomore Questionnaire, but from the Student Identification Pages.

*BY-F1:Student Component
Data File User's Manual*

<u>Question Number</u>				<u>Question Wording</u>
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
63d	47d	--	--	Mathematics is one of my best subjects
63e	47e	--	--	English is one of my best subjects
63f	47f	--	--	I do not like my parents very much
63g	47g	--	--	I get good marks in English
63h	47h	--	--	I get a lot of attention from members of the opposite sex
63i	47i	--	--	I get along well with my parents
63j	47j	--	--	I have always done well in mathematics
63k	47k	--	--	I make friends easily with girls
63l	47l	--	--	I make friends easily with boys
63m	47m	--	--	My parents are unhappy or disappointed with what I do
63n	47n	--	--	I'm hopeless in English classes
63o	47o	--	--	I do not get along very well with girls
63p	47p	--	--	I do not get along very well with boys
63q	47q	--	--	I get good marks in mathematics
63r	47r	--	--	It is difficult to make friends with members of my own sex
63s	47s	--	--	I do badly in tests of mathematics
63t	47t	--	--	I'm not very popular with members of the opposite sex
63u	47u	--	--	My parents understand me
64a	48a	--	--	Chances will graduate from high school
64b	48b	--	--	Chances will go to college
64c	48c	--	--	Chances will have a job that pays well
64d	48d	--	--	Chances will be able to own home
64e	48e	--	--	Chances will have an enjoyable job
64f	48f	--	--	Chances will have a happy family life
64g	48g	--	--	Chances will stay in good health most of the time
64h	48h	--	--	Chances will be able to live wherever want in country
64i	48i	--	--	Chances will be respected in the community
64j	48j	--	--	Chances will have good friends
64k	48k	--	--	Chances life will turn out better than it has for parents
64l	48l	--	--	Chances children will have a better life
67a	--	56a	53a	Other students see me as popular
67b	--	56b	53b	Other students see me as athletic
67c	--	--	53c	Other students see me as socially active
67d	--	56c	53d	Other students see me as a good student
67e	--	56d	53e	Other students see me as important
67f	--	56e	53f	Other students see me as a trouble-maker
67g	--	--	53g	Other students see me as part of the leading crowd
69	52	--	--	How many close friends have dropped out of school
70a	53a	--	--	Important to close friends to attend classes regularly
70b	53b	--	--	Important to close friends to study
70c	53c	--	--	Important to close friends to play sports
70d	53d	--	--	Important to close friends to get good grades
70e	53e	--	--	Important to close friends to be popular
70f	53f	--	--	Important to close friends to finish high school
70g	53g	--	--	Important to close friends to have a steady boy/girlfriend

BY-FL Student Component
Data File User's Manual

<u>Question Number</u>				<u>Question Wording</u>
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
70h	53h	--	--	Important to close friends to be willing to party, get wild
70i	53i	--	--	Important to close friends to continue their education
70j	53j	--	--	Important to close friends to participate in religious activities
70k	53k	--	--	Important to close friends to do community work, volunteer
70l	53l	--	--	Important to close friends to have as steady job
71a	59a	--	--	Person admire most is popular
71b	59b	--	--	Person admire most is honest
71c	59c	--	--	Person admire most dresses well
71d	59d	--	--	Person admire most is intelligent
71e	59e	--	--	Person admire most understands me
71f	59f	--	--	Person admire most drives a nice car
71g	59g	--	--	Person admire most has an important job
71h	59h	--	--	Person admire most makes a lot of money
71i	59i	--	--	Person admire most is good at sports
71j	59j	--	--	Person admire most thinks about important things like I do
71k	59k	--	--	I do not admire anyone
72	60	--	--	Relationship to person admire most
73	58	--	--	Age groups of friends
74	61	--	--	Important to be married before having sex
75	62	--	81	Consider having a child if not married
76	63	--	--	Have children of own
77	66	43	--	Cigarettes smoked daily
78a	67a	--	--	Occasions drank alcoholic beverages in lifetime
78b	67b	--	--	Occasions drank alcoholic beverages in the last year
78c	67c	--	--	Occasions drank alcoholic beverages in the last month
79	68	--	--	Times had five or more drinks in a row in the last two weeks
80Aa	69Aa	--	--	Occasions used marijuana in lifetime
80Ab	69Ab	--	--	Occasions used marijuana in the last year
80Ac	69Ac	--	--	Occasions used marijuana in the last month
80Ba	69Ba	--	--	Occasions used cocaine in lifetime
80Bb	69Bb	--	--	Occasions used cocaine in the last year
80Bc	69Bc	--	--	Occasions used cocaine in the last month
81	70	--	92	Religious background
82	71	--	93	How often attended religious services in the past year
83	72	--	94	Think of self as religious person
84	73	--	--	Currently or ever employed
85	74	53*	--	Hours worked per week
86	75	--	--	How many hours worked are on the weekend
87	76	54	27	Kind of work
88	77	--	--	Earnings per hour
89	83	--	98	Have a twin
90	84	33	97a,b	Number of older brothers and sisters

* Question is not identical across survey instruments, but may be made comparable by collapsing response categories.

Question Number				Question Wording
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
91	85	--	97d,e	Number of younger brothers and sisters
92a	86a	8a	36b	Father lives in the same household with me
92b,c	86b,c	8b	36c	Other adult male (stepfather) lives in the same household with me
92d	86d	8c	36d	Mother lives in the same household with me
92e,f	86e,f	8d	36e	Other adult female (stepmother) lives in same household with me
92g	86g	--	36h	Husband/wife lives in the same household with me
92h	86h	--	--	Boy/girlfriend lives in the same household with me
92i	86i	--	36i	My child or children live in the same household with me
93a,b	87a,b	8e*	36f*	Number of brothers/sisters living in the same household with me
93c	87c	8g*	36g*	Number of grandparents living in same household with me
93d,e	87d,e	8h*	36j*	Number of other relatives living in same household
93f,g	87f,g	8i*	36k*	Number of non-relatives living in same household
94	89	--	--	How many brothers and sisters left school before graduating
95	90	--	--	Babysit own child, younger siblings, or other relatives
96	91	--	--	Hours per day responsible for their care
97	92	--	--	Days of school missed per month because babysitting
98a	93A	--	--	I get along with all of the people in my family
98b	93B	--	--	I don't get along with my father
98c	93c	--	--	I don't get along with another male guardian
98d	93d	--	--	I don't get along with my mother
98e	93e	--	--	I don't get along with another female guardian
98f	93f	--	--	I don't get along with my brother(s)
98g	93g	--	--	I don't get along with my sister(s)
98h	93h	--	--	I don't get along with my grandparent(s)
98i	93i	--	--	I don't get along with other relative(s)
99a	94a	--	--	My family moved to a new home
99b	94c	--	--	One of my parents got married
99c	94b	--	--	My parents got divorced or separated
99d	94d	--	--	My mother lost her job
99e	94e	--	--	My father lost his job
99f	94f	--	--	My mother started to work
99g	94g	--	--	My father started to work
99h	94h	--	--	I became seriously ill or disabled
99i	94i	--	--	My father died
99j	94j	--	--	My mother died
99k	94k	--	--	A close relative died
99l	94l	--	--	One of my unmarried sisters got pregnant
99m	94m	--	--	One of my brothers or sisters dropped out of school
99n	94n	--	--	My family went on welfare
99o	94o	--	--	My family went off welfare
99p	94p	--	--	My family stayed on welfare
99q	94q	--	--	A family member became seriously ill or disabled

* Question is not identical across survey instruments, but may be made comparable by collapsing response categories

BY-F1:Student Component
Data File User's Manual

<u>Question Number</u>				<u>Question Wording</u>
FFS #	DOQ #	BYS #	HS&B #	
99r	94r	--	--	My family was homeless for a period of time
99s	94s	--	--	None apply
100a	--	38a	--	How often parents check on whether have done homework
100e	--	38b	--	How often parents require work or chores around the home
100f	--	38c	--	How often parents limit the time spent watching TV
100g	--	38d	--	How often parents limit the time with friends on school nights
102a	95a	--	--	How much my parents try to find out who my friends are
102b	95b	--	--	How much my parents try to find out where I go at night
102c	95c	--	--	How much my parents try to find out how I spend my money
102d	95d	--	--	How much my parents try to find out what I do with my time
103	96	--	--	My parents know the parents of my closest friends
104a	98a	--	--	Who decides how late at night I can stay out
104b	98b	--	--	Who decides which friends I can spend time with
104c	98g	--	--	Who decides what classes I take in school
104d	98c	--	--	Who decides whether I have a job
104e	98d	--	--	Who decides at what age I can leave school
104f	98e	--	--	Who decides how I spend my money
104g	98f	--	--	Who decides whether I can date
107a	--	55c	--	How often parents received a warning about my attendance
107b	--	55d	--	How often parents received a warning about my grades
107c	--	55e	--	How often parents received a warning about my behavior
108a	99a	39a*	--	My parents trust me to do what they expect
108b	99b	39b*	--	I do not know WHY I am supposed to do what they tell me
108c	99c	39c*	--	I often count on my parents to solve problems for me
108d	99d	--	--	I think I will be a source of pride to my parents in the future
108e	99e	--	--	My parents get along well with each other
108f	99f	--	--	When I grow up I will have a family similar to my own
109	100	--	--	Ran away from home for a week or longer last two years
ADD1a	ADD1a	--	--	Occasions used LSD in lifetime
ADD1b	ADD1b	--	--	Occasions used LSD in the last year
ADD1c	ADD1c	--	--	Occasions used LSD in the last month
ADD2a	ADD2a	--	--	Occasions used amphetamines in lifetime
ADD2b	ADD2b	--	--	Occasions used amphetamines in the last year
ADD2c	ADD2c	--	--	Occasions used amphetamines in the last month
ADD3a	ADD3a	--	--	Someone I know started using illegal drugs
ADD3b	ADD3b	--	--	Someone offered to sell me illegal drugs
ADD3c	ADD3c	--	--	A member of my family used illegal drugs
ADD3d	ADD3d	--	--	A member of my family was in a rehabilitation program

* Question is not identical across survey instruments, but may be made comparable by collapsing response categories

Table 1. Summary of NELS:88 Populations, Samples, Level of Analyses, Sample Identification Flags, and Weights

<u>Population of Interest</u>	<u>Sample and Sample N</u>	<u>Level of Analysis</u>	<u>Sample ID Flag</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Longitudinal Cohort (Panel): The population of 1988 eighth graders two years later.	Base year retained sample members who completed both a base year and first follow-up questionnaire. N = 17,424. Note: undercoverage bias; 5% of potential base year sample excluded.	Cross-wave, longitudinal level of analysis.	Select the panel (F1PANFLG = 1).	Use the panel weight (F1PNLWT).
Eight grade cross-section: The population of all students enrolled in the eighth grade in 1988.	Base year selected sample members who participated in the base year. N = 24,599. Note: undercoverage bias; 5% of potential base year sample excluded.	Cross-sectional level of analysis	Use the base year student data file and select for BYQFLG = 1.	Use the base year questionnaire weight (BYQWT).

Table 1. (cont.) Summary of NELS:88 Populations, Samples, Level of Analyses, Sample Identification Flags, and Weights

<u>Population of Interest</u>	<u>Sample and Sample N</u>	<u>Level of Analysis</u>	<u>Sample ID Flag</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Tenth grade cross-section: The population of all students enrolled in the tenth grade in 1990.	Representative sample of students enrolled in tenth grade in the spring term of 1990. N = 17,544. Includes freshened students and excludes dropouts and out-of-sequence sample members.	Cross-sectional analysis; Trend analyses with HS&B 1980 sophomores and F1 1990 sophomores.	Select for F1QFLG = 1 and F1SEQFLG = 0.	Use the first follow-up questionnaire weight (F1QWT).
First follow-up cross-section: The population of all first follow-up eligible persons who were either in the eighth grade during the 1987-1988 school year or were in the tenth grade during the 1989-1990 school year.	All first follow-up 1990 sample members; combines 1988-eligible eighth-grade cohort and 1990 tenth-grade freshened sample. N = 19,264.		Select for F1STAT = 0	Use the first follow-up questionnaire weight (F1QWT).

Questions appearing in first follow-up abbreviated questionnaires

STUDENT		DROPOUT		NEW STUDENT SUPPLEMENT	
1-4B	Locating information for respondent, parents, and close friend or relative	1-4B	Locating information for respondent, parents, and close friend or relative	1-3	Respondent name, sex, birthdate
5	Respondent's grade level	6	Reasons for leaving school	4	Is respondent's mother living
6A-B	School respondent will attend in twelfth grade	7	Last time respondent attended school	5A-E	Mother's employment status and description of current or most recent job
13	Number of days absent from school in first half of school year	8	Respondent's last grade level attended	6	Is respondent's father living
14	Main reason for last absence	9	Did respondent pass last grade attended	7A-E	Father's employment status and description of current or most recent job
17	Respondent's assessment of how long it will take to graduate from high school	10	Name of last school attended	8A-C, 9	Respondent's ethnic background
18A	Respondent's degree of certainty that he or she will graduate from high school	11	Respondent's plans to get a high school diploma or GED	10	Type of school respondent attended in eighth grade
20	Type of high school program	16 ^a	Type of program in last school attended	11	Did respondent speak a language other than English before starting to go to school
39	Respondent's grades from beginning of ninth grade	20	Respondent's grades from beginning of ninth grade until last grade attended	12	What was first language respondent learned to speak as a child
49	Respondent's assessment of how far in school he or she will get	22	Number of days absent in last semester respondent attended school	13	What other language did respondent speak before starting to go to school
53	Type of job or occupation respondent expects to have right after high school and at age 30	38	Respondent's assessment of how far in school he or she will get	14	Language respondent usually speaks
54-55	What other language, besides English, is spoken in respondent's home	39	Type of job or occupation respondent expects to have at age 30	15-16	Language other than English respondent uses most often, and degree of proficiency in that language
57	Degree of respondent's English proficiency	41-42	What other language, besides English, is spoken in respondent's home		
		44	Degree of respondent's English proficiency		

Note: Question numbers pertain to the original full versions of each questionnaire

Questions appearing in first follow-up abbreviated questionnaires

STUDENT		DROPOUT		NEW STUDENT SUPPLEMENT	
84	Respondent's most recent employment status	63	Does respondent have children	17	Degree of respondent's English proficiency
85	Number of hours worked per week at current or most recent job	73	Respondent's most recent employment status	20	Educational attainment of respondent's parents
88	Respondent's hourly salary at current or most recent job	74	Number of hours worked per week at current job	22	Was respondent ever held back
92-93	Other people living in respondent's household	77	Respondent's hourly salary at current or most recent job		
		86-87	Other people living in respondent's household		

Note: Question numbers pertain to the original full versions of each questionnaire

APPENDIX G

NELS VARIABLES

NELS Variables

TABLE 1: Student Demographics/Background Variables

<u>Student Demographics</u>	<u>Personality/Self Assessment</u>
Gender	Locus of control
Race	R feels good about Self
SES	R doesn't have enough control over
R lives with father/mother	life
	R feels s/he is a person of worth
	R is able to do things as well as
	others
	R is satisfied with self
	R feels useless at times
	R doesn't have much to be proud of

Non-School Activities

How often respondent:
 visits hangout
 plays ball, sports
 uses P/C
 talks on the phone
 drives/rides around

TABLE 2: School Demographics/ School Climate Variables

<u>Student-Teacher Relations</u>	<u>School Demographics</u>
Students get along well w/teachers	Urbanicity of school
Teachers are interested in students	Entire school
When R works hard, teachers praise	enrollment
	Region of the country

Level of Expectations-Core Classes

How often R 1) is asked to show understanding; 2) works hard; and
 3) feels challenged in math, English, history, and science

TABLE 3: Personal School Experiences/ Future Plans Variables

<u>School Recognition</u>	<u>Negative Behavior Patterns</u>
R has not won any awards	How many times R:
R elected officer of school class	-was late for class
R won an academic honor	-skipped a class
R participated in science/math fair	-got in trouble
R received recognition for good grades	-was suspended
work	-went to class w/o
<u>School Achievement Attitudes</u>	<u>School Sports/Activity</u>
<u>Participation</u>	
OK to work hard for good grades	R played school team/
How many years to graduate	individual sport
R sure will graduate from HS	R participated in:
R sure further ed after HS	-school band/orch
How important are good grades	-school play
	-school
	-yearbook/newspaper
	-school hobby/acad
	club
<u>Absentee Policy</u>	
When absent	
-school called home	-school sent letter
	teacher helped R

TABLE 4: Home/ Parent Environment Variables

<u>Parent Expectations</u>	<u>Parent Strategies-Academic</u>
<u>Support</u>	
How far in sch. dad/mom	How often parents check/help
wants R to go	w/ HW
	Special privileges for good grades
Parents' highest ed level	Parents limit privileges for poor
	grades
	Parents limit time with friends

Parents' School Involvement

How often parents:

- attend sch. meetings
- phone teachers
- attend sch. event
- received acad.warning

Parent-Student School
Involvement

How often parents:

- discuss school courses w/
stds.
- discuss grades w/ students
- discuss plans for college
- discuss preparation for
SAT/ACT

APPENDIX I

STATISTICAL DATA/
FREQUENCIES

1SESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE
by F1S7A STUDENTS GET ALONG WELL WITH TEACHERS

		F1S7A				Page 1 of 1
F1SESQ	Count	STRONGLY AGREE 1	AGREE 2	DISAGREE 3	STRONGLY DISAGRE 4	Row Total
	Exp Val Row Pct					
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	31 32.2 2.7%	725 750.6 64.2%	330 309.4 29.2%	43 36.7 3.8%	1129 25.0%
QUARTILE 2	2	31 37.3 2.4%	859 868.9 65.7%	376 358.2 28.8%	41 42.5 3.1%	1307 28.9%
QUARTILE 3	3	30 34.5 2.5%	821 803.8 67.9%	311 331.4 25.7%	47 39.3 3.9%	1209 26.8%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	37 24.9 4.2%	598 579.7 68.6%	221 239.0 25.3%	16 28.4 1.8%	872 19.3%
Column Total		129 2.9%	3003 66.5%	1238 27.4%	147 3.3%	4517 100.0%
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance
-----		-----		----		-----
Pearson		22.38583		9		.00773
Likelihood Ratio		22.60606		9		.00714
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association		12.20259		1		.00048

Minimum Expected Frequency - 24.903

Number of Missing Observations: 127

Appendix 2: The teaching is good at school: as a function of gender, race, and SES.

FLSEX COMPOSITE SEX by FLS7G THE TEACHING IS GOOD AT SCHOOL

Page 1 of 1

FLSEX	Count Exp Val Row Pct	FLS7G				Row Total
		STRONGLY AGREE 1	2	DISAGREE 3	STRONGLY DISAGREE 4	
MALE	1	253 222.4 10.4%	1586 1636.2 65.3%	451 451.8 18.6%	137 116.6 5.6%	2427 54.0%
	2	159 189.6 7.7%	1445 1394.8 69.8%	386 385.2 18.7%	79 99.4 3.8%	2069 46.0%
Column Total		412 9.2%	3031 67.4%	837 18.6%	216 4.8%	4496 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.24985	3	.00015
Likelihood Ratio	20.48154	3	.00013
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.18163	1	.66998

Minimum Expected Frequency - 99.400

Number of Missing Observations: 148

DATA: F1RACE, F1S7G

F1RACE COMPOSITE RACE by F1S7G THE TEACHING IS GOOD AT SCHOOL

Page 1 of 1

F1RACE	Count Exp Val Row Pct	F1S7G				Row Total
		STRONGLY AGREE 1	AGREE 2	DISAGREE 3	STRONGLY DISAGRE 4	
1		16	114	34	6	170
ASIAN, PACIFIC ISL		15.6 9.4%	114.7 67.1%	31.7 20.0%	8.0 3.5%	3.8%
2		59	390	101	18	568
HISPANIC		52.1 10.4%	383.2 68.7%	105.8 17.8%	26.8 3.2%	12.8%
3		56	306	72	20	454
BLACK, NOT HISPA		41.7 12.3%	306.3 67.4%	84.6 15.9%	21.4 4.4%	10.2%
4		276	2181	619	165	3241
WHITE, NOT HISPA		297.6 8.5%	2186.7 67.3%	603.9 19.1%	152.8 5.1%	73.1%
Column Total		407 9.2%	2991 67.5%	826 18.6%	209 4.7%	4433 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
-----	-----	----	-----
Pearson	14.62399	9	.10180
Likelihood Ratio	14.64472	9	.10117
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.35136	1	.01173

Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.015

Number of Missing Observations: 211

Appendix 3: Teachers are interested in students: as a function of gender, race, and SES.

F1SEX COMPOSITE SEX by F1S7H TEACHERS ARE INTERESTED IN STUDENTS

Page 1 of 1

F1SEX	Count Exp Val Row Pct	F1S7H				Row Total
		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE	
		1	2	3	4	
MALE	1	231 222.6 9.5%	1436 1462.0 59.3%	618 612.7 25.5%	136 123.7 5.6%	2421 54.0%
	2	181 189.4 8.8%	1270 1244.0 61.7%	516 521.3 25.0%	93 105.3 4.5%	2060 46.0%
Column Total		412 9.2%	2706 60.4%	1134 25.3%	229 5.1%	4481 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	4.44593	3	.21716
Likelihood Ratio	4.46746	3	.21521
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.86236	1	.35308

Minimum Expected Frequency - 105.276

Number of Missing Observations: 163

F1RACE COMPOSITE RACE by F1S7H TEACHERS ARE INTERESTED IN STUDENTS

Page 1 of 1

F1RACE	Count Exp Val Row Pct	F1S7H				Row Total
		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE	
		1	2	3	4	
ASIAN,PACIFC ISL	1	17 15.6 10.1%	111 102.0 65.7%	33 42.7 19.5%	8 8.7 4.7%	169 3.8%
	2	59 52.5 10.4%	349 344.0 61.2%	138 144.1 24.2%	24 29.4 4.2%	570 12.9%
BLACK, NOT HISPA	3	49 41.8 10.8%	282 274.0 62.1%	95 114.8 20.9%	28 23.4 6.2%	454 10.3%
	4	282 297.1 8.7%	1924 1946.1 59.7%	851 815.4 26.4%	168 166.4 5.2%	3225 73.0%
Column Total		407 9.2%	2666 60.3%	1117 25.3%	228 5.2%	4418 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	13.69413	9	.13363
Likelihood Ratio	13.98630	9	.12281
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.69660	1	.00966

Minimum Expected Frequency - 8.722

FISESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE by F1S7H TEACHERS ARE INTERESTED IN TEACHING

		F1S7H				Page 1 of 1
FISESQ	Count Exp Val Row Pct	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	111 103.1 9.9%	681 677.0 60.7%	270 283.7 24.1%	59 57.3 5.3%	1121 25.0%
QUARTILE 2	2	96 118.5 7.4%	782 778.4 60.7%	338 326.2 26.2%	73 65.9 5.7%	1289 28.8%
QUARTILE 3	3	105 110.7 8.7%	714 727.1 59.3%	325 304.7 27.0%	60 61.5 5.0%	1204 26.9%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	100 79.7 11.5%	529 523.6 61.0%	201 219.4 23.2%	37 44.3 4.3%	867 19.3%
Column Total		412 9.2%	2706 60.4%	1134 25.3%	229 5.1%	4481 100.0%
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance
-----		-----		-----		-----
Pearson		16.72580		9		.05319
Likelihood Ratio		16.69524		9		.05371
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association		1.76583		1		.18390

Minimum Expected Frequency - 44.308

Number of Missing Observations: 163

F1S7I PRAISE EFFORT

Page 1 of 1

		Count	F1S7I				
		Exp Val	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE	Row Total
		Row Pct	1	2	3	4	
FICESQ	1		79	534	418	88	1119
	QUARTILE 1 LOW		74.2	489.2	469.8	85.8	24.9%
			7.1%	47.7%	37.4%	7.9%	
	2		72	520	586	122	1300
QUARTILE 2			86.1	568.3	545.8	99.7	28.9%
			5.5%	40.0%	45.1%	9.4%	
QUARTILE 3	3		78	517	522	90	1207
			80.0	527.7	506.7	92.6	26.8%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH			6.5%	42.8%	43.2%	7.5%	
	4		69	395	362	45	871
			57.7	380.8	365.7	66.8	19.4%
			7.9%	45.4%	41.6%	5.2%	
Column Total			298	1966	1888	345	4497
			6.6%	43.7%	42.0%	7.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	35.24782	9	.00005
Likelihood Ratio	35.99480	9	.00004
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.02748	1	.31075
Minimum Expected Frequency - 57.718			
Number of Missing Observations: 147			

Number of Missing Observations: 199

F15ESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE
by F157J IN CLASS OFTEN FEEL PUT DOWN BY TEACHERS

		F1S7J				Page 1 of 1
	Count Exp Val Row Pct	STRONGLY AGREE AGREE 1	AGREE 2	DISAGREE 3	STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE 4	Row Total
F1SESQ						
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	48 43.1 4.3%	194 199.5 17.3%	643 671.5 57.2%	239 209.9 21.3%	1124 24.9%
QUARTILE 2	2	41 50.0 3.1%	228 231.4 17.5%	801 779.0 61.4%	234 243.6 17.9%	1304 28.9%
QUARTILE 3	3	56 46.4 4.6%	217 214.4 18.0%	723 721.6 59.9%	212 225.6 17.5%	1208 26.8%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	28 33.5 3.2%	161 154.7 18.5%	526 520.9 60.3%	157 162.9 18.0%	872 19.3%
Column Total		173 3.8%	800 17.7%	2693 59.7%	842 18.7%	4508 100.0%
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance	
Pearson		12.87817		9	.16820	
Likelihood Ratio		12.75445		9	.17404	
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association		1.50931		1	.21924	
Minimum Expected Frequency -		33.464				

Number of Missing Observations: 136

Appendix 6: Often feel put down by students in class: as a function of gender, race, and SES.

F1SEX COMPOSITE SEX by F1S7K OFTEN FEEL PUT DOWN BY STUDENTS IN CLASS

Page 1 of 1

F1SEX	Count Exp Val Row Pct	F1S7K				Row Total
		STRONGLY AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE		
		1	2	3	4	
MALE	1	95 101.2 3.9%	400 424.8 16.5%	1402 1395.2 57.7%	534 509.8 22.0%	2431 54.1%
	2	92 85.8 4.5%	385 360.2 18.7%	1176 1182.8 57.1%	408 432.2 19.8%	2061 45.9%
Column Total		187 4.2%	785 17.5%	2578 57.4%	942 21.0%	4492 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	6.56868	3	.08699
Likelihood Ratio	6.56565	3	.08711
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	6.16663	1	.01302

Minimum Expected Frequency - 85.799

Number of Missing Observations: 152

		F1S7K				Page 1 of 1	
F1RACE	Count	STRONGLY AGREE		DISAGREE STRONGLY		Row Total	
	Exp Val	AGREE		DISAGRE			
	Row Pct	1	2	3	4		

ASIAN, PACIFIC ISL	1	5	27	94	44	170
		7.1	29.7	97.6	35.5	3.8%
		2.9%	15.9%	55.3%	25.9%	
HISPANIC	2	8	103	325	130	566
		23.8	99.0	325.1	118.1	12.8%
		1.4%	18.2%	57.4%	23.0%	
BLACK, NOT HISPA	3	17	75	224	139	455
		19.1	79.6	261.4	94.9	10.3%
		3.7%	16.5%	49.2%	30.5%	
WHITE, NOT HISPA	4	156	570	1901	611	3238
		136.0	566.6	1859.9	675.5	73.1%
		4.8%	17.6%	58.7%	18.9%	
Column Total		186	775	2544	924	4429
		4.2%	17.5%	57.4%	20.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	51.25069	9	.00000
Likelihood Ratio	52.56619	9	.00000
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	17.83476	1	.00002
Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.139			

Number of Missing Observations: 215

WILL PUT DOWN BY STUDENTS IN CLASS

Page 1 of 1

		F1S7K				
	Count Exp Val Row Pct	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE	Row Total
		1	2	3	4	
F1SESQ						
1		54	205	618	241	1118
QUARTILE 1 LOW		46.5 4.8%	195.4 18.3%	641.6 55.3%	234.5 21.6%	24.9%
2		48	239	740	270	1297
QUARTILE 2		54.0 3.7%	226.7 18.4%	744.4 57.1%	272.0 20.8%	28.9%
3		56	189	716	243	1204
QUARTILE 3		50.1 4.7%	210.4 15.7%	691.0 59.5%	252.5 20.2%	26.8%
4		29	152	504	188	873
QUARTILE 4 HIGH		36.3 3.3%	152.6 17.4%	501.0 57.7%	183.1 21.5%	19.4%
Column Total		187 4.2%	785 17.5%	2578 57.4%	942 21.0%	4492 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.86453	9	.36156
Likelihood Ratio	9.97767	9	.35230
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	1.23081	1	.26725

Minimum Expected Frequency - 36.343

Number of Missing Observations: 152

Appendix 7: Most teachers listen to R: as a function of gender, race, and SES.

F1SEX COMPOSITE SEX by F1S7L MOST TEACHERS LISTEN TO R

		F1S7L				Page 1 of 1	
F1SEX	Count Exp Val Row Pct	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE	Row Total	
		1	2	3	4		
MALE	1	142	1367	752	170	2431	
		145.9	1400.8	734.2	150.2	54.0%	
		5.8%	56.2%	30.9%	7.0%		
FEMALE	2	128	1226	607	108	2069	
		124.1	1192.2	624.8	127.8	46.0%	
		6.2%	59.3%	29.3%	5.2%		
Column Total		270	2593	1359	278	4500	
		6.0%	57.6%	30.2%	6.2%	100.0%	
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
-----		-----		----	-----		
Pearson		8.62631		3	.03469		
Likelihood Ratio		8.68957		3	.03372		
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association		7.07696		1	.00781		
Minimum Expected Frequency - 124.140							

F1RACE COMPOSITE RACE by F1S7L MOST TEACHERS LISTEN TO R

		F1S7L				Page 1 of 1	
Count Exp Val Row Pct		STRONGLY AGREE		DISAGREE		STRONGLY DISAGREE	
		AGREE				DISAGREE	Row Total
		1	2	3	4		
F1RACE							
	1	8	106	48	9	171	
ASIAN, PACIFIC ISL		10.3	98.8	51.3	10.6	3.9%	
		4.7%	62.0%	28.1%	5.3%		
	2	32	357	146	36	571	
HISPANIC		34.2	330.0	171.3	35.5	12.9%	
		5.6%	62.5%	25.6%	6.3%		
	3	50	268	105	31	454	
BLACK, NOT HISPA		27.2	262.4	136.2	28.2	10.2%	
		11.0%	59.0%	23.1%	6.8%		
	4	176	1833	1032	200	3241	
WHITE, NOT HISPA		194.3	1872.9	972.2	201.6	73.0%	
		5.4%	56.6%	31.8%	6.2%		
Column Total		266	2564	1331	276	4437	
		6.0%	57.8%	30.0%	6.2%	100.0%	
Chi-Square		Value				DF	Significance
-----		-----				----	-----
Pearson		40.44541				9	.00001
Likelihood Ratio		37.41599				9	.00002
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association		7.15299				1	.00748
Minimum Expected Frequency - 10.252							

Number of Missing Observations: 207

FISESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE 1, FLS7L MOST TEACHERS LISTEN TO P

Page 1 of 1

FISESQ	Count Exp Val Row Pct	FLS7L				Row Total
		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGRE	
		1	2	3	4	
1		68	668	316	70	1122
QUARTILE 1 LOW		67.3 6.1%	646.5 59.5%	338.8 28.2%	69.3 6.2%	24.9%
2		75	741	406	81	1303
QUARTILE 2		78.2 5.8%	750.8 56.9%	393.5 31.2%	80.5 6.2%	29.0%
3		75	662	392	76	1205
QUARTILE 3		72.3 6.2%	694.3 54.9%	363.9 32.5%	74.4 6.3%	26.8%
4		52	522	245	51	870
QUARTILE 4 HIGH		52.2 6.0%	501.3 60.0%	262.7 28.2%	53.7 5.9%	19.3%
Column Total		270 6.0%	2593 57.6%	1359 30.2%	278 6.2%	4500 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.92608	9	.44413
Likelihood Ratio	8.93994	9	.44284
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	.00875	1	.92548

Minimum Expected Frequency - 52.200

Number of Missing Observations: 144

Appendix 8: Student's Post High School Educational Expectations (std. reported): as a function of parents' level of education.

F1S49 Page 1 of 2

Count	Exp Val	LESS THAN H.S. GRAD	H.S. GRAD < 2 YRS	2+ YRS T < 2 YRS O	Row
Row Pct		1	2	3	Total
FI PARED					
1	6	152	33	71	496
DID NOT FINISH H	3.0	71.1	32.9	62.7	10.9%
	1.2%	30.6%	6.7%	14.3%	
2	8	212	106	168	1096
HS GRADUATE OR G	6.7	157.1	72.6	138.5	24.1%
	.7%	19.3%	9.7%	15.3%	
3	12	248	143	272	2050
GR HS & LT 4YR D	12.6	293.8	135.9	259.1	45.0%
	.6%	12.1%	7.0%	13.3%	
4	0	25	11	45	535
COLLEGE GRAD	3.3	76.7	35.5	67.6	11.7%
	.0%	4.7%	2.1%	8.4%	
5	1	9	4	16	254
M.A. OR EQUIVALE	1.6	36.4	16.8	32.1	5.6%
	.4%	3.5%	1.6%	6.3%	
6	1	7	5	4	126
PH.D., M.D., OTH	.8	18.1	8.4	15.9	2.8%
	.8%	5.6%	4.0%	3.2%	
Column	28	653	302	576	4557
(Continued) Total	.6%	14.3%	6.6%	12.6%	100.0%

FI PARED PARENTS' HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL
by F1S49 HOW FAR IN SCHOOL R THINKS HE WILL GET

F1S49 Page 2 of 2

Count	Exp Val	2/MORE Y FINISH C	MASTER'S PH.D., M	Row
Row Pct		6	7	Total
FI PARED				
1	70	88	15	496
DID NOT FINISH H	91.6	143.0	34.0	10.9%
	14.1%	17.7%	3.0%	
2	208	232	49	1096
HS GRADUATE OR G	202.5	316.0	75.0	24.1%
	19.0%	21.2%	4.5%	
3	422	565	131	2050
GR HS & LT 4YR D	378.8	591.1	140.4	45.0%
	20.6%	27.6%	6.4%	
4	88	259	64	535
COLLEGE GRAD	98.9	154.3	36.6	11.7%
	16.4%	48.4%	12.0%	
5	38	112	37	254
M.A. OR EQUIVALE	46.9	73.2	17.4	5.6%
	15.0%	44.1%	14.6%	
6	16	58	16	126
PH.D., M.D., OTH	23.3	36.3	8.6	2.8%
	12.7%	46.0%	12.7%	
Column	842	1314	312	4557
Total	18.5%	28.8%	6.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	548.18769	40	.00000
Likelihood Ratio	547.28471	40	.00000
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	377.54674	1	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency = .774
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 = 4 OF 54 (7.4%)
Number of Missing Observations: 87

Appendix 9: Parental Post High School Expectations(std. reported): as a function of parents' level of education.

F1PARED PARENTS' HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL
by F1S48A HOW FAR IN SCHOOL FATHER WANTS R TO GO

Page 1 of 2

		F1S48A						
F1PARED	Count Exp Val Row Pct	LESS THA N HS GRA 1	GRADUATE FROM HS 2	VOCATION AL AFTER 3	ATTEND 2 -YR COLL 4	ATTEND 4 -YR COLL 5	Row Total	
1 DID NOT FINISH H	12 3.6 2.6%	54 28.0 11.6%	59 45.5 12.7%	27 29.2 5.8%	31 44.7 6.7%		465 10.4%	
2 HS GRADUATE OR G	13 8.1 1.2%	100 63.5 9.5%	154 103.1 14.6%	88 66.1 8.3%	69 101.5 6.5%		1055 23.7%	
3 GR HS & LT 4YR D	7 15.5 .3%	105 121.8 5.2%	195 197.8 9.6%	135 126.8 6.7%	217 194.6 10.7%		2023 45.5%	
4 COLLEGE GRAD	0 4.1 .0%	9 32.0 1.7%	16 51.9 3.0%	13 33.3 2.4%	74 51.1 13.9%		531 11.9%	
5 M.A. OR EQUIVALE	1 1.9 .4%	0 15.2 .0%	7 24.6 2.8%	14 15.8 5.6%	28 24.2 11.1%		252 5.7%	
6 PH.D., M.D., OTH	1 .9 .8%	0 7.5 .0%	4 12.1 3.2%	2 7.8 1.6%	9 11.9 7.3%		124 2.8%	
Column (Continued) Total		34 .8%	268 6.0%	435 9.8%	279 6.3%	428 9.6%	4450 100.0%	

F1PARED PARENTS' HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL
by F1S48A HOW FAR IN SCHOOL FATHER WANTS R TO GO

Page 2 of 2

		F1S48A						
F1PARED	Count Exp Val Row Pct	GRAD FRO M COLLEG 6	POST GRA D ED 7	DON'T KN OW 8	PARENT D OESN'T C 9	DOES NOT APPLY 10	Row Total	
1 DID NOT FINISH H	117 172.6 25.2%	31 48.4 6.7%	59 48.1 12.7%	16 10.9 3.4%	59 34.2 12.7%		465 10.4%	
2 HS GRADUATE OR G	309 391.7 29.3%	66 109.8 6.3%	141 109.1 13.4%	34 24.7 3.2%	81 77.5 7.7%		1055 23.7%	
3 GR HS & LT 4YR D	774 751.0 38.3%	187 210.5 9.2%	210 209.1 10.4%	44 47.3 2.2%	149 148.7 7.4%		2023 45.5%	
4 COLLEGE GRAD	275 197.1 51.8%	82 55.2 15.4%	33 54.9 6.2%	5 12.4 .9%	24 39.0 4.5%		531 11.9%	
5 M.A. OR EQUIVALE	115 93.6 45.6%	57 26.2 22.6%	15 26.0 6.0%	5 5.9 2.0%	10 18.5 4.0%		252 5.7%	
6 PH.D., M.D., OTH	62 46.0 50.0%	40 12.9 32.3%	2 12.6 1.6%	0 2.9 .0%	4 9.1 3.2%		124 2.8%	
Column Total		1652 37.1%	463 10.4%	460 10.3%	104 2.3%	327 7.3%	4450 100.0%	

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
-----	-----	----	-----
Pearson	532.82468	45	.00000
Likelihood Ratio	550.07263	45	.00000
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	28.93731	1	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency = .947
 Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 = 5 OF 60 (8.3%)

Number of Missing Observations: 194

F1PARED PARENTS' HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL
by F1S48B HOW FAR IN SCHOOL MOTHER WANTS R TO GO

		F1S48B					Page 1 of 2
F1PARED	Count Exp Val Row Pct	LESS THA N HS GRA 1	GRADUATE FROM HS 2	VOCATION AL AFTER 3	ATTEND 2 -YR COLL 4	ATTEND 4 -YR COLL 5	Row Total
1		20	55	76	37	31	468
DID NOT FINISH H		4.1	28.8	51.6	33.0	47.5	10.5%
		4.3%	11.8%	16.2%	7.9%	6.6%	
2		9	104	158	98	84	1054
HS GRADUATE OR G		9.3	64.8	116.1	74.3	107.1	23.7%
		.9%	9.9%	15.0%	9.3%	8.0%	
3		8	102	229	147	224	2013
GR HS & LT 4YR D		17.7	123.8	221.8	141.9	204.5	45.3%
		.4%	5.1%	11.4%	7.3%	11.1%	
4		1	10	18	18	73	530
COLLEGE GRAD		4.7	32.6	58.4	37.4	53.8	11.9%
		.2%	1.9%	3.4%	3.4%	13.8%	
5		0	1	4	11	30	250
M.A. OR EQUIVALE		2.2	15.4	27.5	17.6	25.4	5.6%
		.0%	.4%	1.6%	4.4%	12.0%	
6		1	1	4	2	9	124
PH.D., M.D., OTH		1.1	7.6	13.7	8.7	12.6	2.8%
		.8%	.8%	3.2%	1.6%	7.3%	
Column (Continued) Total		39	273	489	313	451	4439
		.9%	6.2%	11.0%	7.1%	10.2%	100.0%

F1PARED PARENTS' HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL
by F1S48B HOW FAR IN SCHOOL MOTHER WANTS R TO GO

		F1S48B					Page 2 of 2
F1PARED	Count Exp Val Row Pct	GRAD FRO M COLLEG 6	POST GRA D ED 7	DON'T KN OW 8	PARENT D OESN'T C 9	DOES NOT APPLY 10	Row Total
1		134	46	55	4	10	468
DID NOT FINISH H		186.7	58.1	44.2	6.1	7.9	10.5%
		28.6%	9.8%	11.8%	.9%	2.1%	
2		350	91	113	23	24	1054
HS GRADUATE OR G		420.5	130.8	99.5	13.8	17.8	23.7%
		33.2%	8.6%	10.7%	2.2%	2.3%	
3		807	244	195	26	31	2013
GR HS & LT 4YR D		803.1	249.9	190.0	26.3	34.0	45.3%
		40.1%	12.1%	9.7%	1.3%	1.5%	
4		291	79	31	3	6	530
COLLEGE GRAD		211.5	65.8	50.0	6.9	9.0	11.9%
		54.9%	14.9%	5.8%	.6%	1.1%	
5		124	57	19	2	2	250
M.A. OR EQUIVALE		99.7	31.0	23.6	3.3	4.2	5.6%
		49.6%	22.8%	7.6%	.8%	.8%	
6		65	34	6	0	2	124
PH.D., M.D., OTH		49.5	15.4	11.7	1.6	2.1	2.8%
		52.4%	27.4%	4.8%	.0%	1.6%	
Column Total		1771	551	419	58	75	4439
		39.9%	12.4%	9.4%	1.3%	1.7%	100.0%
Chi-Square		Value		DF		Significance	

-----	-----	----	-----
Pearson	448.07758	45	.00000
Likelihood Ratio	453.09103	45	.00000
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	120.23719	1	.00000

Minimum Expected Frequency = 1.089
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 = 8 OF 60 (13.3%)
Number of Missing Observations: 205

Appendix 10: Parental; Post High School Educational Expectations (std. reported): as a function of SES.

F1SESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE
by F1S48A HOW FAR IN SCHOOL FATHER WANTS R TO GO

Page 1 of 2

		F1S48A					Row Total
F1SESQ	Count Exp Val Row Pct	LESS THA N HS GRA 1	GRADUATE FROM HS 2	VOCATION AL AFTER 3	ATTEND 2 -YR COLL 4	ATTEND 4 -YR COLL 5	
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	23 8.4 2.1%	109 66.3 9.8%	141 108.6 12.7%	74 69.5 6.7%	71 106.8 6.4%	1108 24.7%
QUARTILE 2	2	7 9.8 .5%	104 77.3 8.0%	174 126.6 13.5%	99 81.0 7.7%	118 124.6 9.1%	1292 28.8%
QUARTILE 3	3	3 9.2 .2%	45 72.2 3.7%	94 118.3 7.8%	79 75.7 6.5%	146 116.4 12.1%	1207 26.9%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	1 6.6 .1%	10 52.2 1.1%	30 85.5 3.4%	29 54.8 3.3%	97 84.2 11.1%	873 19.5%
Column (Continued) Total		34 .8%	268 6.0%	439 9.8%	281 6.3%	432 9.6%	4480 100.0%

F1SESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE
by F1S48A HOW FAR IN SCHOOL FATHER WANTS R TO GO

Page 2 of 2

		F1S48A					Row Total
F1SESQ	Count Exp Val Row Pct	GRAD FRO M COLLEG 6	POST GRA D ED 7	DON'T KN OW 8	PARENT D OESN'T C 9	DOES NOT APPLY 10	
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	295 410.1 26.6%	71 115.3 6.4%	155 114.8 14.0%	30 26.2 2.7%	139 82.1 12.5%	1108 24.7%
QUARTILE 2	2	404 478.2 31.3%	105 134.4 8.1%	145 133.8 11.2%	44 30.6 3.4%	92 95.7 7.1%	1292 28.8%
QUARTILE 3	3	503 446.7 41.7%	110 125.5 9.1%	124 125.0 10.3%	26 28.6 2.2%	77 89.4 6.4%	1207 26.9%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	456 323.1 52.2%	180 90.8 20.6%	40 90.4 4.6%	6 20.7 .7%	24 64.7 2.7%	873 19.5%
Column Total		1658 37.0%	466 10.4%	464 10.4%	106 2.4%	332 7.4%	4480 100.0%

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	568.70164	27	.00000
Likelihood Ratio	583.33899	27	.00000
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association	11.95643	1	.00054

Minimum Expected Frequency - 6.625

Number of Missing Observations: 164

F1SESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE
by F1S48B HOW FAR IN SCHOOL MOTHER WANTS R TO GO

		F1S48B					Page 1 of 2
F1SESQ	Count	LESS THA	GRADUATE	VOCATION	ATTEND 2	ATTEND 4	Row Total
	Exp Val Row Pct	N HS GRA 1	FROM HS 2	AL AFTER 3	-YR COLL 4	-YR COLL 5	
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	28 9.7 2.5%	122 67.7 11.0%	170 122.5 15.3%	94 78.4 8.5%	78 113.3 7.0%	1108 24.8%
QUARTILE 2	2	6 11.2 .5%	96 78.6 7.5%	195 142.2 15.2%	110 91.0 8.6%	124 131.5 9.6%	1286 28.8%
QUARTILE 3	3	4 10.5 .3%	45 73.6 3.7%	103 133.2 8.5%	83 85.2 6.9%	153 123.3 12.7%	1205 27.0%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	1 7.6 .1%	10 53.1 1.2%	26 96.1 3.0%	29 61.5 3.3%	102 88.9 11.7%	869 19.4%
(Continued) Column Total		39 .9%	273 6.1%	494 11.1%	316 7.1%	457 10.2%	4468 100.0%

F1SESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE
by F1S48B HOW FAR IN SCHOOL MOTHER WANTS R TO GO

		F1S48B					Page 2 of 2
F1SESQ	Count	GRAD FRO	POST GRA	DON'T KN	PARENT D	DOES NOT	Row Total
	Exp Val Row Pct	M COLLEG 6	D ED 7	OW 8	OESN'T C 9	APPLY 10	
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	324 441.2 29.2%	111 137.4 10.0%	137 104.4 12.4%	17 14.6 1.5%	27 18.8 2.4%	1108 24.8%
QUARTILE 2	2	443 512.0 34.4%	138 159.5 10.7%	128 121.2 10.0%	23 17.0 1.8%	23 21.9 1.8%	1286 28.8%
QUARTILE 3	3	537 479.8 44.6%	135 149.4 11.2%	115 113.5 9.5%	13 15.9 1.1%	17 20.5 1.4%	1205 27.0%
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	475 346.0 54.7%	170 107.7 19.6%	41 81.9 4.7%	6 11.5 .7%	9 14.8 1.0%	869 19.4%
Column Total		1779 39.8%	554 12.4%	421 9.4%	59 1.3%	76 1.7%	4468 100.0%
Chi-Square		Value		DF	Significance		
Pearson		465.07350		27	.00000		
Likelihood Ratio		488.93130		27	.00000		
Mantel-Haenszel test for linear association		112.85112		1	.00000		

Minimum Expected Frequency - 7.585
Number of Missing Observations: 176

F R E Q U E N C I E S

BYS8A R LIVES IN HOUSEHOLD WITH FATHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	3189	68.7	69.4	69.4
No	2	1403	30.2	30.6	100.0
REFUSAL	7	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	49	1.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4592 Missing cases 52

BYS8C R LIVES IN HOUSEHOLD WITH MOTHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	1	4219	90.8	91.9	91.9
No	2	373	8.0	8.1	100.0
REFUSAL	7	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	49	1.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4592 Missing cases 52

BYPAQFLG PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE AVAILABLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Did not complete	0	276	5.9	5.9	5.9
Completed	1	4368	94.1	94.1	100.0
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4644 Missing cases 0

BYFCOMP FAMILY COMPOSITION COMPOSITE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Mother & father	1	2946	63.4	64.2	64.2
Mother & male guardn	2	512	11.0	11.1	75.3
Father & fem guard.	3	119	2.6	2.6	77.9
Mother only	4	761	16.4	16.6	94.5
Father only	5	124	2.7	2.7	97.2
Oth rel/non-relative	6	130	2.8	2.8	100.0
MISSING	8	52	1.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4592 Missing cases 52

F1S7A STUDENTS GET ALONG WELL WITH TEACHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	129	2.8	2.9	2.9
AGREE	2	3003	64.7	66.5	69.3
DISAGREE	3	1238	26.7	27.4	96.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	147	3.2	3.3	100.0
MISSING	8	127	2.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4517 Missing cases 127

F1S7G THE TEACHING IS GOOD AT SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	412	8.9	9.2	9.2
AGREE	2	3031	65.3	67.4	76.6
DISAGREE	3	837	18.0	18.6	95.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	216	4.7	4.8	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	4	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	144	3.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4496 Missing cases 148

F1S7H TEACHERS ARE INTERESTED IN STUDENTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	412	8.9	9.2	9.2
AGREE	2	2706	58.3	60.4	69.6
DISAGREE	3	1134	24.4	25.3	94.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	229	4.9	5.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	158	3.4	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4481 Missing cases 163

F1S7I WHEN R WORKS HARD TEACHERS PRAISE EFFORT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	298	6.4	6.6	6.6
AGREE	2	1966	42.3	43.7	50.3
DISAGREE	3	1888	40.7	42.0	92.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	345	7.4	7.7	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	7	.2	Missing	
MISSING	8	140	3.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4497 Missing cases 147

F1S7J IN CLASS OFTEN FEEL PUT DOWN BY TEACHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	173	3.7	3.8	3.8
AGREE	2	800	17.2	17.7	21.6
DISAGREE	3	2693	58.0	59.7	81.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	842	18.1	18.7	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	134	2.9	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4508 Missing cases 136

F1S7K OFTEN FEEL PUT DOWN BY STUDENTS IN CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	187	4.0	4.2	4.2
AGREE	2	785	16.9	17.5	21.6
DISAGREE	3	2578	55.5	57.4	79.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	942	20.3	21.0	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	4	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	148	3.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4492 Missing cases 152

F1S7L MOST TEACHERS LISTEN TO R

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	270	5.8	6.0	6.0
AGREE	2	2593	55.8	57.6	63.6
DISAGREE	3	1359	29.3	30.2	93.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	278	6.0	6.2	100.0
MISSING	8	144	3.1	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	4500	Missing cases	144		

F1S8A R HAS NOT WON ANY AWARDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	2627	56.6	66.3	66.3
DOES NOT APPLY	2	1335	28.7	33.7	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	3962	Missing cases	682		

F1S8B R ELECTED OFFICER OF A SCHOOL CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	265	5.7	6.7	6.7
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3697	79.6	93.3	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	3962	Missing cases	682		

F1S8C R WON AN ACADEMIC HONOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	243	5.2	6.1	6.1
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3719	80.1	93.9	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	3962	Missing cases	682		

F1S8D R PARTICIPATED IN A SCIENCE OR MATH FAIR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	336	7.2	8.5	8.5
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3626	78.1	91.5	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	3962	Missing cases	682		

F1S8E RECEIVED RECOGNITION FOR GOOD ATTENDANCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	456	9.8	11.5	11.5
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3506	75.5	88.5	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	3962	Missing cases	682		

F1S8F RECEIVED RECOGNITION FOR GOOD GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	340	7.3	8.6	8.6
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3622	78.0	91.4	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3962 Missing cases 682

F1S8G RECEIVED RECOGNITION FOR WRITING ESSAY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	340	7.3	8.6	8.6
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3622	78.0	91.4	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3962 Missing cases 682

F1S8H NAMED MOST VALUABLE PLAYER ON SPORT TEAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	340	7.3	8.6	8.6
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3622	78.0	91.4	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3962 Missing cases 682

F1S8I RECEIVED A COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	148	3.2	3.7	3.7
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3814	82.1	96.3	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3962 Missing cases 682

F1S8J PARTICIPATED IN VOC/TECH COMPETITION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	287	6.2	7.2	7.2
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3675	79.1	92.8	100.0
MISSING	8	682	14.7	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3962 Missing cases 682

F1S10A HOW MANY TIMES WAS R LATE FOR SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	941	20.3	20.4	20.4
1-2 TIMES	1	1660	35.7	36.0	56.3
3-6 TIMES	2	1203	25.9	26.1	82.4
7-9 TIMES	3	334	7.2	7.2	89.6
OVER 10 TIMES	4	478	10.3	10.4	100.0
MISSING	8	28	.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4616 Missing cases 28

F1S10B HOW MANY TIMES DID R CUT/SKIP CLASSES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	2431	52.3	52.7	52.7
1-2 TIMES	1	1170	25.2	25.4	78.0
3-6 TIMES	2	530	11.4	11.5	89.5
7-9 TIMES	3	159	3.4	3.4	93.0
OVER 10 TIMES	4	324	7.0	7.0	100.0
MISSING	8	30	.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4614 Missing cases 30

F1S10C HOW MANY TIMES R GOT IN TROUBLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	2030	43.7	44.0	44.0
1-2 TIMES	1	1700	36.6	36.8	80.8
3-6 TIMES	2	545	11.7	11.8	92.7
7-9 TIMES	3	144	3.1	3.1	95.8
OVER 10 TIMES	4	195	4.2	4.2	100.0
MISSING	8	30	.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4614 Missing cases 30

F1S10D HOW MANY TIMES PUT ON IN-SCHL SUSPENSION

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	3798	81.8	82.5	82.5
1-2 TIMES	1	620	13.4	13.5	96.0
3-6 TIMES	2	147	3.2	3.2	99.2
7-9 TIMES	3	14	.3	.3	99.5
OVER 10 TIMES	4	24	.5	.5	100.0
MISSING	8	41	.9	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4603 Missing cases 41

F1S10E HOW MANY TIMES R SUSPENDED FROM SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	4116	88.6	89.3	89.3
1-2 TIMES	1	424	9.1	9.2	98.5
3-6 TIMES	2	49	1.1	1.1	99.5
7-9 TIMES	3	10	.2	.2	99.8
OVER 10 TIMES	4	11	.2	.2	100.0
MISSING	8	34	.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4610 Missing cases 34

F1S10F R TRANSFERRED FOR DISCIPLINARY REASONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	4571	98.4	99.2	99.2
1-2 TIMES	1	30	.6	.7	99.9
3-6 TIMES	2	3	.1	.1	99.9
OVER 10 TIMES	4	3	.1	.1	100.0
MISSING	8	37	.8	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4607 Missing cases 37

F1S10G HOW MANY TIMES WAS R ARRESTED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	4382	94.4	95.1	95.1
1-2 TIMES	1	193	4.2	4.2	99.3
3-6 TIMES	2	16	.3	.3	99.7
7-9 TIMES	3	3	.1	.1	99.7
OVER 10 TIMES	4	12	.3	.3	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	37	.8	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4606 Missing cases 38

F1S11A IT'S OK TO WORK HARD FOR GOOD GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	4417	95.1	95.7	95.7
NO	2	198	4.3	4.3	100.0
MISSING	8	29	.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4615 Missing cases 29

F1S15A WHEN ABSENT SCHOOL DID NOT DO ANYTHING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	1514	32.6	39.1	39.1
NO	2	1690	36.4	43.7	82.8
DON'T KNOW	3	664	14.3	17.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	272	5.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3868 Missing cases 776

F1S15B WHEN ABSENT SCHOOL CALLED R'S HOME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	1534	33.0	40.0	40.0
NO	2	1978	42.6	51.6	91.6
DON'T KNOW	3	320	6.9	8.4	100.0
MISSING	8	311	6.7	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3832 Missing cases 812

F1S15C WHEN ABSENT THE SCHOOL VISITED R'S HOME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	66	1.4	1.8	1.8
NO	2	3479	74.9	95.3	97.1
DON'T KNOW	3	106	2.3	2.9	100.0
MISSING	8	492	10.6	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3651 Missing cases 993

F1S15D WHEN ABSENT THE SCHL SENT A LETTER HOME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	392	8.4	10.6	10.6
NO	2	3107	66.9	84.4	95.0
DON'T KNOW	3	183	3.9	5.0	100.0
MISSING	8	461	9.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3682 Missing cases 962

F1S15E WHEN ABSENT R HAD TO SEE A COUNSELOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES	1	99	2.1	2.7	2.7
NO	2	3499	75.3	95.5	98.2
DON'T KNOW	3	67	1.4	1.8	100.0
MISSING	8	478	10.3	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 3665 Missing cases 979

F1S16A AFT BEING ABSENT TEACHER HELPED R DO WRK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	1901	40.9	47.4	47.4
DOES NOT APPLY	2	2109	45.4	52.6	100.0
MISSING	8	133	2.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4010 Missing cases 634

F1S16B AFTER BEING ABSENT STUS HELPED R DO WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	1776	38.2	44.3	44.3
DOES NOT APPLY	2	2234	48.1	55.7	100.0
MISSING	8	133	2.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4010 Missing cases 634

F1S16C AFTER BEING ABSENT SOMEONE ELSE HELPED R

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	324	7.0	8.1	8.1
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3686	79.4	91.9	100.0
MISSING	8	133	2.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4010 Missing cases 634

F1S16D AFTER BEING ABSENT R DIDN'T NEED HELP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	630	13.6	15.7	15.7
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3380	72.8	84.3	100.0
MISSING	8	133	2.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4010 Missing cases 634

F1S16E AFTER BEING ABSENT THE TEACHER GOT MAD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	332	7.1	8.3	8.3
DOES NOT APPLY	2	3678	79.2	91.7	100.0
MISSING	8	133	2.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4010 Missing cases 634

F1S16F AFTER BEING ABSENT, ASKED WHERE R WAS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	1092	23.5	27.2	27.2
DOES NOT APPLY	2	2918	62.8	72.8	100.0
MISSING	8	133	2.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4010 Missing cases 634

F1S16G AFTER BEING ABSENT R FELL BEHIND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
APPLIES	1	1096	23.6	27.3	27.3
DOES NOT APPLY	2	2914	62.7	72.7	100.0
MISSING	8	133	2.9	Missing	
LEGITIMATE SKIP	9	501	10.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4010 Missing cases 634

F1S17 HOW MANY YRS WILL IT TAKE R TO GRADUATE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1 YEAR	1	93	2.0	2.0	2.0
2 YEARS	2	4317	93.0	93.4	95.4
3 YEARS	3	123	2.6	2.7	98.0
4 YEARS	4	14	.3	.3	98.3
MORE THAN 4 YEARS	5	8	.2	.2	98.5
DON'T KNOW	6	69	1.5	1.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	19	.4	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4624 Missing cases 20

F1S18A R SURE TO GRADUATE FROM HIGH SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
YES/VERY SURE GRAD	1	3607	77.7	77.7	77.7
PROBABLY	2	957	20.6	20.6	98.3
PROBABLY NOT	3	31	.7	.7	99.0
NO/VERY SURE I WON'T	4	46	1.0	1.0	100.0
MISSING	8	3	.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4641 Missing cases 3

F1S18B R SURE TO FURTHER EDUCATION AFTER H.S

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
VERY SURE I'LL GO	1	2092	45.0	45.3	45.3
PROBABLY WILL GO	2	1882	40.5	40.7	86.0
PROBABLY WON'T GO	3	486	10.5	10.5	96.5
VERY SURE I WON'T GO	4	161	3.5	3.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	21	.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4621 Missing cases 23

F1S20 DESCRIBE PRESENT HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
GENERAL H.S PROGRAM	1	2220	47.8	48.8	48.8
COLLEGE PREPARATORY	2	1044	22.5	23.0	71.8
INDUSTRIAL ARTS	3	155	3.3	3.4	75.2
AGRICULTURAL OCCUP7N	4	57	1.2	1.3	76.4
BUSINESS OCCUPATIONS	5	139	3.0	3.1	79.5
MARKETING EDUCATION	6	18	.4	.4	79.9
HEALTH OCCUPATIONS	7	37	.8	.8	80.7
HOME ECON OCCUPATION	8	14	.3	.3	81.0
CONSUMER EDUCATION	9	8	.2	.2	81.2
TECHNICAL OCCUPATION	10	52	1.1	1.1	82.3
TRADE OCCUPATIONS	11	44	.9	1.0	83.3
SPECIALIZED H.S PROG	12	71	1.5	1.6	84.9
OTHER	13	241	5.2	5.3	90.1
I DON'T KNOW	14	448	9.6	9.9	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	92	2.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	4	.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4548 Missing cases 96

F1S26A OFTEN ASKED TO SHOW UNDERSTAND MATH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	177	3.8	3.9	3.9
NEVER	2	496	10.7	11.1	15.0
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	605	13.0	13.5	28.5
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	712	15.3	15.9	44.3
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	997	21.5	22.2	66.6
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	1501	32.3	33.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	155	3.3	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4488 Missing cases 156

F1S26B OFTEN ASKED TO SHOW UNDERSTAND ENGLISH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	43	.9	1.0	1.0
NEVER	2	735	15.8	16.4	17.4
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	764	16.5	17.1	34.5
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	816	17.6	18.3	52.8
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	1081	23.3	24.2	76.9
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	1031	22.2	23.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	172	3.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4470 Missing cases 174

F1S26C OFTEN ASKED TO SHOW UNDERSTAND HISTORY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	1429	30.8	32.1	32.1
NEVER	2	657	14.1	14.7	46.8
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	524	11.3	11.8	58.5
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	545	11.7	12.2	70.8
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	649	14.0	14.6	85.3
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	654	14.1	14.7	100.0
MISSING	98	186	4.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4458 Missing cases 186

F1S26D OFTEN ASKED TO SHOW UNDERSTAND SCIENCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	432	9.3	9.7	9.7
NEVER	2	679	14.6	15.2	24.9
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	672	14.5	15.1	40.0
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	773	16.6	17.3	57.3
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	941	20.3	21.1	78.4
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	963	20.7	21.6	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	182	3.9	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4460 Missing cases 184

F1S27A OFTEN WORK HARD IN MATH CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	177	3.8	3.9	3.9
NEVER	2	272	5.9	6.1	10.0
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	315	6.8	7.0	17.0
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	402	8.7	9.0	26.0
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	1289	27.8	28.7	54.7
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	2036	43.8	45.3	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	152	3.3	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4491 Missing cases 153

F1S27B OFTEN WORK HARD IN ENGLISH CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	44	.9	1.0	1.0
NEVER	2	253	5.4	5.6	6.6
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	322	6.9	7.2	13.8
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	484	10.4	10.8	24.6
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	1500	32.3	33.4	58.0
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	1883	40.5	42.0	100.0
MISSING	98	158	3.4	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4486 Missing cases 158

F1S27C OFTEN WORK HARD IN HISTORY CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	1429	30.8	31.9	31.9
NEVER	2	234	5.0	5.2	37.1
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	243	5.2	5.4	42.6
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	364	7.8	8.1	50.7
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	995	21.4	22.2	72.9
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	1212	26.1	27.1	100.0
MISSING	98	167	3.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4477 Missing cases 167

F1S27D OFTEN WORK HARD IN SCIENCE CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	431	9.3	9.6	9.6
NEVER	2	223	4.8	5.0	14.6
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	295	6.4	6.6	21.2
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	496	10.7	11.1	32.3
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	1314	28.3	29.4	61.6
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	1717	37.0	38.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	167	3.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4476 Missing cases 168

F1S28A OFTEN FEEL CHALLENGED IN MATH CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	176	3.8	3.9	3.9
NEVER	2	398	8.6	8.9	12.8
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	333	7.2	7.4	20.2
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	456	9.8	10.2	30.4
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	1100	23.7	24.5	54.9
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	2026	43.6	45.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	154	3.3	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4489 Missing cases 155

F1S28B OFTEN FEEL CHALLENGED IN ENGLISH CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	43	.9	1.0	1.0
NEVER	2	537	11.6	12.0	12.9
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	523	11.3	11.7	24.6
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	794	17.1	17.7	42.3
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	1410	30.4	31.5	73.8
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	1175	25.3	26.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	161	3.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4482 Missing cases 162

F1S28C OFTEN FEEL CHALLENGED IN HISTORY CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	1427	30.7	31.9	31.9
NEVER	2	370	8.0	8.3	40.2
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	315	6.8	7.0	47.3
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	517	11.1	11.6	58.8
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	921	19.8	20.6	79.4
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	919	19.8	20.6	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	172	3.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4469 Missing cases 175

F1S28D OFTEN FEEL CHALLENGED IN SCIENCE CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	430	9.3	9.6	9.6
NEVER	2	353	7.6	7.9	17.5
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	3	358	7.7	8.0	25.5
ABOUT ONCE A WEEK	4	521	11.2	11.6	37.1
A FEW TIMES A WEEK	5	1234	26.6	27.5	64.6
ALMOST EVERY DAY	6	1584	34.1	35.4	100.0
MISSING	98	164	3.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4480 Missing cases 164

F1S38 HOW IMPORTANT ARE GOOD GRADES TO R

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT IMPORTANT	1	85	1.8	1.9	1.9
SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	2	895	19.3	20.2	22.1
IMPORTANT	3	2058	44.3	46.5	68.6
VERY IMPORTANT	4	1389	29.9	31.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	216	4.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4427 Missing cases 217

F1S39A DESCRIBE RESPONDENT'S MATH GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	31	.7	.7	.7
MOSTLY A'S	2	135	2.9	2.9	3.6
HALF A AND HALF B	3	270	5.8	5.8	9.4
MOSTLY B'S	4	404	8.7	8.7	18.1
HALF B AND HALF C	5	1270	27.3	27.4	45.5
MOSTLY C'S	6	1090	23.5	23.5	69.0
HALF C AND HALF D	7	952	20.5	20.5	89.5
MOSTLY D'S	8	319	6.9	6.9	96.4
MOSTLY BELOW D	9	165	3.6	3.6	99.9
CLASSES NOT GRADED	10	4	.1	.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	1	.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4640 Missing cases 4

F1S39B DESCRIBE RESPONDENT'S ENGLISH GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	8	.2	.2	.2
MOSTLY A'S	2	71	1.5	1.5	1.7
HALF A AND HALF B	3	239	5.1	5.2	6.9
MOSTLY B'S	4	533	11.5	11.5	18.4
HALF B AND HALF C	5	1506	32.4	32.5	50.8
MOSTLY C'S	6	1172	25.2	25.3	76.1
HALF C AND HALF D	7	787	16.9	17.0	93.1
MOSTLY D'S	8	217	4.7	4.7	97.8
MOSTLY BELOW D	9	104	2.2	2.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	2	.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4637 Missing cases 7

F1S39C DESCRIBE RESPONDENT'S HISTORY GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	809	17.4	17.6	17.6
MOSTLY A'S	2	68	1.5	1.5	19.0
HALF A AND HALF B	3	178	3.8	3.9	22.9
MOSTLY B'S	4	398	8.6	8.6	31.6
HALF B AND HALF C	5	984	21.2	21.4	52.9
MOSTLY C'S	6	1007	21.7	21.9	74.8
HALF C AND HALF D	7	722	15.5	15.7	90.5
MOSTLY D'S	8	285	6.1	6.2	96.7
MOSTLY BELOW D	9	140	3.0	3.0	99.7
CLASSES NOT GRADED	10	13	.3	.3	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	5	.1	Missing	
REFUSAL	97	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	33	.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4604 Missing cases 40

F1S390 DESCRIBE RESPONDENT'S SCIENCE GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT TAKING SUBJECT	1	118	2.5	2.5	2.5
MOSTLY A'S	2	67	1.4	1.4	4.0
HALF A AND HALF B	3	153	3.3	3.3	7.3
MOSTLY B'S	4	385	8.3	8.3	15.6
HALF B AND HALF C	5	1198	25.8	25.8	41.4
MOSTLY C'S	6	1276	27.5	27.5	68.9
HALF C AND HALF D	7	913	19.7	19.7	88.6
MOSTLY D'S	8	374	8.1	8.1	96.7
MOSTLY BELOW D	9	147	3.2	3.2	99.8
CLASSES NOT GRADED	10	7	.2	.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	4	.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4638 Missing cases 6

F1S40A OFTEN GO TO CLASS WITHOUT PENCIL/PAPER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
USUALLY	1	168	3.6	3.7	3.7
OFTEN	2	407	8.8	8.9	12.6
SELDOM	3	2113	45.5	46.2	58.8
NEVER	4	1887	40.6	41.2	100.0
MISSING	8	69	1.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4575 Missing cases 69

F1S40B OFTEN GO TO CLASS WITHOUT BOOKS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
USUALLY	1	128	2.8	2.8	2.8
OFTEN	2	217	4.7	4.8	7.6
SELDOM	3	1964	42.3	43.0	50.6
NEVER	4	2258	48.6	49.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	76	1.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4567 Missing cases 77

F1S40C OFTEN GO TO CLASS WITHOUT HOMEWORK DONE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
USUALLY	1	310	6.7	6.8	6.8
OFTEN	2	858	18.5	18.7	25.5
SELDOM	3	2865	61.7	62.6	88.1
NEVER	4	545	11.7	11.9	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	64	1.4	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4578 Missing cases 66

F1S41AA PLAYED BASEBALL/SOFTBALL AT SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	193	4.2	4.5	4.5
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3450	74.3	81.0	85.5
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	153	3.3	3.6	89.1
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	265	5.7	6.2	95.3
VARSITY TEAM	5	181	3.9	4.2	99.6
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	19	.4	.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	7	.2	Missing	
MISSING	98	376	8.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4261 Missing cases 383

F1S41AB PLAYED BASKETBALL AT SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	35	.8	.8	.8
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3481	75.0	81.6	82.4
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	215	4.6	5.0	87.4
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	338	7.3	7.9	95.4
VARSITY TEAM	5	170	3.7	4.0	99.3
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	28	.6	.7	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	372	8.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4267 Missing cases 377

F1S41AC PLAYED FOOTBALL AT SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	233	5.0	5.5	5.5
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3272	70.5	76.8	82.3
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	112	2.4	2.6	84.9
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	364	7.8	8.5	93.5
VARSITY TEAM	5	257	5.5	6.0	99.5
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	22	.5	.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	10	.2	Missing	
MISSING	98	374	8.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4260 Missing cases 384

F1S41AD PLAYED SOCCER AT SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	911	19.6	21.6	21.6
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3002	64.6	71.3	92.9
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	84	1.8	2.0	94.9
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	105	2.3	2.5	97.4
VARSITY TEAM	5	99	2.1	2.4	99.7
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	11	.2	.3	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	4	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	428	9.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4212 Missing cases 432

F1S41AE PARTICIPATED ON SWIM TEAM AT SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	1385	29.8	33.0	33.0
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	2675	57.6	63.7	96.7
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	31	.7	.7	97.5
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	41	.9	1.0	98.4
VARSITY TEAM	5	61	1.3	1.5	99.9
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	5	.1	.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	441	9.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4198 Missing cases 446

F1S41AF PLAYED OTHER TEAM SPORT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	534	11.5	12.7	12.7
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3129	67.4	74.3	87.0
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	215	4.6	5.1	92.1
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	190	4.1	4.5	96.6
VARSITY TEAM	5	129	2.8	3.1	99.6
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	15	.3	.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	427	9.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4212 Missing cases 432

F1S41AG PLAYED AN INDIVIDUAL SPORT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	250	5.4	5.9	5.9
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3155	67.9	74.2	80.0
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	157	3.4	3.7	83.7
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	279	6.0	6.6	90.3
VARSITY TEAM	5	387	8.3	9.1	99.4
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	26	.6	.6	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	9	.2	Missing	
MISSING	98	381	8.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4254 Missing cases 390

F1S41AH PARTICIPATED IN CHEERLEADING

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	172	3.7	4.1	4.1
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3812	82.1	91.0	95.2
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	24	.5	.6	95.7
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	87	1.9	2.1	97.8
VARSITY TEAM	5	73	1.6	1.7	99.5
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	19	.4	.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	454	9.8	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4187 Missing cases 457

F1S41A1 PARTICIPATED ON POM-POM, DRILL TEAM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHOOL DOES NOT HAVE	1	606	13.0	14.5	14.5
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3424	73.7	81.8	96.3
INTRAMURAL SPORTS	3	35	.8	.8	97.1
JUNIOR VARSITY TEAM	4	42	.9	1.0	98.1
VARSITY TEAM	5	60	1.3	1.4	99.5
CAPTAIN CO-CAPTAIN	6	19	.4	.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	455	9.8	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4186 Missing cases 458

F1S41BA PARTICIPATED IN SCHOOL BAND, ORCHESTRA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	97	2.1	2.2	2.2
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3458	74.5	78.6	80.8
PARTICIPATED	3	796	17.1	18.1	98.8
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	51	1.1	1.2	100.0
MISSING	8	242	5.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4402 Missing cases 242

F1S41BB PARTICIPATED IN SCHOOL PLAY OR MUSICAL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	177	3.8	4.0	4.0
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3807	82.0	86.7	90.8
PARTICIPATED	3	378	8.1	8.6	99.4
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	28	.6	.6	100.0
MISSING	8	254	5.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4390 Missing cases 254

F1S41BC PARTICIPATED IN STUDENT GOVERNMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	315	6.8	7.2	7.2
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3912	84.2	89.5	96.7
PARTICIPATED	3	101	2.2	2.3	99.0
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	44	.9	1.0	100.0
MISSING	8	272	5.9	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4372 Missing cases 272

F1S41BD PARTICIPATED IN ACADEMIC HONOR SOCIETY

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	217	4.7	5.0	5.0
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	4126	88.8	94.2	99.1
PARTICIPATED	3	34	.7	.8	99.9
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	4	.1	.1	100.0
MISSING	8	263	5.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4381 Missing cases 263

F1S418E PARTICIPATED IN SCHL YEARBOOK, NEWSPAPER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	58	1.2	1.3	1.3
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	4071	87.7	92.9	94.2
PARTICIPATED	3	236	5.1	5.4	99.6
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	18	.4	.4	100.0
MISSING	8	261	5.6	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4383 Missing cases 261

F1S418F PARTICIPATED IN SCHOOL SERVICE CLUBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	468	10.1	10.7	10.7
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3565	76.8	81.5	92.2
PARTICIPATED	3	320	6.9	7.3	99.6
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	19	.4	.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	269	5.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4372 Missing cases 272

F1S418G PARTICIPATED IN SCHOOL ACADEMIC CLUBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	156	3.4	3.6	3.6
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3262	70.2	74.5	78.0
PARTICIPATED	3	925	19.9	21.1	99.2
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	37	.8	.8	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	262	5.6	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4380 Missing cases 264

F1S418H PARTICIPATED IN SCHOOL HOBBY CLUBS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	615	13.2	14.1	14.1
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3445	74.2	79.2	93.3
PARTICIPATED	3	268	5.8	6.2	99.5
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	22	.5	.5	100.0
MISSING	8	294	6.3	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4350 Missing cases 294

F1S418I PARTICIPATED IN SCHOOL FTA, FHA, FFA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
SCHL DOES NOT OFFER	1	431	9.3	9.9	9.9
DID NOT PARTICIPATE	2	3393	73.1	77.6	87.5
PARTICIPATED	3	482	10.4	11.0	98.5
PARTICIPATED OFFICER	4	64	1.4	1.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	271	5.8	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4370 Missing cases 274

F1S44A VISIT WITH FRIENDS AT LOCAL HANGOUT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	635	13.7	14.2	14.2
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	611	13.2	13.6	27.8
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	1834	39.5	40.9	68.7
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	1401	30.2	31.3	100.0
MISSING	8	163	3.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4481 Missing cases 163

F1S44B HOW OFTEN DOES R USE PERSONAL COMPUTERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	3439	74.1	77.1	77.1
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	516	11.1	11.6	88.7
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	327	7.0	7.3	96.0
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	178	3.8	4.0	100.0
MISSING	8	184	4.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4460 Missing cases 184

F1S44C HOW OFTEN DOES R WORK ON HOBBIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	1698	36.6	37.9	37.9
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	1039	22.4	23.2	61.1
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	1095	23.6	24.4	85.5
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	648	14.0	14.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	162	3.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4480 Missing cases 164

F1S44D HOW OFTEN DOES R READ FOR PLEASURE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	1976	42.5	44.5	44.5
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	926	19.9	20.8	65.3
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	933	20.1	21.0	86.3
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	607	13.1	13.7	100.0
MISSING	8	202	4.3	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4442 Missing cases 202

F1S44E HOW OFTEN DOES R GO TO THE PARK, GYM, POOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	1457	31.4	32.7	32.7
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	1000	21.5	22.5	55.2
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	1318	28.4	29.6	84.8
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	675	14.5	15.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	191	4.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4450 Missing cases 194

F1S44F HOW OFTEN DOES R PLAY BALL OR OTHER SPORTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	1410	30.4	31.5	31.5
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	985	21.2	22.0	53.5
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	1239	26.7	27.7	81.2
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	843	18.2	18.8	100.0
MISSING	8	167	3.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4477 Missing cases 167

F1S44G HOW OFTEN DOES R ATTEND YOUTH GROUPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	3092	66.6	69.6	69.6
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	674	14.5	15.2	84.7
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	583	12.6	13.1	97.9
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	95	2.0	2.1	100.0
MISSING	8	200	4.3	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4444 Missing cases 200

F1S44H HOW OFTEN R PERFORMS COMMUNITY SERVICES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	3774	81.3	85.1	85.1
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	426	9.2	9.6	94.7
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	195	4.2	4.4	99.1
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	38	.8	.9	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	206	4.4	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4433 Missing cases 211

F1S44I HOW OFTEN DOES R DRIVE OR RIDE AROUND

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	916	19.7	20.6	20.6
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	798	17.2	18.0	38.6
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	1522	32.8	34.2	72.8
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	1208	26.0	27.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	199	4.3	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4444 Missing cases 200

F1S44J HOW OFTEN R TALKS ON PHONE WITH FRIENDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	394	8.5	8.9	8.9
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	460	9.9	10.4	19.3
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	840	18.1	18.9	38.2
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	2740	59.0	61.8	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	209	4.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4434 Missing cases 210

F1S44K HOW OFTEN R DOES THINGS W/MOTHER/FATHER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	718	15.5	16.2	16.2
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	1112	23.9	25.1	41.2
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	1517	32.7	34.2	75.4
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	1091	23.5	24.6	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	203	4.4	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4438 Missing cases 206

F1S44L HOW OFTEN R TALKS WITH OTHER ADULTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	1239	26.7	28.0	28.0
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	1443	31.1	32.6	60.6
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	1241	26.7	28.0	88.6
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	505	10.9	11.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	215	4.6	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4428 Missing cases 216

F1S44M HOW OFTN R TAKES MUSIC, ART, DANCE CLASS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	3493	75.2	78.4	78.4
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	200	4.3	4.5	82.9
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	288	6.2	6.5	89.4
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	472	10.2	10.6	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	189	4.1	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4453 Missing cases 191

F1S44N HOW OFTEN R TAKES SPORTS LESSONS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	3694	79.5	83.1	83.1
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	228	4.9	5.1	88.2
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	284	6.1	6.4	94.6
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	240	5.2	5.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	196	4.2	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4446 Missing cases 198

F1S440 HOW OFTEN R ATTENDS RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
RARELY OR NEVER	1	2652	57.1	59.5	59.5
LESS THAN ONCE WEEK	2	718	15.5	16.1	75.6
ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK	3	999	21.5	22.4	98.0
EVERY DAY OR ALMOST	4	88	1.9	2.0	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	186	4.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4457 Missing cases 187

F1S48A HOW FAR IN SCHOOL FATHER WANTS R TO GO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LESS THAN HS GRAD	1	34	.7	.8	.8
GRADUATE FROM HS	2	268	5.8	6.0	6.7
VOCATIONAL AFTER HS	3	439	9.5	9.8	16.5
ATTEND 2-YR COLLEGE	4	281	6.1	6.3	22.8
ATTEND 4-YR COLLEGE	5	432	9.3	9.6	32.5
GRAD FROM COLLEGE	6	1658	35.7	37.0	69.5
POST GRAD ED	7	466	10.0	10.4	79.9
DON'T KNOW	8	464	10.0	10.4	90.2
PARENT DOESN'T CARE	9	106	2.3	2.4	92.6
DOES NOT APPLY	10	332	7.1	7.4	100.0
MISSING	98	164	3.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4480 Missing cases 164

F1S48B HOW FAR IN SCHOOL MOTHER WANTS R TO GO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LESS THAN HS GRAD	1	39	.8	.9	.9
GRADUATE FROM HS	2	273	5.9	6.1	7.0
VOCATIONAL AFTER HS	3	494	10.6	11.1	18.0
ATTEND 2-YR COLLEGE	4	316	6.8	7.1	25.1
ATTEND 4-YR COLLEGE	5	457	9.8	10.2	35.3
GRAD FROM COLLEGE	6	1779	38.3	39.8	75.2
POST GRAD ED	7	554	11.9	12.4	87.6
DON'T KNOW	8	421	9.1	9.4	97.0
PARENT DOESN'T CARE	9	59	1.3	1.3	98.3
DOES NOT APPLY	10	76	1.6	1.7	100.0
MISSING	98	176	3.8	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4468 Missing cases 176

F1S49 HOW FAR IN SCHOOL R THINKS HE WILL GET

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
LESS THAN H.S. GRAD	1	28	.6	.6	.6
H.S. GRADUATION ONLY	2	658	14.2	14.3	14.9
< 2 YRS TRADE SCHOOL	3	304	6.5	6.6	21.6
2+ YRS TRADE SCHOOL	4	581	12.5	12.7	34.2
< 2YRS OF COLLEGE	5	239	5.1	5.2	39.4
2/MORE YRS OF COLL	6	852	18.3	18.6	58.0
FINISH COLLEGE	7	1319	28.4	28.7	86.7
MASTER'S DEGREE	8	314	6.8	6.8	93.6
PH.D., M.D.	9	296	6.4	6.4	100.0
REFUSAL	97	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	98	52	1.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4591 Missing cases 53

F1S51 DOES R PLAN TO GO TO COLLEGE AFTER H.S.

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NO,DON'T PLN COLLEGE	1	870	18.7	19.4	19.4
YES, RIGHT AFTER H.S	2	1991	42.9	44.5	63.9
YES, AFTER ONE YEAR	3	852	18.3	19.0	83.0
YES, AFTER OVER A YR	4	133	2.9	3.0	85.9
DON'T KNOW	5	629	13.5	14.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	6	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	163	3.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4475 Missing cases 169

F1S62A R FEELS GOOD ABOUT HIM/HERSELF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1302	28.0	29.6	29.6
AGREE	2	2651	57.1	60.2	89.8
DISAGREE	3	388	8.4	8.8	98.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	62	1.3	1.4	100.0
MISSING	8	241	5.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4403 Missing cases 241

F1S62B R DOESN'T HAVE ENOUGH CONTROL OVER LIFE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	213	4.6	4.9	4.9
AGREE	2	1019	21.9	23.2	28.1
DISAGREE	3	2266	48.8	51.6	79.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	890	19.2	20.3	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	254	5.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4388 Missing cases 256

F1S62C GOOD LUCK MORE IMPORTANT THAN HARD WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	113	2.4	2.6	2.6
AGREE	2	583	12.6	13.3	15.9
DISAGREE	3	2570	55.3	58.7	74.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	1114	24.0	25.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	4	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	260	5.6	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4380 Missing cases 264

F1S62D R FEELS S/HE IS A PERSON OF WORTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1238	26.7	28.2	28.2
AGREE	2	2685	57.8	61.2	89.4
DISAGREE	3	390	8.4	8.9	98.3
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	75	1.6	1.7	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	255	5.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4388 Missing cases 256

F1S62E R ABLE TO DO THINGS AS WELL AS OTHERS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	1096	23.6	25.2	25.2
AGREE	2	2802	60.3	64.3	89.5
DISAGREE	3	405	8.7	9.3	98.8
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	54	1.2	1.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	284	6.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4357 Missing cases 287

F1S62F WHEN GETTING AHEAD SOMEBODY/THING STOPS R

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	200	4.3	4.6	4.6
AGREE	2	1251	26.9	28.6	33.1
DISAGREE	3	2477	53.3	56.6	89.7
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	451	9.7	10.3	100.0
MISSING	8	265	5.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4379 Missing cases 265

F1S62G R FEELS PLANS HARDLY EVER WORK OUT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	197	4.2	4.5	4.5
AGREE	2	983	21.2	22.6	27.1
DISAGREE	3	2562	55.2	58.8	85.9
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	614	13.2	14.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	7	.2	Missing	
MISSING	8	281	6.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4356 Missing cases 288

F1S62H ON THE WHOLE, R'S SATISFIED WITH SELF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	964	20.8	22.1	22.1
AGREE	2	2620	56.4	60.0	82.1
DISAGREE	3	672	14.5	15.4	97.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	109	2.3	2.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	274	5.9	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4365 Missing cases 279

F1S62I R FEELS USELESS AT TIMES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	281	6.1	6.4	6.4
AGREE	2	2091	45.0	47.9	54.4
DISAGREE	3	1531	33.0	35.1	89.4
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	461	9.9	10.6	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	279	6.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4364 Missing cases 280

F1S62J AT TIMES, R THINKS HE IS NO GOOD AT ALL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	278	6.0	6.4	6.4
AGREE	2	1583	34.1	36.4	42.8
DISAGREE	3	1748	37.6	40.2	83.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	741	16.0	17.0	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	4	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	290	6.2	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4350 Missing cases 294

F1S62K WHEN MAKES PLANS R'S CERTAIN THEY WORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	537	11.6	12.3	12.3
AGREE	2	2692	58.0	61.8	74.2
DISAGREE	3	1001	21.6	23.0	97.2
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	124	2.7	2.8	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	288	6.2	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4354 Missing cases 290

F1S62L R DOES NOT HAVE MUCH TO BE PROUD OF

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	153	3.3	3.5	3.5
AGREE	2	828	17.8	19.0	22.5
DISAGREE	3	2307	49.7	53.0	75.6
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	1063	22.9	24.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	291	6.3	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4351 Missing cases 293

F1S62M CHANCE,LUCK VERY IMPORTANT FOR R'S LIFE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	215	4.6	4.9	4.9
AGREE	2	1292	27.8	29.7	34.6
DISAGREE	3	2125	45.8	48.9	83.5
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	718	15.5	16.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	293	6.3	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4350 Missing cases 294

F1S62N FEEL EMOTIONALLY EMPTY MOST OF THE TIME

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STRONGLY AGREE	1	227	4.9	5.2	5.2
AGREE	2	843	18.2	19.3	24.5
DISAGREE	3	2331	50.2	53.4	78.0
STRONGLY DISAGREE	4	961	20.7	22.0	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	3	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	279	6.0	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4362 Missing cases 282

F1S100A HOW OFTEN PARENTS CHECK R'S HOMEWORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
OFTEN	1	973	21.0	23.0	23.0
SOMETIMES	2	1309	28.2	31.0	54.0
RARELY	3	1136	24.5	26.9	80.9
NEVER	4	808	17.4	19.1	100.0
MISSING	8	418	9.0	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4226 Missing cases 418

F1S100B HOW OFTEN PARENTS HELP R WITH HOMEWORK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
OFTEN	1	359	7.7	8.5	8.5
SOMETIMES	2	1566	33.7	37.2	45.7
RARELY	3	1307	28.1	31.0	76.8
NEVER	4	978	21.1	23.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	433	9.3	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4210 Missing cases 434

F1S100C SPECIAL PRIVILEGES GIVEN FOR GOOD GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
OFTEN	1	757	16.3	18.0	18.0
SOMETIMES	2	1546	33.3	36.8	54.8
RARELY	3	993	21.4	23.6	78.4
NEVER	4	909	19.6	21.6	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	437	9.4	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4205 Missing cases 439

F1S100D PARENTS LIMIT PRIVILEGES DUE POOR GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
OFTEN	1	1002	21.6	23.9	23.9
SOMETIMES	2	1370	29.5	32.6	56.5
RARELY	3	1057	22.8	25.2	81.6
NEVER	4	772	16.6	18.4	100.0
MISSING	8	443	9.5	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4201 Missing cases 443

F1S100E R REQUIRED TO WORK AROUND THE HOUSE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
OFTEN	1	1967	42.4	47.0	47.0
SOMETIMES	2	1355	29.2	32.4	79.4
RARELY	3	575	12.4	13.7	93.2
NEVER	4	285	6.1	6.8	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	460	9.9	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4182 Missing cases 462

F1S100F PARENTS LIMIT TV WATCHING OR VIDEO GAMES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
OFTEN	1	336	7.2	8.0	8.0
SOMETIMES	2	823	17.7	19.7	27.7
RARELY	3	1131	24.4	27.0	54.7
NEVER	4	1893	40.8	45.3	100.0
MISSING	8	461	9.9	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4183 Missing cases 461

F1S100G PARENTS LIMIT TIME WITH FRIENDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
OFTEN	1	1354	29.2	32.3	32.3
SOMETIMES	2	1393	30.0	33.2	65.5
RARELY	3	775	16.7	18.5	84.0
NEVER	4	670	14.4	16.0	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	451	9.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4192 Missing cases 452

F1S101 LATEST R CAN STAY OUT ON SCHOOL NIGHTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NOT ALLOWED OUT	0	296	6.4	7.0	7.0
NO LATER THAN 8	1	328	7.1	7.8	14.8
NO LATER THAN 9	2	784	16.9	18.6	33.5
NO LATER THAN 10	3	1481	31.9	35.2	68.7
NO LATER THAN 11	4	731	15.7	17.4	86.0
NO LATER THAN 12	5	300	6.5	7.1	93.2
AS LATE AS I WANT	6	287	6.2	6.8	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	96	5	.1	Missing	
MISSING	98	432	9.3	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4207 Missing cases 437

F1S105A DISCUSSED SCHOOL COURSES WITH PARENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	903	19.4	21.8	21.8
SOMETIMES	2	2596	55.9	62.7	84.5
OFTEN	3	641	13.8	15.5	100.0
MISSING	8	504	10.9	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4140 Missing cases 504

F1S105B DISCUSSED SCHOOL ACTIVITIES WITH PARENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	1089	23.4	26.4	26.4
SOMETIMES	2	2292	49.4	55.5	81.8
OFTEN	3	751	16.2	18.2	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	511	11.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4132 Missing cases 512

F1S105C DISCUSS THINGS STUDIED IN CLASS W/PARENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	976	21.0	23.6	23.6
SOMETIMES	2	2551	54.9	61.7	85.3
OFTEN	3	608	13.1	14.7	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	507	10.9	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4135 Missing cases 509

F1S105D HOW OFTEN DISCUSSED GRADES WITH PARENTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	312	6.7	7.6	7.6
SOMETIMES	2	2063	44.4	49.9	57.5
OFTEN	3	1756	37.8	42.5	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	512	11.0	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4131 Missing cases 513

1S105E DISCUSSED TRANSFERRING TO ANOTHER SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	2942	63.4	71.2	71.2
SOMETIMES	2	930	20.0	22.5	93.7
OFTEN	3	260	5.6	6.3	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	1	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	511	11.0	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4132 Missing cases 512

F1S105F DISCUSSED PREP FOR THE ACT/SAT TEST

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	2626	56.5	63.6	63.6
SOMETIMES	2	1279	27.5	31.0	94.6
OFTEN	3	225	4.8	5.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	512	11.0	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4130 Missing cases 514

F1S105G DISCUSSED GOING TO COLLEGE WITH PARENTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	1	808	17.4	19.5	19.5
SOMETIMES	2	2139	46.1	51.8	71.3
OFTEN	3	1186	25.5	28.7	100.0
MISSING	8	511	11.0	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4133 Missing cases 511

F1S106A HOW OFTEN PARENTS ATTEND SCHOOL MEETINGS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	2163	46.6	53.4	53.4
ONCE OR TWICE	1	1382	29.8	34.1	87.5
MORE THAN TWICE	2	407	8.8	10.0	97.5
I DON'T KNOW	3	101	2.2	2.5	100.0
MISSING	8	591	12.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4053 Missing cases 591

F1S106B HOW OFTEN PARENT PHONED TEACHR,COUNSELOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	1612	34.7	39.7	39.7
ONCE OR TWICE	1	1698	36.6	41.8	81.5
MORE THAN TWICE	2	624	13.4	15.4	96.9
I DON'T KNOW	3	127	2.7	3.1	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	2	.0	Missing	
MISSING	8	581	12.5	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4061 Missing cases 583

F1S106C HOW OFTEN PARENTS ATTENDED SCHOOL EVENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	2049	44.1	50.7	50.7
ONCE OR TWICE	1	844	18.2	20.9	71.6
MORE THAN TWICE	2	1063	22.9	26.3	97.9
I DON'T KNOW	3	83	1.8	2.1	100.0
MISSING	8	605	13.0	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4039 Missing cases 605

F1S106D PARENTS ACTED AS VOLUNTEER AT R'S SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	3147	67.8	78.2	78.2
ONCE OR TWICE	1	544	11.7	13.5	91.7
MORE THAN TWICE	2	214	4.6	5.3	97.0
I DON'T KNOW	3	119	2.6	3.0	100.0
MISSING	8	620	13.4	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4024 Missing cases 620

F1S107A PARENTS REC'D WARNING ABOUT R ATTENDANCE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	2781	59.9	69.0	69.0
ONCE OR TWICE	1	991	21.3	24.6	93.6
MORE THAN TWICE	2	259	5.6	6.4	100.0
MULTIPLE RESPONSE	6	4	.1	Missing	
MISSING	8	609	13.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4031 Missing cases 613

F1S107B PARENT'S REC'D WARNING ABOUT R'S GRADES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	1711	36.8	42.2	42.2
ONCE OR TWICE	1	1866	40.2	46.0	88.2
MORE THAN TWICE	2	478	10.3	11.8	100.0
MISSING	8	589	12.7	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4055 Missing cases 589

F1S107C PARENTS REC'D WARNING ABOUT R'S BEHAVIOR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NEVER	0	3129	67.4	77.7	77.7
ONCE OR TWICE	1	693	14.9	17.2	94.9
MORE THAN TWICE	2	207	4.5	5.1	100.0
MISSING	8	615	13.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4029 Missing cases 615

F1QFLG FIRST FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE AVAILABLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
STUDENT QUEX COMPLETE	1	4644	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4644 Missing cases 0

F1BYQFLG BASE YEAR QUESTIONNAIRE AVAILABLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
COMPLETED BY QUEX	1	4644	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4644 Missing cases 0

F1PANFLG BASE YEAR & 1FU QUESTIONNAIRES AVAILABLE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BY AND 1FU COMPLETE	1	4644	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4644 Missing cases 0

F1SEQFLG ENROLLED 10TH GR. WHEN QUEX ADMINISTERED

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ENROLLED IN 10TH GRD	0	4644	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4644 Missing cases 0

F1SEX COMPOSITE SEX

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
MALE	1	2521	54.3	54.3	54.3
FEMALE	2	2123	45.7	45.7	100.0
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4644 Missing cases 0

F1RACE COMPOSITE RACE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
ASIAN,PACIFIC ISLANDR	1	175	3.8	3.8	3.8
HISPANIC	2	600	12.9	12.9	16.7
BLACK, NOT HISPANIC	3	482	10.4	10.4	27.1
WHITE, NOT HISPANIC	4	3323	71.6	71.7	98.8
AMER INDIAN, ALASKAN	5	57	1.2	1.2	100.0
MISSING	8	7	.2	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4637 Missing cases 7

F1SESQ SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUARTILE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	1179	25.4	25.4	25.4
QUARTILE 2	2	1337	28.8	28.8	54.2
QUARTILE 3	3	1241	26.7	26.7	80.9
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	887	19.1	19.1	100.0
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4644 Missing cases 0

F1PARED PARENTS' HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	1	502	10.8	10.8	10.8
HS GRADUATE OR GED	2	1103	23.8	23.8	34.6
GR HS & LT 4YR DEG	3	2078	44.7	44.8	79.4
COLLEGE GRAD	4	542	11.7	11.7	91.1
M.A. OR EQUIVALENT	5	256	5.5	5.5	96.6
PH.D., M.D., OTHER	6	128	2.8	2.8	99.4
DON'T KNOW	7	29	.6	.6	100.0
MISSING	98	6	.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4638 Missing cases 6

F1LOCU2Q QUARTILE CODING OF VARIABLE F1LOCUS2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	1356	29.2	30.8	30.8
QUARTILE 2	2	1261	27.2	28.6	59.4
QUARTILE 3	3	1030	22.2	23.4	82.8
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	760	16.4	17.2	100.0
MISSING	8	237	5.1	Missing	
Total		4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4407 Missing cases 237

F1CNCPT2 QUARTILE CODING OF VARIABLE F1CNCPT2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
QUARTILE 1 LOW	1	1497	32.2	33.9	33.9
QUARTILE 2	2	1112	23.9	25.2	59.2
QUARTILE 3	3	990	21.3	22.4	81.6
QUARTILE 4 HIGH	4	811	17.5	18.4	100.0
MISSING	8	234	5.0	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4410 Missing cases 234

G10CTRL1 SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION REPORTED BY SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
PUBLIC	1	4144	89.2	89.5	89.5
CATHOLIC	2	251	5.4	5.4	95.0
PRIVATE,OTH RELIGION	3	93	2.0	2.0	97.0
PRIVATE, NON-RELIG.	4	129	2.8	2.8	99.8
PRIV,NOT ASCERTAINED	5	11	.2	.2	100.0
MISSING	98	16	.3	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4628 Missing cases 16

G10URBAN URBANICITY OF THE STUDENT'S SCHOOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
URBAN	1	1214	26.1	26.3	26.3
SUBURBAN	2	2652	57.1	57.5	83.8
RURAL - OUTSIDE MSA	3	750	16.1	16.2	100.0
MISSING	8	28	.6	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4616 Missing cases 28

G10REGION REGION OF THE COUNTRY (4 CENSUS REGIONS)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
NORTHEAST	1	811	17.5	17.5	17.5
NORTH CENTRAL	2	1377	29.7	29.7	47.3
SOUTH	3	1490	32.1	32.2	79.5
WEST	4	951	20.5	20.5	100.0
MISSING	98	15	.3	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4629 Missing cases 15

F1SCENRL ENTIRE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1 - 399	1	519	11.2	11.2	11.2
400 - 599	2	558	12.0	12.1	23.3
600 - 799	3	454	9.8	9.8	33.1
800 - 999	4	552	11.9	11.9	45.0
1000 - 1199	5	621	13.4	13.4	58.4
1200 - 1599	6	780	16.8	16.9	75.3
1600 - 1999	7	573	12.3	12.4	87.7
2000 - 2499	8	276	5.9	6.0	93.6
2500 +	9	295	6.4	6.4	100.0
MISSING	98	16	.3	Missing	
	Total	4644	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 4628 Missing cases 16