

FACTORS IN VOLUNTARY DROP-OUTS
IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY
SCHOOLS IN OREGON

by

BRETT RANDALL STUART

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

June 1955

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of School of Education

In Charge of Major

Redacted for Privacy

Chairman of School Graduate Committee

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented April 25, 1955

Typed by Ruth Stuart

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Dr. Franklin R. Zeran provided constant encouragement throughout the course of this study. His supervision and support aided greatly in its completion.

Dr. Frank L. Parks, Dr. James W. Sherburne, Dr. William R. Crooks, and Stanley E. Williamson gave freely of their time in making suggestions and criticisms designed to improve the form and content of the study.

Rex Putnam, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Cliff Robinson, Director of Secondary Education in Oregon, supported this study to the fullest extent, as did Clifford J. Skinner, President of the Oregon Association of Secondary School Principals.

Dr. Paul B. Jacobson, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Oregon, and Dr. Franklin R. Zeran, Dean of the School of Education at Oregon State College, extended the facilities of their departments by permitting graduate credit in Research for those persons responsible for the successful collection of data for this study.

The Northwest Cooperative Association of the Kellogg Foundation, administered by Dr. Donald E. Tope of the School of Education at the University of Oregon, provided necessary funds.

Dr. Jerome C. R. Li of the Mathematics Department of

Oregon State College gave wise counsel in proper statistical approaches to the problem.

Cooperation of the administrators in the participating schools made it possible to enlist the aid of a select group of guidance workers and interested teachers. Their diligent efforts brought forth required information.

This writer wishes to express his thanks to the above persons and agencies. Without their support this study could not have been carried to completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study	5
	Definitions	7
	Scope of the Study	9
	Development of Forms	11
	Method of Study	12
	Securing of Information	14
	Limitations	15
II	SURVEY OF LITERATURE	18
	Enumerative Studies	20
	Comparative Studies	25
	Follow-Up Studies	28
	Curriculum Studies	31
	Summary of Area Studies	31
	Related Studies	32
III	FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	34
	State-Wide Differences	34
	School Record Differences	35
	Significant Differences by Item	36
	Information Secured From Teacher Observation	39
	Teachers' Supporting Comments	40
	Information Secured by Personal Interview	44

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Sex Differences	47
Male Group	47
Information Secured From School Records	47
Information Secured From Teacher Observation	50
Information Secured By Personal Interview	51
Female Group	53
Information Secured From School Records	53
Information Secured From Teacher Observation	55
Information Secured By Personal Interview	57
Comparison of Male and Female Differences	59
Summary of Male and Female Differences	60
Grade Differences	62
Age Differences in Drop-Outs	64
Age Sixteen and Under	65
Information From School Records .	65
Teacher Observations	66
Personal Interview Responses . . .	67
Age Seventeen and Over	68
Information From School Records .	68
Teacher Observations	69
Personal Interview Responses . . .	70
Summary of Differences in Age Groups .	71

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Size of School	73
Schools Over One Thousand Students . .	74
Teacher Observations	75
Personal Interview Responses . . .	76
Schools With Five Hundred to One Thousand Student Enrollment	77
Teacher Observations	78
Personal Interview Responses . . .	79
Schools of Five Hundred or Fewer Students	80
Teacher Observations	81
Personal Interview Responses . . .	81
Summary of Size of School Differences	82
Differences by Geographic Location . .	85
Comparisons: East and West of Cascade Mountains	85
Summary of Geographic Differences . .	91
Comparison of Western Schools to Willamette Valley Only	93
Central Oregon Compared With Schools East of Cascades	93
Southern Oregon Drop-Outs	93
Interrelationships Within the Drop-Out Group	96
Home and Family Background Compared With Scholarship	97
Home and Family Background Compared With Test Data	98
Home and Family Background Compared With Health	98

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Home and Family Background Compared With Socialization	98
Home and Family Background Compared With Economic Status	99
Scholarship Compared With I.Q. of Drop-Out	99
Scholarship Compared With Reading Problems	100
Economic Background Compared With I.Q. of Drop-Out	100
Economic Background Compared With Socialization	100
Economic Background Compared With Health of Drop-Out	101
Economic Background Compared With Scholarship of Drop-Out	101
IV CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	103
Conclusions	103
Summary	110
Recommendations	117
BIBLIOGRAPHY	123
APPENDIX A	128
APPENDIX B	146
APPENDIX C	200

FACTORS IN VOLUNTARY DROP-OUTS IN SELECTED PUBLIC
SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN OREGON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The need for statistically valid information on characteristics of high school pupils in attendance, or who have dropped out of our public schools, has long been recognized. Securing such information has been difficult and to some extent ignored because the isolation of variables representing contributing causes is exceedingly difficult where humans are concerned.

Our problem becomes somewhat less complicated when we accept the fact that even though all individuals are different they still possess many similarities. Indeed we must recognize that it is quite possible that no one catalyst may be of sufficient strength to produce a reaction within the human animal. With each individual it may require a combination of variables operating in juxtaposition that bring about certain modes of behavior such as early termination of educational experience. Tracing the contributing factors resulting in early school leaving should then spotlight a number of possible causes.

Unfortunately, in the past, studies have been accepted with slightly more than empirical judgment on the part of

the examiners. The slow advance of human measurement and the difficulties involved in measuring attitudes and feelings have been the primary cause for the acceptance of inadequate explanations for early termination of educational experience by students who might still benefit from the curricula of the public schools.

The fact that measurement is difficult does not relieve us of the responsibility of improving our methods and technics of measurement. An adequate understanding of the limitations of our methods is imperative. Particularly great is the need for comparative studies. It is not enough to list reasons given by the drop-out for leaving school, giving most credence to the reasons listed most often.

For example, one of the reasons listed by students for dropping out of our public high schools is given as enlistment in the armed forces. At first examination this appears as an adequate explanation for early termination of educational experience. When the facts are known we find that the leaders of our armed forces urge the student to stay in school. In the pamphlet "Straight from the Shoulder", a message to high school students from the U. S. Air Force, this policy is underlined by the statement:

Regardless of the motivation, the U. S. Air Force wants you to stay in school. When you graduate,

there will be a spot for you. It will be a good spot, something you couldn't qualify for without a diploma. You'll be of much greater value to the Air Force--and yourself--once you've graduated from high school. (34, p.6)

Unless the principal of the school is willing to state that the student is no longer profiting by his educational experience, or if the student has reached the age of twenty, there is no danger from the draft. Such being the case, entrance into the armed forces is not a basic cause for drop-out.

One study listing "dissatisfaction with school" as the reason students drop out indicates that fifty-seven per cent of the students who dropped are placed in this category. (20, p.33) One might well say that with few exceptions the drop-outs are dissatisfied with school. However, it may be assumed that a number of non-leavers might also be placed in this category. Numerous studies in the field indicate that the drop-out is generally dissatisfied with school. While they may not have a statistically valid base for this statement, it would seem the reason for the student's dissatisfaction is of paramount importance. Such reasons are the equivalent of saying that a man dies because his heart stops. This may be true, but the reason the heart stopped is more important from the standpoint of diagnosis of cause.

What are the basic factors behind the dissatisfaction with school as expressed by the drop-out? Why do they

leave school before all reasonable chance of success is exhausted? In the State of Oregon an estimated 110,000 potential high school graduates have left school since 1930. (26, p.3) The financial loss to the school systems in basic support money would represent an alarming total.

In "Improving the Holding Power of Public Schools", a manual published by the West Virginia Education Association, indications are that twenty-one per cent of the drop-outs in West Virginia occur in the ninth grade, eighteen per cent in the tenth grade, eight per cent in the eleventh grade, and seven per cent occur in the final year of school. The above study further states that only one-half of the potential graduating class in West Virginia stays until the tenth grade and that finally, when graduation day arrives, only thirty-five out of each hundred are still on hand to receive their diplomas. (38, p.20) There is no reason to believe the above situation will improve overnight.

The drop-out is usually the pupil who stays in the community, finding whatever work is available. His vote concerning public school affairs is as important as that of the most well-educated member of the community. It is doubtful if his dissatisfaction with school will be represented in a favorable outlook toward future educational improvement in the schools which require additional tax funds. This student represents a potential threat to the

healthy community by virtue of the difficulty he might find in securing full-time continuous gainful employment. His energies might well be represented in the crime statistics of the community. The cost of crime to the community has continued to increase in almost all sections of the United States. Welfare rolls may well bear the drop-out's name, representing another drain on community funds. While adequate studies to verify the above statements have not yet been made, numerous drop-out surveys show that the drop-out is continuously a high representation of the lower socio-economic group. It is well known that crime, welfare dependency, and joblessness is most prevalent in this group. It is probably true that the necessary expense involved in providing adequate educational facilities which might be required to keep the drop-out in school would also represent an expense, but where is money better spent: For crime prevention, law enforcement and welfare, or in making better citizens to begin with by providing educational opportunity for all youth?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to discover factors in voluntary drop-outs in selected public secondary schools in Oregon. This study is designed to find basic differences between those students who remain in high school until graduation and those who terminate their educational

experience before high school graduation. Further, this study has the purpose of locating those factors which, singly or in combination, affect the drop-out in such a way as to cause termination of high school training before graduation.

Earl J. McGrath, past U. S. Commissioner of Education, in speaking to the Work Conference on Life Adjustment Education in Chicago in February of 1951, said:

A year ago it was apparent that the school systems you represent were reducing school drop-outs and improving the adjustment of pupils to schools and communities by such measures as eliminating hidden tuition costs, developing educational programs for semiskilled jobs, and extending participation in school activities so that more youth develop a sense of belonging...Yet the truth of the matter is that, although we schoolmen have many good hunches about effective ways to hold boys and girls in school, we have little valid evidence as to what will really do the job... For too long, schools have approached the complex problem of education through isolated and piecemeal efforts. (33, p.3)

At the Governor's Conference on California's Children and Youth in 1954, which was held in Sacramento, California, the need for more information about drop-outs was stressed. In the first recommendation made by the group on the problem of school drop-outs it was stated, "With all the information available on the nature, extent, and cause of school drop-outs, there is a felt need for more and better facts about this problem. Facts which will help establish a means of early identification of the potential drop-outs;..." (11, p.73)

This study is constructed in order to provide additional information as the need has been indicated above.

As has been stated in the California Test Bureau Bulletin on Technique of Follow-up Study of School Leavers:

A school may determine its success also by examining its product. The school may ascertain the cause of its "crop failures" and "unmarketable crops" by evaluating its curriculum, instructional service, and guidance practices in the light of findings revealed by the records of school-leavers, and make necessary changes and modification. (1, p.1)

This study hopes to provide a tool which might be utilized in aiding the schools to determine the success or failure of their "product".

DEFINITIONS

Factor - For the purpose of this study a factor is one of the elements which contributes to bring about any given result. In the case of this study the result being drop-out from high school before graduation. The word "element" serves to emphasize that a factor is a basic symptom or cause for drop-out, and not an expression of feeling resulting from a cause.

Drop-out - For the purpose of this study a drop-out is defined as a pupil who has left school permanently for reasons other than graduation or transfer to another school, with the exception of those pupils who leave day school to take employment and complete required subjects in evening school in order to qualify for high school

graduation. A person is not a drop-out who discontinues school because of transfer to another school, illness, death, draft, exclusion or commitment to an institution. This definition of drop-outs concentrates the problem on the child who withdraws from school from causes which can, to some extent, be governed.

This definition of drop-out follows in essence many other previous studies, holding particularly close to the drop-out as defined in a "Report on Holding Power in the Grand Rapids, Michigan Public Schools." (13, p.3)

Non-Leaver - A non-leaver is defined as a pupil presently enrolled in the public schools.

Early School-Leaver is a term synonymous with a drop-out.

Secondary School - As here defined, secondary school includes grades nine to twelve. This definition is contrary to the organization of some of the secondary schools in the state, but serves the purpose of limiting this study to secondary school students during those years when there is the greatest tendency to drop out.

Gross Differences - As used in this study the term "gross differences" represents the combination of the "Yes" and "No" responses to items of a related nature, and the computation of chi-square values for the items so combined.

Chi-Square - As chi-square is employed in this study

it is a method used to test the significance of the difference between the frequency of occurrence of two percentages of response as it applies to differences between characteristics of drop-outs on the one hand, and non-leavers on the other. This is done by use of the formulae $X^2 = \sum \frac{(O-T)^2}{T}$; Where X^2 is chi-square and "O" represents the frequency of occurrence of the "Yes" and "No" response, with "T" representing the calculated theoretical or hypothetical frequency of response. (6, p.184)

5% Level of Significance - If there is no real difference between the percentage of "Yes" or "No" responses of the drop-out and non-leaver groups, the chance of getting a X^2 value over 3.84 is five out of one hundred. Therefore the value 3.84 is used as a standard. If the X^2 value is greater than 3.84, the difference between the two groups is significant. If it is less than 3.84, the difference between the two groups is not significant. (Ibid, p.80)

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The drop-outs in this study were students in eighteen selected high schools in Oregon who fitted the definition of drop-outs above, and who left school during the 1953-54 academic year. They were chosen from a sampling of the two hundred twenty-six high schools in the State of Oregon.

The high schools were selected on the basis of the

interest they had shown in problems of this kind as evidenced by their participation in the "Evaluative Criteria Program" conducted by the cooperative study of Secondary School Standards. (4, pp.27-34) The original sample consisted of twenty of the schools which had participated in the above program. They were selected on the basis of their representation of the schools of Oregon by geographic location, economic situation, size, and representation of population distribution in the state. The sample size was reduced to eighteen schools by the expressed unwillingness of one school to participate in the study, and the failure of one school to answer correspondence requesting permission to conduct the study. The sample was finally reduced to seventeen schools by failure on the part of one school to collect the information promised.

It should be stated here that the fine cooperation of the participating schools was of great value in the success of the study, and this cooperation was further stimulated by covering letters requesting support of the study over the signature of the State Superintendent of Schools, and the President of the Oregon Association of Secondary School Principals. Appendix, pp.200-201.

The drop-outs in this study represent only those persons who could be contacted by personal interview, and thus their responses represent the result of a person-to-person contact.

DEVELOPMENT OF FORMS

In the development of forms for this study it was necessary to meet the requirements for IBM evaluation. This initial requirement does not always lend itself to beauty of form, however ease of analysis of data was considered a more critical requirement.

Further development of the included forms vary somewhat from the usual pattern of other studies because one of the prime concerns of this study was isolation of factors related to drop-out as determined by comparison of responses of drop-out and non-leaver groups. It was felt that description of characteristics of drop-outs was not enough to determine factors in their dropping from school. The mere fact that a response occurs in quantity does not insure its validity. This significant truth might be demonstrated by the frequency of cancer among smokers. We might well attribute this cause to the use of tobacco, yet when the facts are known the tars from the burning of the paper in which the tobacco is rolled could well be the greater cause. The above, while in need of further proof, serves to illustrate the necessity for development of forms which would permit a comparison between the drop-out and the non-leaver. These forms are shown in the Appendix, pages 128-145. In the development of forms for this study consideration was given to numerous past studies

which have indicated certain factors as critical and significant in the early termination of educational experience by youth of high school age. In this study these hypothetical factors were tested for validity by the chi-square method as they related to the problem of drop-outs in selected Oregon schools.

METHOD OF STUDY

This study uses the chi-square method of comparison. In effect, this involves the comparison of differences between two groups. As it applies to this study, on the one hand, the drop-out; on the other, the non-leaver. To accomplish this purpose reasons were listed that had been given as significant reasons for drop-out by studies from nearly every state in the United States and from Canada. These reasons were then matched to remove duplication insofar as possible. This composite list of causes for drop-outs then had each item phrased as a question which could be answered with a categorical response as it concerned two groups: One group consisting of drop-outs, the other group consisting of non-leavers. The differences of response between the two groups were measured at the five per cent level of significance to determine basic differences between the two groups. Where the initial criteria of items selected from other studies applied outside the critical region of the chi-square curve the item was not

considered a significant factor in drop-outs in the State of Oregon high schools. Where the item fell within the critical region it was considered a significant factor in drop-outs in the State of Oregon high schools. Because a "Yes" or "No" response might not have provided adequate opportunity for clarifying explanation of the response, space was provided on the questionnaire forms for this purpose.

For ease of securing the necessary responses it was found that the questions for the forms could be divided into three groups. The first group consisted of information which could be secured from school records. The second group, information which could be secured from a teacher who had direct contact with the drop-out or non-leaver. In the case of the teacher, a social studies teacher who had taught the student was suggested as a first choice; or, where this was not possible, information was secured from a teacher who had taught the student in a required course. The third group of questions consisted of information which could be secured by direct interview of the drop-out or a member of the comparison group of non-leavers.

The selection of the comparison group of non-leavers was achieved by taking a random sample of non-leavers presently enrolled in the high schools that were the subject

of the drop-out study. A statistical table of random numbers was used for this purpose. (18, 60p) The comparison group was equivalent in size and by grade in school to the 1953-54 drop-out group. A check was made to assure the fact that there was no significant difference between the 1953-54 non-leaver and the 1954-55 non-leaver before the study was made.

To further simplify the forms, the non-leaver group of forms were reproduced on white paper while the drop-out forms were reproduced on buff. This was deemed advisable because the question content of the forms for the two groups was identical except for tense of phrasing.

Non-leaver forms were labeled A-1, B-1 and C-1. Drop-out forms were labeled A-2, B-2 and C-2. The "A" forms contain the information to be secured from school records, the "B" forms contain the information to be secured from the teacher, and the "C" forms contain information to be secured directly from the subjects of the study. Appendix, pages 128-145.

SECURING OF INFORMATION

The information for this study was secured from the school records, the teacher, and the subjects of the study through the use of interviewers who represented each of the seventeen schools in the study. These individuals

were for the most part guidance people in the various schools, or administrators and teachers who evidenced a personal interest in the use of the results such a study might provide for use in their school.

Each interviewer was contacted personally and the method of study and approach to securing the information was carefully explained. Uniformity of approach to the collection of data was emphasized, and questions of detail of method were referred to a central source to assure continuation of uniformity throughout the gathering of data.

When all available information had been secured, it was punched on IBM cards. A form was designed for the purpose of recording the frequency of occurrences of similar traits between drop-outs and non-leavers, and the analysis was made.

LIMITATIONS

The study was limited by the size of the sample. The total sample consisted of four hundred students. Two hundred of them drop-outs, and two hundred who were non-leavers. The drop-outs were a sampling of students who left school during the 1953-54 school year.

The distribution of male and female drop-outs proved to be exactly equal through chance. One hundred female

drop-outs and one hundred male drop-outs were examined and compared with equal groups of female and male non-leavers.

In schools with enrollments of five hundred students and less, sixty-five drop-outs and sixty-five non-leavers were examined and compared. In schools with enrollments of five hundred to one thousand students, sixty-five drop-outs and sixty-five non-leavers were examined and compared. In schools with enrollments of one thousand students and over, seventy-one drop-outs and seventy-one non-leavers were examined and compared.

The grade nine sample consisted of forty-four drop-outs and forty-four non-leavers. The grade ten sample consisted of fifty-one drop-outs and fifty-one non-leavers. The grade eleven sample consisted of fifty-five drop-outs and fifty-five non-leavers. The grade twelve sample consisted of fifty drop-outs and fifty non-leavers.

By age the sample sizes were not equal in matching because this section was not completed in its entirety by all interviewers, and because of the fact that fewer non-leavers were in the seventeen year and older group than non-leavers. In the sixteen year old and under group, one hundred and five non-leavers were examined and compared to eighty-one drop-outs. In the seventeen years of age and older group, ninety-two non-leavers and one hundred and fifteen drop-outs were examined and evaluated compared to

eighty-one drop-outs.

The size of the sample was considered adequate by the graduate committee and consultation with the statistics and IBM departments supported this judgment. The limitation of sample size still exists theoretically, however, until it increases to the size of the population being sampled. Of course, when this occurs it is no longer a sample, it is the population, and the limitation would then no longer exist.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF LITERATURE

Research studies on drop-outs made their entrance into the educational literature during the first years of the twentieth century. These initial studies were primarily directed toward counting the number of students who were leaving school before graduation (29). As greater numbers of students entered the public high schools of the United States and compulsory attendance laws were increasingly in effect throughout the country, more studies of an inquiring nature into the problems associated with drop-outs in public schools became a subject of research.

A review of the literature in the field of follow-up studies of drop-outs reveals that for the most part this research is an accounting of possible reasons for early school leaving. These studies have been made as the student terminates his schooling, or at dates from one to ten years later.

While the above studies of drop-outs have laid an important groundwork in supplying a more adequate understanding of the problem, they are lacking in certain respects. They have not provided a concise means of identification of the potential drop-out. They have not fully met the requirements of statistical verification.

Three other types of research in the area of drop-outs have frequently been used. One of these is the comparative study. This kind of study made its appearance as early as 1931. Buckner (2) appears to have been the first to utilize it. These studies have attempted to make a comparison between high school graduates and drop-outs, between two groups of drop-outs, or between drop-outs and non-leavers. It would seem to this writer that, because of its statistical validity, this type of study would offer the best possibility for accurate research in the field at the present time.

Other research in the field of drop-outs occurs as an incidental part of broader attempts to follow the progress of the product of the public school after either drop-out or graduation. This more generalized follow-up study has been important in the development of methods for drop-out research. It has also brought emphasis to the drop-out problem.

Investigation of curriculum problems has also contributed to studies of drop-outs. The "Evaluative Criteria" study in Oregon (4), through an examination of what schools are doing to prevent early school leaving, pays some attention to drop-outs as they might affect certain curriculum revisions in the public schools.

Research directed at estimating the holding power of

schools, including sections on drop-outs, is not infrequent. These studies usually fit into one of the preceding four classifications of studies and are primarily directed toward finding means of retaining the student in school.

ENUMERATIVE STUDIES

As studies enumerating possible reasons for drop-out are the most frequent and are among those which have been done on the largest scale to the present time, the general purpose of such studies is deserving of mention here. In "A Preliminary Study of Drop-Outs in Oregon High Schools" a statement is made by Dr. Buell G. Gallagher to illustrate the need for this type of study. Dr. Gallagher states:

If we are to educate all, we must educate each and the whole of each. . .The nation's schools will begin to reach all youth only if and when there is a concerted effort in every state and in every school district and in every school in each district to provide the kind of school experience which will impel voluntary attendance after legal compulsion ends. (26, p.1)

This statement might well be applied to all types of studies in the field of drop-outs.

In a recent study conducted throughout the State of Kentucky, which goes into considerable detail concerning characteristics and attitudes of youth who left school, the purpose of the study was stated very well in the

following manner. "The purpose of this study is to discover evidence which would indicate early signs of vulnerability to early school leaving and to determine measures secondary schools in Kentucky might take to increase their holding power." (14, p.7)

Further emphasizing the purpose of enumerative studies of drop-outs, Dean N. Evans states, "Many factors in withdrawal will be beyond the control of the school. The main job that the high school faces is the identification of those factors which seem to lead to withdrawal and the correction of those phases over which it can exercise some control." (9, p.33)

The enumerative study has served the very useful purpose of bringing attention to the fact that there is a drop-out problem in the nation's high schools. It has also revealed that drop-outs have certain observable differences which set them apart from non-leavers. While the statistical validity of such studies might be open to question, they have nevertheless served the important purpose of pointing out that the drop-out is different from the non-leaver in many respects.

When enumerating the possible reasons for drop-outs it is interesting to note that these studies have frequently recorded the reasons that drop-outs give for early school leaving, calling the reasons given most frequently

significant cause for drop-out. While these reasons may, of course, be true factors in early drop-out, they are suspect until compared with the attitudes and characteristics of the non-leaver group.

In the publication "Why Do Boys and Girls Drop Out of School and What Can We Do About It?", which was prepared by the Work Conference on Life Adjustment Education, many of the characteristics of drop-outs are listed (35). For example, they state that in respect to reasons related to the school itself, drop-outs indicated in order of frequency that they:

1. Preferred work to school.
2. Were not interested in school work.
3. Could not learn and were discouraged.
4. Were failing and didn't want to repeat the grade.
5. Disliked a certain teacher.
6. Disliked a certain subject.
7. Could learn more out of school than in school.
(35, p.10)

The drop-outs also listed financial reasons for not going to school. For example, in the same study cited above, they indicated:

1. They needed more money to buy clothes and to help at home.
2. They wanted more spending money. (Ibid, p.10)

The same group of drop-outs gave personal reasons for

leaving school, stating:

1. Friends had left school.
2. Parents wanted them to leave school.
(Opcit, p.10)

From a study by Harold J. Dillon, which was cited in the above-quoted Work Conference on Life Adjustment Education publication, it can be seen that reasons relating to school were given more frequently as a cause for drop-out than financial or personal reasons over which the school would have slight or no control.

In reporting the characteristics of drop-outs from a study of "Early School Leavers in Kentucky," it was found that when teachers appraised former students who had dropped out they indicated that:

1. Speech disorders were frequent.
2. The students were too aggressive.
3. They caused trouble.
4. They were not interested in school.
5. They seemed unhappy or worried.
6. They were sullen and resentful.
7. They were immature. (14, p.45)

The teachers reported characteristics of drop-outs, in addition to the above, most of them indicating that the drop-outs were suffering from definite attitude problems.

In the same study the drop-outs themselves indicated:

1. They preferred work to school.

2. They weren't interested in school.
3. They were failing and did not want to repeat a grade.
4. They disliked a certain teacher.
5. They could not learn and were discouraged.
6. They disliked a certain subject.
7. They needed money to buy clothes and help at home.
8. They wanted spending money.
9. Marriage.
10. Their parents wanted them to leave.
11. Their friends had left. (Ibid, p.48)

In reviewing other enumerative studies a certain amount of overlap of reasons why drop-outs leave school soon becomes apparent. Melcher (21), Lanier (19), Gragg (12), and Jensen (16) list reasons similar to the above.

A study by the Evansville public schools on characteristics of drop-outs found that the scholastic aptitude of the drop-out group was below average, that their reading ability was impaired, that there was much instability in many of the homes, and that parents were frequently apathetic. This study found, in addition, that approximately one-third of the drop-outs frequently transferred from one school to another and that the names of the potential drop-outs were often listed among the absentees and failures of the school. According to this study sixty-five per cent of the drop-outs do not participate in

extracurricular activities and many of them were behavior problems (10). In a study reported by Stewart many of the above reasons were corroborated (32).

In "Now Hear Youth," a study which contains the report on the California Co-operative Study of School Drop-outs and Graduates, the reasons why students leave school, as they were determined from student interviews and school records, were lumped into four classifications. In order of frequency of occurrence they were:

1. Dissatisfaction with school.
2. Marriage.
3. Financial.
4. Entrance into armed forces. (15, p.33)

COMPARATIVE STUDIES

One of the first comparative studies was made by Mabel Buckner. She examined reasons for drop-out before graduation by looking at school records, surveying teacher opinion, and through interview of drop-outs. After she had collected information on one hundred ninety-six drop-outs she divided them into two groups and compared one group against the other as a means of determining internal consistency of response between the two sections (2). Her purpose was consistent with that of many enumerative studies, but her methodology was a step toward more accurate statistical research.

Joseph Samler made a comparative study in the metropolitan area of New York City (28). Over an eight months' period of time he studied factors which were associated chiefly with educational and vocational adjustments of students of schools offering commercial or academic courses. He made comparisons between graduate boys and drop-out boys taking a general course, and between graduate boys and drop-out boys taking a commercial course. He then did the same with a group of girls, and finally summarized the total graduate group against the total drop-out group. Samler found that drop-outs and graduates differed in many respects. For example, adjustment of the graduates was superior to that of the drop-outs. The I.Q. of the graduates was generally higher. The graduates had a higher scholastic attainment record (Ibid). Samler made no attempt to examine the extent of the differences encountered as a means of determining their significance.

Leonard M. Miller (23) made a comparative study of drop-outs and graduates in Virginia with the express purpose of finding out differences in employment status of the two groups. He found little difference in the amount of employment between the two groups, but 18.3 per cent of the graduates were employed in professional and managerial job classifications while only 2.7 per cent of the non-graduates were employed in similar jobs.

Rudolph F. Sando (29) employed the comparative study approach to study differences between drop-outs and non-leavers as they applied to sophomores in eight high schools of Contra Costa County, California. Sando spent about an hour with each sophomore drop-out. He contacted them within a week after they had left public school and talked with them about their feelings and thinking in regard to various aspects of school life. A prepared student opinionnaire was used as a basis for interview. An equal number of sophomore students who remained in school were also interviewed. They were selected by pairing each drop-out with a non-leaver of the same sex who was similar to the drop-out in the school in which he was enrolled, in socio-economic status, and the ratio of promotion. This type of approach provided a method of comparing the differences between the non-leaver who had the characteristics of the drop-out and the drop-out for the purpose of finding holding power factors.

Richard H. Dresher has provided the latest known information of a comparative study type in his doctoral thesis which studies factors in voluntary drop-outs in the Detroit, Michigan public high schools (8). This study compares the relationship between differences in selected criteria as they apply to the drop-out. In an article (7) describing his study, Dresher states that the drop-outs

in the study were all the pupils who did not return or who withdrew voluntarily during the month of September, 1951, from eighteen academic high schools, one trade school and one technical school in the Detroit public school system. His study tests the interrelatedness of three hundred one criteria.

FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

While drop-out studies are all follow-up studies, they represent just one phase of this type of study. Because of the many follow-up studies that report in part on characteristics of drop-outs and various ways and means of holding potential drop-outs in school, they will also be noted.

One of the major contributions of follow-up studies has been to bring to the attention of the public schools the need for checking on their product. In chapter ten of the book "Foundations of Guidance Services," presently being written by Franklin R. Zeran, this need is emphasized by the statement: "The realization by educators that the school has an interest in and a responsibility for the adjustment of its out of school youth, as well as for those still in school, has emphasized the necessity of studying each individual, in order that the school may meet the needs of the individual and the demands of society." (39)

The Utah State Department of Public Instruction has published a manual of procedure for the "Follow-Up Study of High School Graduates and Drop-Outs" (36) and also has produced a supplement to this manual of procedure (Ibid). These manuals of procedure, while directed particularly at Utah State schools, serve to provide many suggestions on how to conduct follow-up studies. The Michigan holding power study (22) serves the same purpose.

The Oregon Association of Secondary-School Principals devised a questionnaire to be utilized for collecting information from students who have left or are leaving high school (25). Questionnaires of this type may well be utilized with various implementations to meet the local situation in the initiation of drop-out studies.

Brewster and Zeran (1) have provided in outline form the steps in preliminary planning, scope and technic, work schedule and estimating cost, preparation of forms, directing of personnel, and other vital steps to be taken in the conduct of a follow-up study.

In the pamphlet "Improving the Holding Power of the Public Schools," which was published by the West Virginia Education Association, several methods of collecting information about drop-outs are given and the loss of potential high school graduates is emphasized (37).

One of the most complete follow-up studies compiled

to date has been the "Report on Holding Power in the Grand Rapids, Michigan, Public Schools K-14" (13). This study provides an excellent definition of a drop-out; it focuses attention on the number of students leaving the high schools in Grand Rapids, and it lists reasons why students are so eager to leave school before graduation. In describing the potential drop-out in Grand Rapids, Michigan, the results of many other studies seem to be verified. Some of the typical items found to have bearing on potential drop-outs are:

1. A student who is two years older than his grade group.
2. A poor attendance and tardiness record.
3. Aggressiveness.
4. Lack of interest.
5. Reading difficulties.
6. Immaturity.
7. "Broken home."
8. Intelligence.
9. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
10. Failure to participate in gym activities.
(Ibid, p.19)

These are but a few of the reasons which the Michigan study lists as cause of drop-out, but all the reasons listed are consistent with other studies. As with most enumerative studies, this report states that no extensive

analysis of reasons students give for leaving is made.

(Opcit, p.8)

CURRICULUM STUDIES

Brief mention should also be made of studies primarily concerned with a revision of curriculum and an examination of the school's offerings. A study of the type provided by the "Evaluative Criteria" program of the Co-operative Study of Secondary-School Standards serves the purpose of bringing to our attention the fact that once cognizance has been taken that schools are not fulfilling the function of educating all youth, certain revisions in curriculum which would enable the schools to do a better job might be introduced (4).

Harold J. Dillon, reporting on "Work Experience Programs" (5), has examined the results of providing certain curriculum revisions as they might tend to hold the potential drop-out within the public school curriculum. He has indicated that by providing an opportunity to certain of the secondary school students of a combined classroom and work experience program, many students who might otherwise have dropped from school have received the benefit of a high school education.

SUMMARY OF AREA STUDIES

The criteria selected for comparison as applied to

drop-out and non-leaver groups in the study were selected from a wide range of studies. Major among these were "Report on Holding Power in the Grand Rapids, Michigan, Public Schools K-14" (13), "Early School Leavers in Kentucky" (14), and "Factors in Voluntary Drop-Outs in the Public Secondary Schools of Detroit, Michigan" (8). Among lesser studies which verified, and in some cases supplemented, the above studies were "Your Child Leaves School" (3), "Findings in Ithaca's Continuous Survey of Drop-Outs" (12), "Seven Ways to Help Prevent Drop-Outs" (15), "Why Young People Leave School" (17), "Why High School Pupils Leave School" (21), "A Study of Pupils Dropping Out of Midwestern High School" (30), and "Why They Drop Out: Eight Clues to Greater Holding Power" (31). These studies, as they were corroborated by others, were used in selection of items as they are found in the questionnaire forms in the Appendix, pages 128-145.

RELATED STUDIES

Four studies were found which in their approach to the problem of drop-outs most closely approximate the examination of the problem as undertaken by this study. Buckner (2) first used chi-square comparison as a method of differentiating factors related to drop-out within the drop-out group. Samler (28) specifically isolated factors

of difference between drop-outs and graduates, but did not survey the significance of such differences. Dresher (8) applied the chi-square method to three hundred one relationships between certain selected criteria, and Sande (29) actually compared factors of difference between drop-outs in the sophomore year of high school and certain non-leavers selected because they possessed similar characteristics of the drop-outs.

None of the previous studies utilized all of the following techniques:

1. Examination of selected criteria classified by previous studies as significant reason for drop-out.
2. Random sampling of non-leaver group as basis for comparison.
3. Isolation of those factors which actually proved significant after chi-square comparison.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study indicated that there were certain specific factors of difference between drop-outs and non-leavers in the high schools of the State of Oregon. These differences can be determined from information that is available from three sources: The school records, teachers who have had the students in their classes, and from personal interview of the subjects of study.

Many criteria were the subject of a critical analysis to determine whether or not they were significant cause for drop-out in the schools of Oregon. Many of these items proved to be significant, but in varying circumstances and as they were subject to certain conditions.

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES

Differences between drop-outs and non-leavers in the schools studied were examined on a state-wide basis as a means of isolating those factors which were significant cause for drop-out.

The records of the drop-outs were compared with those of the non-leaver. Responses of non-leavers to the thirty-one items on Form A-1 were paired with corresponding

responses of drop-outs to the thirty-one items on Form A-2. Chi-square differences were calculated at the five per cent level of significance. Chi-square values computed at 3.84 and above were called significant factors in drop-out; chi-square values computed at 3.83 and below were indicated as not significant cause for drop-out. When tested at the five per cent level of significance the chance of getting a X^2 value over 3.84 is only five out of one hundred unless the difference in responses of the two groups is really significant.

The teacher observations of the non-leaver and drop-out groups were also compared in the manner described above, as were the responses of the non-leaver and the drop-out. The "B" forms contained the teacher observations, and the "C" forms contained the responses of the non-leavers and drop-outs. Appendix A, pp.128-145 .

School Record Differences (Appendix A, pp.128-133)

A comparison of responses of non-leavers to those of drop-outs showed gross differences in the following areas:

1. The home and family background of the drop-out was less favorable than that of the non-leaver. See Appendix B, p.146.
2. The intelligence level of the drop-out proved to be below that of the non-leaver. See Appendix B, p.146 .
3. The socio-economic status of the drop-out was below the level of the non-leaver. See Appendix B, p.146 .

4. The scholarship record of the drop-out was inferior to that of the non-leaver. See Appendix B, p. 146.

The overall health patterns of the drop-outs proved to be equivalent to those of the non-leaver. See Appendix B, p. 146.

Significant Differences by Item (Appendix B, p.146)

Records of the drop-outs showed a greater tendency of occurrence in respect to the following factors:

Home & Family

1. Sex (Differences examined separately; see p.⁴⁷~~37~~)
3. Three or more school transfers since eighth grade.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. A record of tardiness.
6. A record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.
8. Student from a "broken home."
12. I.Q. score below 90.
14. Reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in two or more extracurricular activities each year of attendance.
17. Student or family received welfare aid.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.

19. Failure of student to dress down for gym activities.

21. Low economic status of family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".

27. Student put back a grade during grade or high school attendance.

28. Failure of required courses.

29. Failure of elective courses.

30. Failure of English.

31. Failure of mathematics. (Appendix B, p.146)

In reviewing the above items it should be noted that failure of a required course appeared to be more significant as a cause of drop-out than failure of elective courses.

The following items:

20. Economic status of family: Average or above?

26. Grade average of "C" or above.

showed a significant difference between drop-outs and non-leavers. Specifically, they revealed that the drop-out rarely came from a family with an above-average income, and that he seldom was a student with a grade average of "C" or above.

The following data secured from the school records proved to be of no significance in distinguishing between the drop-out and the non-leaver in the schools studied in

the State of Oregon:

9. Foreign language spoken extensively at home by parents.
10. Foreign language spoken extensively at home by student.
13. I.Q. differences when above 91 were not significant.
16. Receipt of books and supplies on a gratuity basis.
22. Physical health handicaps.
23. Doctor's excuse from P. E. (Appendix B, p.146)

The Grand Rapids, Michigan study (13, p.19) was in agreement with some of the above items. For example, they found that the following items were critical "weathervanes" in drop-out:

1. A student who is unrecommended or passed on trial to the next grade. See item 27 above.
2. A student who is two years older than his grade group. See item 18 above.
3. A student who has a poor attendance and tardiness record. See items 5 and 6 above.
4. A boy or girl who refuses to participate in gym activities, refuses to dress down, or stands on the sidelines. See item 19 above.

The Kentucky study (14, p.47) showed that failure in school contributed to the drop-out problem. See items 28 through 31, Appendix A, p.128. The Kentucky study indicated that poor health was a significant cause of drop-out. (Ibid, p.47) This was in disagreement with results found

in Oregon. See items 22 and 23, Appendix A, p.133, and Appendix B, p.146.

Information Secured From Teacher Observation (Appendix A, pp.134-139)

From Forms B-1 and B-2 it was quite apparent that teachers observed tremendous differences between negative attitudes as evidenced by the drop-out and those evidenced by the non-leaver. The drop-out was observed to have shown a significantly greater number of negative characteristics than the non-leaver.

The following factors proved to be significant in differentiating between the drop-out and the non-leaver as the two groups were observed by teachers:

1. Drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. The drop-out lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school.
6. They caused trouble more often than the non-leaver.
7. The drop-out was more secretive and seclusive.
8. The drop-out did not participate in class.
9. The drop-out did not get along well with the teacher.
10. The drop-out did not get along well with others.
12. The drop-out was sullen in class.

13. He was resentful of authority.
15. There was evidence of reading problems.
16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
17. The drop-out was more immature.
18. The drop-out was more irresponsible.
19. The drop-out possessed less effective study habits.
20. The drop-out displayed less school spirit.
(Appendix B, p.147)

There were no observable differences between the drop-out and the non-leaver as they appeared to the teacher in reference to the following items:

11. The drop-out, as compared with the non-leaver, did not appear overly aggressive in class.
14. The drop-out did not seem to suffer more frequently from speech disorders. (Appendix B, p.177)

Teachers' Supporting Comments

Some fairly typical comments of teachers concerning the drop-out group in reference to the above items might be of aid here in highlighting some of the differences. While the comments are recognized as subjective in nature, they are included because they are representative of teachers' responses to questionnaire items.

Commenting on the unhappy and worried attitude of one drop-out, the teacher remarked that, "He seemed to have

some problem that I couldn't identify - either one of adjusting to school, or at home." "Family concern" was cited by another teacher, and worry that resulted in "constant headaches" was given as an example of the student's expression of worry shortly before drop-out.

The aforementioned tendency of the drop-out to be easily discouraged is further emphasized by the comments of teachers, as follows: "He was convinced he couldn't make it before he came into the class." Another teacher observed, "She felt inadequate in school affairs."

Lack of initiative and lack of self-confidence were evidenced in the following remark concerning one drop-out. "He did only the minimum of assignments and was socially unaware of himself." Another teacher said of her former student, "He never spoke up to recite." Other teachers, speaking of students' initiative and self-confidence, made such comments as, "She never seemed to know what she was supposed to do," and "She just couldn't seem to get started with her work."

Lack of interest in school was seen by teachers in the drop-out's frequent "skipping". Another common remark was, "He was attending because his parents made him."

Causing trouble in class was primarily reflected in the student's efforts to get attention. For example, "He used many attention getting devices." "Excessive talking"

also was frequently listed.

Secretive and seclusive drop-outs were frequently those who only participated in class when asked specific questions, and then they oftentimes showed a sullenness of response. Secretive students were characterized by this type of teacher observation: "She had one friend in class, and did not mix socially." About the same student in reference to class participation, "Very little classroom participation - usually very quiet and inactive." Another student who was seclusive "Didn't mix with other students--excused 10 min early for job--blame hair-lip and poor clothes." Failure to mix with other students was often listed as a characteristic of the drop-out.

Failure to get along with the teacher was emphasized by such statements as, "I finally threw him out," and "The only reason we got along was because we had little contact with each other." Not a few comments in regard to the troublemaker were of the type that stated, "It depends on the teacher and the situation."

The drop-out frequently did not get along well with others, was sullen in class and resentful of authority. Teachers often observed, "He was too withdrawn to get along--no contact with others at all," and "She just did not seek out others." Or, the student was "Much admired

by the duck-tailed¹ crowd, not much by others." Resentment of authority ranged from some slight amount to complete rebellion. One student would not even bring his books back to school when he dropped. Sullen students were characterized by considerable variability of mood.

Teachers cited many instances of immature and irresponsible behavior on the part of the drop-out. One junior boy would throw tantrums when, as the teacher stated it, she could not answer his incomprehensible questions. One teacher indicated that there were many scenes, and childish tricks and displays on the part of the student. Failure to turn in assignments was also given as a sign of irresponsible behavior. This failure to turn in assignments was also cited as the result of less effective study habits on the part of the drop-out. Complete apathy was listed on occasion, as demonstrated by this teacher comment: "He did not try to study at all."

The teachers frequently felt that the drop-out showed no interest in the school at all in respect to school spirit. "No apparent interest in school at all," was a characteristic comment in this regard. "School was kid stuff to him," remarked another teacher. Some teachers commented only, "No spirit."

Teachers were in rather close agreement in their

¹A slang expression denoting membership in a group characterized by a type of haircut.

observations of the behavioral characteristics of drop-outs. Almost invariably their comments were based on behavior that ranged from mild to extreme action on the part of the drop-out. Their comments about non-leaver behavior was almost invariably on the milder side and, of course, there were fewer incidents reported.

The Kentucky study (14, p.45) substantiated teacher observations, as shown above, in many instances. It was found that the drop-out was:

Easily discouraged.

Lacking in initiative.

Sullen and resentful.

Immature.

Irresponsible.

The West Virginia study (39, p.20) was in agreement with many aspects of teacher observations as cited above. It stated that the students:

Lacked interest.

Resented authority.

"Did not try" to do their work.

Information Secured By Personal Interview (Appendix A, pp.140-145)

Personal interview of the drop-outs revealed significant differences in their responses and the responses of non-leavers to identical items.

The drop-outs had more school problems, they gave evidence of more socio-economic problems, and they had more problems related to home and family living.

Responding to questions raised during the course of personal interview, the drop-outs were significantly different from the non-leavers in the following respects:

Problems Related to the School

2. They felt they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. They generally disliked their teachers.
4. They disliked one particular teacher.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
7. They wished they could change to other courses than those they had been carrying.
8. They wanted specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
9. They felt classes were too large.
10. They wanted more contact with a guidance counselor.
13. They felt certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.
14. They felt that they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They showed reluctance toward completing high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.

19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
21. They needed money to buy clothes.
22. They needed money to help at home.
23. They felt "left out" of school activities.
24. They would like an opportunity to work part time and go to school part time.

Home & Family

26. Their parents frequently suggested that they leave school.
27. They often considered dropping school to be married. (Appendix B, p.148)

It was also evident from personal interview that the drop-out seldom contacted anyone connected with the school in advance of dropping classes.

Drop-outs also showed less tendency to dislike any one particular teacher; rather, they appeared to dislike teachers in general. This seems to characterize the attitude of the drop-out toward school. Many times his attitude was not poor in reference to specific instances, but was evidenced by a generally negative approach toward school.

In reference to item twenty-three above, it was found that the drop-out frequently felt "left out" of school activities; however, he desired to participate as much as the non-leaver. Appendix B, p.148.

The following items reflected no significant difference between the drop-out and the non-leaver, based on

information secured from the "C" forms:

1. They stated they found it no more difficult to learn than did the non-leaver.
11. The non-leaver did not appear to wish more personal contact with his teacher than did the drop-out.
12. There was no difference in the desire of the two groups to participate in school activities.
15. There was no difference in frequency of career planning.
20. There was no difference shown between the two groups in the need for spending money.
25. There was no difference in the amount of part-time employment between the two groups.
(Appendix B, p.148)

SEX DIFFERENCES

In considering the differences in factors related to drop-out as they applied individually to the male and female groups, it was found that certain elements which applied to the males did not apply to the females, and vice versa.

Male Group

Information Secured From School Records (Appendix A, pp. 128-133)

From information which was secured from the school records it was found that certain factors were significant cause for drop-out. It will be shown that these factors were partly in agreement and partly at variance with the

responses of the female group. The following items were significant cause for drop-out in the male group:

Home & Family

3. Three or more school transfers since eighth grade.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. A record of tardiness.
6. A record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.

Test Data

12. I.Q. score below 90.
14. Reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in two or more extracurricular activities each year of attendance.
17. Student or family received welfare aid.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.
19. Failure of student to dress down for gym activities.
21. Low economic status of family.

Health

22. Student suffering from a physical health handicap.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
28. Failure of required courses.
30. Failure of English.

31. Failure of mathematics. (Appendix B, p.149)

The following items:

20. Economic status of family: Average or above?

26. Grade average of "C" or above.

revealed a significant difference between male drop-outs and male non-leavers. Specifically, they showed that the male drop-out rarely came from a family with an above-average income, and that he seldom was a student with a grade average of "C" or above.

The following data secured from the school records proved to be of no significance in distinguishing between the male drop-out and male non-leaver in the schools studied in the State of Oregon:

8. Student from a "broken home."
9. Foreign language spoken extensively at home by parents.
10. Foreign language spoken extensively at home by student.
13. I.Q. differences when above 91 were not significant.
16. Receipt of books and supplies on a gratuity basis.
23. Doctor's excuse from P. E.
27. Student put back a grade during grade or high school attendance.
29. Failure of elective courses.

Information Secured From Teacher Observation
(Appendix A, pp.134-139)

Teacher observations of the male drop-outs indicated that certain factors affected them which were not operative with the male non-leaver group. They are as follows:

1. Male drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school.
6. They caused more trouble than the non-leaver.
7. The male drop-outs were more secretive and seclusive.
8. They did not participate in class.
9. They did not get along well with the teacher.
10. They did not get along well with others.
12. They were sullen in class.
13. They were resentful of authority.
15. There was evidence of reading problems.
16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
18. They were more irresponsible.
19. They possessed less effective study habits.
20. They displayed less school spirit.
(Appendix B, p.150)

There were fewer observable differences between the male drop-out and the male non-leaver as they appeared to the teacher in reference to the following items:

11. The male drop-outs, as compared with the male non-leavers, did not appear overly aggressive in class.
14. The male drop-outs did not seem to suffer more frequently from speech disorders.
17. The male drop-outs were no less mature in behavior than the male non-leavers.
(Appendix B, p.150)

Information Secured By Personal Interview
(Appendix A, pp.140-145)

Personal interview of the male drop-outs revealed significant differences in their responses and the responses of male non-leavers to identical items.

Responding to questions raised during the course of personal interview, the male drop-outs were significantly different from the male non-leavers in the following respects:

Problems Related to the School

2. They stated they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. Generally disliked their teachers.
4. Disliked one particular teacher.
5. Were disinterested in school work.
7. Wished they could change to courses other than those they had been carrying.

8. They wanted specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
13. They stated that certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.
14. They stated that they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not express a desire to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
20. They stated they needed more spending money.
23. They stated they felt "left out" of school activities.

It was also found that the male drop-out seldom contacted anyone connected with the school in advance of dropping classes. (Appendix B, p.151)

The following were not significant cause for drop-out when applied to differences between male drop-outs and the male non-leaver group:

1. The drop-outs said they did not find it difficult to learn certain subjects in school.
9. They stated they did not feel classes were too large.
10. They said they did not wish more contact with a guidance counselor.
11. They did not wish more personal contact with their teachers.

12. They did not want to participate more in school activities.
15. They did not have a definite career planned when they left high school.
21. They did not need more money to buy clothes.
22. They did not need more money to help at home.
24. They did not want an opportunity to work part time and attend school part time.
25. They were not employed to a greater extent outside of school than the non-leaver group.
26. Their parents had not suggested they leave school.
27. They usually did not drop school to be married. (Appendix B, p.151)

Female Group

Information Secured From School Records (Appendix A, pp.128-133)

From information which was secured from the school records it was found that certain factors were significant cause for drop-out. It will be shown that these factors were partly in agreement and partly at variance with the responses of the male group. The following items were significant cause for drop-out in the female group:

Home & Family

3. Three or more school transfers since eighth grades.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.

5. A record of tardiness.
6. A record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.
8. Student from a "broken home."

Test Data

11. I.Q. test score of 80 or below.
12. I.Q. test score of 81 to 90.
14. Reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in two or more extra-curricular activities each year of attendance.
18. Student two years older than her grade group.
19. Failure of student to dress down for gym activities.
20. Economic status of family: Average or above?
21. Low economic status of family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
25. Grade average between "C" and "D".
26. Grade average of "C" or above.
27. Student put back a grade while attending grade or high school.
28. Failure of required courses.
29. Failure of elective courses.
30. Failure of English.
31. Failure of mathematics. (Appendix B, p.152)

The following data secured from the school records proved to be of no significance in distinguishing between the female drop-out and female non-leaver in the schools studied in the State of Oregon:

9. Foreign language spoken extensively at home by parents.
10. Foreign language spoken extensively at home by student.
13. I.Q. differences when above 91 were not significant.
16. Receipt of books and supplies on a gratuity basis.
17. Welfare aid received by the student or her family.
22. Physical health handicap.
23. Doctor's excuse from P. E.

Information Secured From Teacher Observation
(Appendix A, pp.134-139)

Teacher observations of the female drop-outs indicated that certain factors affected them which were not operative with the female non-leaver group. They are as follows:

1. Female drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school.

7. The female drop-outs were more secretive and seclusive.
8. They did not participate in class.
12. They were sullen in class.
13. They were resentful of authority.
16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
17. They were immature in behavior.
18. They were more irresponsible.
19. They possessed less effective study habits.
20. They displayed less school spirit.
(Appendix B, p.153)

There were fewer observable differences between the female drop-out and the female non-leaver as they appeared to the teacher in reference to the following items:

6. The female drop-outs, as compared with the female non-leavers, did not appear to cause trouble in class.
9. The female drop-outs appeared to have gotten along with the teacher.
10. The female drop-outs appeared to have gotten along with others.
11. The female drop-outs, as compared with the female non-leavers, did not appear overly aggressive in class.
14. The female drop-outs did not seem to suffer more frequently from speech disorders.
15. They did not seem to be handicapped by a reading problem. (Appendix B, p.153)

Information Secured By Personal Interview
(Appendix A, pp.140-145)

Personal interview of the female drop-outs revealed significant differences in their responses and the responses of female non-leavers to identical items.

Responding to questions raised during the course of personal interview, the female drop-outs were significantly different from the female non-leavers in the following respects:

Problems Related to the School

2. They stated they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. They generally disliked their teachers.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
9. They stated classes were too large.
14. They stated they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not express a desire to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
22. They needed money to help at home.
25. They were employed part time outside of school.

Home & Family

27. Marriage was given as the reason for dropping.

It was also found that the female drop-out seldom contacted anyone connected with the school in advance of dropping classes. (Appendix B, p.154)

The following were not significant cause for drop-out when applied to differences between female drop-outs and the female non-leaver group:

1. The drop-outs said they did not find it difficult to learn certain subjects in school.
4. They did not dislike one particular teacher in high school.
7. They did not express a desire to change to courses other than those they were carrying.
8. They did not wish specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
10. They did not wish more contact with a guidance counselor.
11. They did not wish more personal contact with their teachers.
12. The drop-outs did not want to participate more in school activities.
13. They did not feel that discipline received was unreasonable.
15. They did not have a definite career planned when they left high school.
20. They did not need more spending money.
21. They did not need money to buy clothes.
23. They did not feel "left out" of school activities.

24. They did not want an opportunity to work part time and attend school part time.
26. Their parents had not suggested that they leave school. (Appendix B, p.154)

Comparison of Male and Female Differences (Appendix B, Pp.149-154)

The following factors which were significant cause for drop-out in the male group were not significant cause for drop-out in the female group:

Form A (Appendix A, pp.128-133)

17. Welfare aid received by student or his family. (Appendix B, p.149)

Form B (Appendix A, pp.134-139)

6. The male drop-out caused more trouble in class.
9. The male drop-out did not get along with the teacher.
10. The male drop-out did not get along with others.
15. The male drop-out evidenced reading problems. (Appendix B, p.150)

Form C (Appendix A, pp.140-145)

4. The male drop-out appeared to dislike one particular teacher in high school.
7. He wished to change to courses other than those he was carrying.
8. He wished specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
13. He felt certain discipline which he had received was unreasonable.
20. The male drop-out stated he needed more spending money.

23. He felt "left out" of school activities.
(Appendix B, p.151)

The following factors which were significant cause for drop-out in the female group were not significant cause for drop-out in the male group:

Form A (Appendix A, pp.128-133)

8. The female drop-out appeared more influenced by the "broken home" factor than did the male drop-out.
25. Grade averages of between "C" and "D" fostered drop-out in the female group.
27. The female drop-out was more affected by being held back a grade than was the male drop-out.
29. Failure of an elective course appeared to affect the female drop-out to a greater degree than the male drop-out. (Appendix B, p.152)

Form B (Appendix A, pp.134-139)

17. The female drop-out displayed less tendency toward behavioral immaturity than did the male drop-out. (Appendix B, p.153)

Form C (Appendix A, pp.140-145)

9. The female drop-out felt classes were too large.
22. She indicated a need for money to help at home.
25. The female drop-out was employed on a part-time basis outside of school.
27. Marriage was given as the reason for dropping classes by the female student. (Appendix B, p.154)

Summary of Male and Female Differences

The above comparison of differences between male and female drop-outs would indicate that male students in the

schools studied in the State of Oregon do not appear to be affected as severely by "broken homes" as do female students. Low grades and being held back a grade do not seem to affect the male as much as it does the female student. It also appeared that male students who fail an elective course display less concern than female students in similar situations.

Teachers did not indicate as strong a difference in the maturity of the male drop-out and the male non-leaver as were apparent in the female group; however, female drop-outs seemed less mature to teachers than male drop-outs.

It can be seen from the above comparison of differences that the male drop-outs were not as affected as the female drop-outs by large classes, a need for money to help at home, and drop-out prompted by marriage. The male drop-outs did not show significant differences from the male non-leavers in the amount of part-time employment in which they engaged. It will be seen that this was not the case with the female group.

The characteristics of the female group indicated that they were more likely than the males to drop when their family or they themselves were receiving welfare aid.

Teachers observing the females found that in many

social respects they were no different than the female non-leaver group. They did not seem to cause more trouble in class than female non-leavers, they seemed to get along as well with their teachers as the female non-leaver group and the same applied to their relationship with other students. The female drop-out, however, was more frequently found to be a reading problem than was the female non-leaver.

Responses of female drop-outs to questions on the personal interview forms showed that they did not differ to a significant degree from the female non-leavers in respect to the following factors which differentiated male drop-outs from male non-leavers:

1. The females were less inclined than the males to dislike one particular teacher.
2. They did not show as much concern about the course offerings, and did not feel as strongly as the male group about the need for additional vocational instruction.
3. They were less concerned than the male group over problems of discipline, and indeed were not subjected to it in as large a dose as were the males.
4. The females did not evince as great a need for spending money as did the males, and
5. They did not seem as inclined to feel "left out" of school activities.

GRADE DIFFERENCES

When examining factors which affected students at

grade levels nine through twelve, it was apparent that many of the factors which affected the total group also affected the groups by grade.

From information secured from the school records, Form A (Parts 1 and 2), it was found that one factor which proved significant when applied to the total group was not significant when applied to the ninth grade group alone; this was item 2: "Transferring schools two times since eighth grade."

An examination of the breakdown of grade ten and grade eleven revealed no significant deviation applying specifically to those grades which did not seem to apply to the group in its entirety. However, by grade twelve many additional factors which had been seen as significant cause for drop-out in grades nine through eleven no longer had a bearing on the tendency of the subject to drop from school. By the time the students had reached the twelfth grade they appeared able to cope with certain additional factors which had been attributed as significant cause for drop-out in the earlier grades. Specifically, the following items were no longer significant cause for drop-out:

3. Transfer of schools three or more times since eighth grade.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
7. Problems of discipline.

14. Reading problems.
15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
19. Refusal to dress down for gym.
21. Economic status of the family.
31. Failure in mathematics. (Appendix B, p.164)

In reviewing grade differences it can be seen that the longer the student remains in school the more problems he encounters. Attainment of advanced class standing results in a greater probability that a satisfactory adjustment will be made to problems which cause drop-out when confronted early in his academic history.

AGE DIFFERENCES IN DROP-OUTS

To discern whether any differences were apparent between the younger age group in high school and those students who were older, differences were checked between drop-outs of age sixteen and under, and those seventeen years of age and over. The total age range of the drop-out group extended from fourteen to twenty-two, while the age group of the non-leavers extended from thirteen to nineteen. It would appear then that the drop-out group generally tended to be somewhat overage in comparison with those students who remained in school, and also that entrance into high school at an early age by a potential drop-out was a rare occurrence.

Some very important differences occurred between the age group sixteen and under, and age group seventeen and over, which lead to the belief that the school might well be able to influence many potential drop-outs toward continuation of school experience, if such were the desired end.

Age Sixteen and Under

In the age group sixteen and under it was quite apparent that there were fewer factors operative that were significant cause for drop-out than in the age group seventeen and over.

Factors which were significant cause for drop-out in this group are listed below:

Information From School Records (Appendix A, pp.128-133)

Home & Family

3. Transfer of schools three or more times since eighth grade.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. Record of tardiness.
6. Record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.
8. Student from a "broken home."

Test Data

12. I.Q. test score between 81 and 90.

14. Evidence of reading problems.

Socio-Economic

- 15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
- 18. Student two years older than his grade group.
- 19. Reluctance or refusal to dress down for gym activities.
- 21. Low economic status of family.

Scholarship

- 24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
- 27. Student put back a grade while attending grade or high school.
- 28. Failure of a required course in high school.
- 29. Failure of an elective course in high school.
- 30. Failure of English in high school.
- 31. Failure of mathematics in high school.

All other items are not significant. (Appendix B, p.167)

Teacher Observations (Appendix A, pp.134-139)

- 1. The drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
- 2. They were more easily discouraged.
- 3. They lacked initiative in class.
- 4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
- 5. They were less interested in school than were the non-leavers.
- 7. They were more secretive and seclusive.
- 8. They did not participate in class.
- 9. They did not get along well with the teacher.

10. They did not get along well with others.
12. They were sullen in class.
13. They were resentful of authority.
15. There was evidence of reading problems.
16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
17. The student was immature in class.
18. They were more irresponsible than the non-leaver.
19. They possessed less effective study habits.
20. They displayed less school spirit.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix B, p.168)

Personal Interview Responses (Appendix A, pp.140-145)

Problems Related to the School

2. The drop-outs felt they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. They generally disliked their teachers.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
14. They felt that they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not feel they wanted to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.

23. They felt "left out" of school activities.
24. They desired an opportunity to work part time and attend school part time.

Home & Family

26. Their parents had suggested that they leave school.
27. They had considered dropping school to be married.

All other items are not significant. (Appendix B, p.169)

Age Seventeen and Over

In the age group seventeen and over it was quite apparent that there were more factors operative that were significant cause for drop-out than in the sixteen and under age group.

Factors which were significant cause for drop-out in this group are listed below:

Information From School Records (Appendix A, pp.128-133)

Home & Family

3. Transfer of schools three or more times since eighth grade.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. Record of tardiness.
6. Record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.

Test Data

12. I.Q. test score between 81 and 90.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
16. Receipt of books and supplies on a gratuity basis.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.
19. Reluctance or refusal to dress down for gym activities.
20. Economic status of the family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
27. Student put back a grade while attending grade or high school.
28. Failure of a required course in high school.
29. Failure of an elective course in high school.
30. Failure of English in high school.
31. Failure of mathematics in high school.

All other items are not significant. (Appendix B, p.170)

Teacher Observations (Appendix A, pp.134-139)

1. The drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school than was the non-leaver.

7. They were more secretive and seclusive than the non-leaver.
8. They did not participate in class.
9. They did not get along well with the teacher.
12. They were sullen in class.
13. They were resentful of authority.
15. There was evidence of reading problems.
16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
18. They were more irresponsible than the non-leaver.
19. They possessed less effective study habits.
20. They displayed less school spirit.

All other items are not significant. (Appendix B, p.171)

Personal Interview Responses (Appendix A, pp.140-145)

Problems Related to the School

2. The drop-outs felt they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. They generally disliked their teachers.
4. They disliked one particular teacher in high school.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
7. They wished to change to courses other than those which they had to carry.
8. They wished specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
9. They felt that classes were too large.
13. They felt certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.

14. They felt they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not feel they wanted to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
22. They needed money to help at home.
23. They felt "left out" of school activities.
24. They desired an opportunity to work part time and attend school part time.

Home & Family

26. Their parents had suggested that they leave school.
27. They had considered dropping school to be married.

All other items are not significant. (Appendix B, p.172)

Summary of Differences in Age Groups

Differences in age of drop-outs brought to light the following facts: The older group of students tended to become accustomed to the factor of a "broken home" and it had less tendency to cause them to drop out than students in the younger group. The older group appears to be comprised of a greater percentage of students who have learned to adjust to this difficult situation.

The younger group of drop-outs tend to become less affected by the economic status of the family than the older group. This would be reasonable to expect because the employability of the younger group would be less than that of the older group of students; therefore, a low economic status would probably have less of a tendency to cause their drop-out in order to search for employment than would occur in the older group.

Lower grades, specifically those between "C" and "D", did not disturb the older group or cause their drop-out as much as it did the younger group. Students sixteen years of age and under are more disturbed by the factor of low grades. Early discouragement in this area promotes premature termination of school. (Appendix B, p.167)

From the results of teacher observations it became apparent that the inability of the younger group to get along with others manifested itself in such a manner as to differentiate this group from the younger group of non-leavers. The adjustment of the older group in this regard appeared adequate, and there was no significant difference between them and the non-leavers in respect to this item.

The greatest differences between the two grades appeared primarily in their responses to personal interview questions. It was here specifically that fewer items were found to be significant among the sixteen and under age

group. In fact only thirteen of twenty-seven items were significant in this group, while nineteen were significant in the older group. It can be determined from this that the pressure for leaving school increases rapidly after the age of seventeen, and cumulative effects of early disturbances are more varied and difficult to contend with than in the earlier years.

SIZE OF SCHOOL

When differences in factors affecting drop-outs in schools of varying sizes were studied, it was found that in the larger school a more extensive list of factors was significant cause for drop-out than in schools of smaller size. As the size of the school decreased, the proportion of factors in evidence diminished. This would lead to the belief that while the smaller schools have perhaps fewer trained personnel to cope with the problem of the potential drop-out, they might find themselves greatly aided in their efforts to increase their holding power because of the more limited variety of problems which ultimately lead to the drop-out of students within their schools.

It is also possible that in the smaller schools a better knowledge of students, and closer rapport between teachers and pupils provide a stabilizing influence. One might also suspect that there is more community solidarity

in the smaller towns and, perhaps, fewer working mothers.

Schools Over One Thousand Students

In schools of over one thousand enrollment, information secured from the school records showed eleven items out of thirty-one to be of no significant cause for dropout. The significant items are as follows:

Home & Family

3. Transfer of schools three or more times since eighth grade.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. Record of tardiness.
6. Record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.
8. Student from a "broken home."

Test Data

11. I.Q. test score of 80 or below.
14. Evidence of reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
16. Receipt of books and supplies on a gratuity basis.
17. Receipt of welfare aid by student or his family.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.
19. Reluctance or refusal to dress down for gym activities.

21. Low economic status of the family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".

27. Student put back a grade while attending grade or high school.

28. Failure of a required course in high school.

29. Failure of an elective course in high school.

30. Failure of English in high school.

31. Failure of mathematics in high school.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.128-133; Appendix B, p.173)

Teacher Observations

1. The drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school than were the non-leavers.
6. The drop-outs appeared to cause trouble in class.
7. They were more secretive and seclusive than the non-leavers.
8. They did not participate in class.
11. The drop-out was overly aggressive in class.
12. They were sullen in class.
13. They were resentful of authority.
15. There was evidence of reading problems.

16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
17. The drop-out behaved immaturely in class.
18. They were more irresponsible than the non-leaver.
19. They possessed less effective study habits.
20. They displayed less school spirit.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.134-139; Appendix B, p.174)

Personal Interview Responses

Problems Related to the School

2. The drop-outs felt they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. They generally disliked their teachers.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
7. They wished to change to courses other than those which they had to carry.
8. They wished specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
13. They felt certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.
14. They felt that they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.

24. They desired an opportunity to work part time and attend school part time.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.140-145; Appendix B, p.175)

Schools With Five Hundred to One Thousand Student Enrollment

In schools with an enrollment of between five hundred and one thousand students, sixteen out of thirty-one items in the "A" group were not significant. The significant items follow:

Home & Family

4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. Record of tardiness.
6. Record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.

Test Data

12. I.Q. test score between 81 and 90.
14. Evidence of reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.
19. Reluctance or refusal to dress down for gym activities.
21. Low economic status of the family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
27. Student put back a grade while attending grade or high school.
28. Failure of a required course in high school.
30. Failure of English in high school.
31. Failure of mathematics in high school.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.128-133; Appendix B, p.176)

Teacher Observations

1. The drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school than were the non-leavers.
7. They were more secretive and seclusive than the non-leavers.
8. They did not participate in class.
9. They did not get along with the teacher.
12. They were sullen in class.
13. They were resentful of authority.
15. There was evidence of reading problems.
16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
18. They were more irresponsible than the non-leaver.

19. They possessed less effective study habits.

20. They displayed less school spirit.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.134-139; Appendix B, p.177)

Personal Interview Responses

Problems Related to the School

2. The drop-outs stated they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. They generally disliked their teachers.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
7. They wished to change to courses other than those which they had to carry.
13. They stated that certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.
14. They stated they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not express a desire to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
21. They needed money to buy clothes.
22. They needed money to help at home.
23. They felt "left out" of school activities.

Home & Family

26. Their parents suggested that they leave school.
27. They had considered dropping school to be married.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.140-145; Appendix B, p.178)

Schools of Five Hundred or Fewer Students

In schools of five hundred and less, the information from the school records again showed an increase in the number of items which did not affect the drop-out. The items which were significant are as follows:

Home & Family

5. Record of tardiness.
6. Record of unexcused absences.

Test Data

12. I.Q. test score between 81 and 90.
14. Evidence of reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.

Scholarship

24. Student's grade average between "D" and "F".
27. Student put back a grade while attending grade or high school.
28. Failure of a required course in high school.

29. Failure of an elective course in high school.

30. Failure of English in high school.

31. Failure of mathematics in high school.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.128-133; Appendix B, p.179)

Teacher Observations

1. The drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school than were the non-leavers.
7. They were more secretive and seclusive than the non-leavers.
8. They did not participate in class.
12. They were sullen in class.
18. They were more irresponsible than the non-leaver.
19. They possessed less effective study habits.
20. They displayed less school spirit.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.134-139; Appendix B, p.180)

Personal Interview Responses

Problems Related to the School

2. The drop-outs felt they could learn more out of school than in school.

5. They were disinterested in school work.
13. They felt that certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.
14. They felt that they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not express a desire to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
20. They stated they needed more spending money.
21. They needed money to buy clothes.
23. They felt "left out" of school activities.

Home & Family

26. Their parents suggested that they leave school.
27. They had considered dropping school to be married.

All other items were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.140-145; Appendix B, p.181)

Summary of Size of School Differences

From the above items it can be seen that as the size of the school increases, the number and variety of factors that cause drop-outs also increase.

Viewed from the standpoint of the teacher in schools of over one thousand enrollment, the student who causes

trouble in class is a potential drop-out. From the standpoint of the teacher in schools of under one thousand enrollment, this type of student appeared to be no more the potential drop-out than members of the comparative non-leaver group.

As seen by the teacher in schools of over one thousand enrollment, the student who appeared immature in class was a likely candidate for drop-out. Observation of students who were classified as immature in schools of five hundred to one thousand enrollment disclosed no differences significant to the extent that would distinguish this group from the non-leavers.

Aggressiveness in class was found to be the mark of a potential drop-out in schools of over one thousand enrollment. The same factors operating in the smaller schools did not serve as notice of early school leaving.

Teachers in the schools of five hundred and under enrollment observed less resentment of authority on the part of students in their classes than was observed in the larger schools.

Students in the smaller schools also appeared to be less seriously handicapped by reading problems, and less affected by lack of skill in the use of the English language, either written or spoken.

The latter two items might lead one to the belief that the tendency toward more individualized instruction,

closer contact with teachers, and a more intimate relationship between the school and the home helps to prevent reading and language skills problems from becoming insurmountable barriers to school success.

Feelings of drop-outs in the different-sized schools varied little as they expressed themselves during the course of personal interviews. This brings to light the very important point that while there is a multiplicity of reasons for drop-outs in the larger schools, the feelings of drop-outs toward factors causing them to drop-out were essentially the same.

Some of the differences between the personal feelings of the drop-outs in the larger and smaller schools are noted below:

1. In the smaller schools less concern was evidenced on the part of students for more specific vocational instruction than what the school was presently offering. This was not the case in the larger school where the drop-out was significantly different from the non-leaver in his desire for a greater range of specific vocational course offerings. Appendix B, p.175.

2. Money to buy clothes stimulated drop-out in schools of five hundred and under, while in the larger schools this did not appear as a significant factor in drop-out. Appendix B, p.175.

Item two above was somewhat of a surprise to this writer as it might be expected that students in the larger schools would be more conscious of their dress because of the proximity of these schools to the larger centers of population within the state. Such, however, did not appear to be the case.

DIFFERENCES BY GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION

It was deemed important to the purpose of this study to examine differences between drop-out and non-leaver groups in various areas of the state. The characteristics of drop-outs in Willamette Valley schools, Southern Oregon schools, and Central Oregon schools were scrutinized. Differences between schools west of the Cascade Mountain Range and those east of the Cascade Mountain Range were also evaluated.

Comparisons: East and West of Cascade Mountains

It was found that schools west of the Cascade Mountain Range were affected by a wider variety of significant factors than were schools east of the Cascades. A comparison of differences in school records of drop-outs in the western part of the state revealed only seven factors which were not significant cause for drop-out. Factors which proved to be significant were as follows:

Home & Family

3. Transfer of schools three or more times since eighth grade.
4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. Record of tardiness.
6. Record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.
8. Student from a "broken home."

Test Data

11. I.Q. test score of 80 or below.
14. Evidence of reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.
19. Reluctance or refusal to dress down for gym activities.
21. Low economic status of the family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
27. Student put back a grade in grade or high school.
28. Failure of a required course in high school.
29. Failure of an elective course in high school.
30. Failure of English in high school.
31. Failure of mathematics in high school.

All other factors within this group were not significant.
(Appendix A, pp.128-133; Appendix B, p.182)

Factors which proved significant cause for drop-out in the eastern part of the state as a result of examination of the school records were as follows:

Home & Family

4. Two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. Record of tardiness.
6. Record of unexcused absences.
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.

Test Data

12. I.Q. test score between 81 and 90.
14. Evidence of reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Failure to participate in extracurricular activities.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.
19. Reluctance or refusal to dress down for gym activities.
21. Low economic status of the family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
27. Student put back a grade in grade or high school.
28. Failure of a required course in high school.
30. Failure of English in high school.
31. Failure of mathematics in high school.

Other factors within this group were not significant.

(Appendix A, pp.128-133; Appendix B, p.185)

Observation of teachers showed only three factors not significant cause for drop-out in schools west of the Cascade Range. The factors which were significant are as follows:

1. The drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
 2. They were more easily discouraged.
 3. They lacked initiative in class.
 4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
 5. They were less interested in school than were the non-leavers.
 7. They were more secretive and seclusive than the non-leavers.
 8. They did not participate in class.
 9. They did not get along with the teacher.
 10. They did not get along well with others.
 12. They were sullen in class.
 13. They were resentful of authority.
 15. There was evidence of reading problems.
 16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
 17. The drop-out behaved immaturely in class.
 18. They were more irresponsible than the non-leaver.
 19. They possessed less effective study habits.
 20. They displayed less school spirit.
- (Appendix A, pp.134-139; Appendix B, p.183)

East of the Cascades, teacher observation indicated that six items were not related to drop-out. The factors which were significant are as follows:

1. The drop-outs appeared more unhappy and worried.
2. They were more easily discouraged.
3. They lacked initiative in class.
4. They lacked self-confidence in class.
5. They were less interested in school than were the non-leavers.
8. They did not participate in class.
9. They did not get along with the teacher.
12. They were sullen in class.
13. They were resentful of authority.
15. There was evidence of reading problems.
16. There was evidence of lack of skill in the written and spoken use of the English language.
18. They were more irresponsible than the non-leaver.
19. They possessed less effective study habits.
20. They displayed less school spirit.
(Appendix A, pp.134-139 ; Appendix B, p.186)

Personal interview of the drop-outs west of the Cascades showed the following factors to be significant cause for drop-out:

Problems Related to the School

1. The drop-outs found it difficult to learn a certain subject in school.
2. They felt they could learn more out of school than in school.

3. They generally disliked their teachers.
4. They disliked one particular teacher in high school.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
7. They wished to change to courses other than those which they had to carry.
8. They wished specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
9. They stated classes were too large.
13. They felt certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.
14. They stated they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not express a desire to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
22. They needed money to help at home.
23. They felt "left out" of school activities.
24. They would like an opportunity to work part time and go to school part time.

All other factors were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.140-145; Appendix B, p. 184)

East of the Cascades the following factors examined through personal interview proved to be significant cause for drop-out:

Problems Related to the School

1. The drop-outs found it difficult to learn a certain subject in school.
2. They felt they could learn more out of school than in school.
3. They generally disliked their teachers.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
7. They wished to change to courses other than those which they had to carry.
13. They stated certain discipline which they had received was unreasonable.
14. They felt they had not received enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. Generally speaking, they did not like high school.
17. They did not feel they wanted to complete high school.

Socio-Economics

18. An overwhelming majority preferred work to school, if given a choice.
19. Most of their close friends were out of school.
21. They needed money to buy clothes.
22. They needed money to help at home.
23. They felt "left out" of school activities.

All other factors were not significant. (Appendix A, pp.140-145; Appendix B, p. 187)

Summary of Geographic Differences

The school records of the drop-outs west of the Cascades reflected that frequent transfers to other schools

often resulted in eventual drop-out. The "broken home" led frequently to drop-out, and failure in elective courses also proved to be significant. None of the above items proved to be significant factors in schools east of the Cascades.

Teacher observation indicated that students west of the Cascades who were secretive or seclusive were more frequently in the drop-out group than were students east of the Cascades. This was also true of the student who failed to get along with others. Finally, it was noted that immaturity in class often resulted in the drop-out of the student west of the Cascades. (Appendix B, p.182) The above three factors did not distinguish the drop-out from the non-leaver in schools east of the Cascades.

In the western part of the state the drop-out more frequently expressed dislike for one particular teacher. He also indicated that he wished more specific vocational instruction than what was offered. He stated that classes were too large, and he would have liked an opportunity to work part time and attend school part time. These differences did not apply to the drop-out in the eastern part of the state to any significant degree. It is interesting to note that the drop-out east of the Cascades was much more concerned with the need for money to buy clothes than was the drop-out west of the Cascades.

Comparison of Western Schools to Willamette Valley Only

Willamette Valley schools proved to be essentially the same in comparison with drop-outs west of the Cascades. No differences were noted between their school records. On Form B it was noted that Willamette Valley students differed less from drop-outs in aggressiveness of action than did the total student group west of the Cascades. The drop-outs in the Willamette Valley schools differed from the drop-outs in schools west of the Cascades in their tendency to dislike one particular teacher in high school. They wished for a chance to take a wider variety of courses than those they were required to carry, and they desired more specific vocational instruction in addition to that which was offered. (Appendix B, p. 189)

Central Oregon Compared With Schools East of Cascades

Drop-outs in Central Oregon schools compared very closely with drop-outs in schools east of the Cascades. Few significant differences were noted between these groups.

Southern Oregon Drop-Outs

Drop-outs in Southern Oregon schools showed the smallest variety of significant factors than anywhere else in the State of Oregon. An examination of the differences

between drop-outs and non-leavers in Southern Oregon schools showed that only twelve items taken from the school records were significant cause for drop-out. These were the following:

5. Record of tardiness (nine or more in a term).
6. Record of absences (three or more unexcused absences in a term).
12. I.Q. test score of 81 to 90.
15. Student's failure to participate in two or more extracurricular activities.
18. Student two years older than his grade group.
19. Refusal to dress down for gym activities.
20. Economic status of the family.
24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
28. Failure of required courses.
29. Failure of elective courses.
30. Failure of English courses. (Appendix B, p.194)

Significant differences between Southern Oregon drop-outs and non-leavers, as observed by teachers, showed eleven out of twenty factors to be significant cause for drop-out. These were the following:

2. The student was easily discouraged.
3. The student lacked initiative.
4. The student lacked self-confidence.
5. Lack of interest in school on the part of the student.
7. Student noted to be secretive or seclusive.

8. Student failed to participate in class.
12. The student was sullen in class.
15. He evidenced reading problems.
18. The student appeared irresponsible in class work.
19. The student possessed poor study habits.
20. He lacked good school spirit. (Appendix B, p.195)

When comparing the responses of Southern Oregon drop-outs and non-leavers to Form C it was found that, out of twenty-seven items compared, only eleven were significant cause for drop-out. These were the following items:

2. The student stated he could learn more outside of school.
4. Dislike of one particular teacher.
5. Disinterest in school work.
14. Insufficient encouragement to stay in school.
18. Preference of work to school training.
19. Greater number of friends out of school.
22. Need of money to help at home.
24. Desire for an opportunity to work part time and attend school part time.
26. Suggestion by parents that student leave school.
27. Marriage.

On Forms A, B, and C, the items not cited proved to be of no significance in causing drop-outs. (Appendix A, pp.128-145; Appendix B, p.196)

From the above comparisons it can be seen that while

drop-outs throughout the state are the same in many respects, they also differ in many respects.

The problems of the drop-outs in State of Oregon schools should be treated on a regional basis. Schools in various areas of the state should take the isolated factors which are significant cause for drop-out in their area and utilize the information as a means of early location of the potential drop-out in order that he may be observed and aided in every possible manner. The drop-outs in each area of the state, in all age groups, and in every grade, expressed the need for more encouragement to "stay in school." This study reveals that the drop-outs shun the soliciting of this encouragement. This means that if the schools wish them to remain, they must extend a helping hand even though the potential drop-outs do not urge them to do so.

Interrelationships Within the Drop-Out Group

Finding whether relationships existed between the home and family background of the drop-out and his scholarship, intelligence and health, was considered of importance. If it was found that various relationships were separate and distinct in the cause of drop-out, it would become necessary to explore each area in looking for potential drop-outs. If relationships between areas existed, it might be possible to examine certain information which

was easily secured and, from a study of relatively few items, estimate whether or not a student might eventually terminate his educational experience prior to receipt of the high school diploma.

As personal interview of each student entering high school is a long and arduous task, and as teachers who had students under their direct observation are not usually easily available for comment about the entering students, it was deemed advisable to examine information which could be secured from school records in this regard.

The examination of interrelationships within the various areas of information secured from the school records was carried out and is reported on the subsequent pages. It should be noted here that when a significant difference is found by chi-square, there is no relationship. When no significant difference is found, however, there is a relationship.

Home and Family Background Compared With Scholarship

It was found that the home and family background of the drop-out was not related to the scholarship of the student whose grade average was between "D" and "F", to the scholarship of the student whose grade average was between "C" and "D", or to the scholarship of the student whose grade average was "C" or above. (Appendix B, p. 197) This means that the home and family background of

the student does not determine his scholarship in the State of Oregon, and that these factors should be examined separately in individual cases when looking for the potential drop-out.

It was also found that the home and family background of the student who had been put back a grade or who had failed either an elective or required course, or both, varied with the individual to such an extent that it could not be construed as a significant relationship. (Appendix B, p. 197)

Home and Family Background Compared With Test Data

Home and family background of the drop-out did not relate to the available test data. It was found that I.Q. scores of 80 and below, between 81 and 90, between 91 and 100, and over 100, did in no case fit with the home and family background of the drop-out. This was also true of factors in reading. (Appendix B, p. 197)

Home and Family Background Compared With Health

The health of the drop-out was not related to his home and family background. (Appendix B, p. 197)

Home and Family Background Compared With Socialization

The home and family background of the student was not related to the type of extracurricular activities in which

the student participated. (Appendix B, p. 197)

Home and Family Background Compared With Economic Status

The economic status of the family was not related to the home and family background of the student. (Appendix B, p. 197)

Scholarship Compared With I.Q. of Drop-Out

Grades of drop-outs which fell in the "C" and "D" category, and "C" and above brackets, distinguished these students from those whose I.Q. was 80 and below. Passing grades in the 80 and below I.Q. bracket were not frequent. It was also noted that scholarship of drop-outs ranked in the "D" group was not necessarily related to I.Q. scores of between 81 and 90. An examination of the collected data revealed that many individuals in this I.Q. range establish "C" grades. (Appendix B, p. 198)

Significant relationships existed between scholarship of students whose grades ranked from "D" and above in respect to I.Q. scores from the 81 through 100 range. An evaluation of the data revealed that students whose I.Q. scores were 81 and above had a scattering of grades encompassing the "D" category and above. This would seem to indicate that the I.Q. score, unless it is 80 or below, is not as serious a handicap in the making of passing high school grades as one might conjecture without a thorough

examination of the evidence. (Appendix B, p. 198)

Scholarship Compared With Reading Problems

There was no significant difference between drop-outs whose grades ranged between failure and high "D", and scores attained by these drop-outs on reading tests. It was found, however, that a significant difference existed between drop-outs whose grades were above "C" and their scores on reading tests. Examination of the data revealed that there were fewer reading difficulties among students whose grades were "C" and above. (Appendix B, p. 198)

Economic Background Compared With I.Q. of Drop-Out

The economic background of the drop-out did not relate to the I.Q. of the drop-out. The drop-out with the I.Q. of 80 and below, 81 to 90, 91 to 100, and 101 and above, did not appear to consistently come from higher or lower income brackets. This does not mean that the parental I.Q. is not related to the income bracket in which the family finds itself. It merely points out that, as measured by this study, the low or high I.Q. drop-outs are not consistently derived from any one economic group. (Appendix B, p. 199)

Economic Background Compared With Socialization

The amount of extracurricular activity in which the

drop-out engaged was not related to the economic background of the drop-out. (Appendix B, p. 199)

Economic Background Compared With Health of Drop-Out

The economic background of the drop-out was not related to the health of the drop-out. (Appendix B, p. 199)

Economic Background Compared With Scholarship of Drop-Out

Grades of drop-outs, from failure to "C" and above, were found to have no relationship to the economic background of the drop-out. This was also true of failure in either elective or required courses, and whether or not the drop-out had been put back a grade. (Appendix B, p. 199)

Locating the drop-out by examining any one aspect of information which might be derived from the school records can be seen as an impossible task from the above data. Any attempt at finding the potential drop-out must come as the result of extensive examination of a combination of factors. No one element of the drop-out's school record is of itself adequate in finding the potential school leaver before he terminates his educational experience. It is possible, as has been shown in preceding sections of this paper, to locate the potential school leaver through examination of a combination of items taken from various

sources. See Conclusions, pp. 110-117, for a summarization of these items.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

It is possible to draw some definite conclusions about drop-outs in the State of Oregon as the result of this study. Further, it is possible to determine those factors which distinguish the drop-out and the non-leaver. These factors can be isolated as they relate to gross differences between drop-outs and non-leavers, between sexes of the two groups, and as they apply to differences between ages within the two groups. Drop-outs may also be distinguished in their characteristics from the non-leavers on the basis of size of school and geographic location in the state. When examined carefully the differences shown to exist can be seen to follow a logical pattern even though they have not heretofore been examined in other studies.

One must decide whether it is advantageous to encourage potential drop-outs to remain in the public schools; drop-outs throughout the state expressed a need for such encouragement. It was found that larger schools had a wider variety of factors which caused drop-outs than did medium-size schools, and schools of five hundred pupils and under had fewer significant factors related to drop-outs than did the medium or larger size schools.

Feelings of drop-outs, regardless of size of school, appeared to differ very little. However, teachers observed greater numbers of factors resulting in eventual drop-out from large schools than they observed in small schools. The school records showed the same tendency to a wider variety of drop-out causes in the larger schools.

Certain factors which affected the males did not affect the females, and vice versa. The males were more prone to terminate school when influenced by the following items, which did not affect the female group:

Form A

- 17. Welfare aid received by student or his family.
- 22. Physical health handicap.

Form B

- 6. Student was the cause of trouble in class.
- 9. Student did not get along with the teacher.
- 10. Student did not get along with others.
- 15. Evidence of reading problems.

Form C

- 4. Disliked one particular teacher in high school.
- 7. Wished to change to courses other than those being carried.
- 8. Desired specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered.
- 13. Felt certain discipline received was unreasonable.
- 20. Needed more spending money.

23. Felt "left out" of school activities.
(Appendix B, pp.149-151)

On the other hand, the females were inclined to drop school when encountering the following items, which did not affect the male group:

Form A

8. Student from a "broken home."
25. Grade average between "C" and "D".
27. Student put back a grade or more in grade or high school.
29. Failure of an elective course.

Form B

17. Student was immature in class.

Form C

9. Felt classes were too large.
22. Needed money to help at home.
25. Part-time employment outside of school.
27. Marriage. (Appendix B, pp.152-154)

Schools in the eastern part of the state had fewer causes for drop-outs listed than schools in the western part of the state. Schools in the Willamette Valley reflected fewer drop-out factors than other schools west of the Cascades. Schools in Southern Oregon had the least number of significant factors in drop-outs than anywhere else in the state.

Throughout the state as a whole, the following factors which could be secured from the school records were

significant cause for drop-out:

Home & Family

3. Transfer of schools three or more times since eighth grade.
4. Record of two or more changes of home address since eighth grade.
5. Record of tardiness (nine or more a term).
6. Record of absences (three or more unexcused absences in one term).
7. Student considered a disciplinary problem.
8. Student from a "broken home."

Test Data

11. I.Q. test score of 80 or below.
12. I.Q. test score of 81 to 90.
14. Evidence of reading problems.

Socio-Economic

15. Non-participation in extracurricular activities.
17. Welfare aid received by student or his family.
18. Student two years older than grade group.
19. Refusal to dress down for gym activities.
21. Economic status of family.

Scholarship

24. Grade average between "D" and "F".
25. Grade average between "C" and "D".
27. Student put back a grade in grade or high school.
28. Failure of a required course.
29. Failure of an elective course.

30. Failure of an English course.
31. Failure of a mathematics course.
(Appendix B, p. 146)

Teachers found that the drop-out was more likely to be characterized by the following factors which distinguished him from the non-leaver. He was:

1. More often unhappy or worried.
2. Easily discouraged.
3. Lacking in initiative in class.
4. Lacking in self-confidence in class.
5. Disinterested in school.
6. A source of trouble in class.
- ~~7.~~ Secretive or seclusive.
8. Non-participative in class.
9. Unable to get along with the teacher.
10. Unable to get along with others.
- ~~12.~~ Sullen in class.
13. Resentful of authority.
15. Handicapped by a reading problem.
- ~~16.~~ Lacking in skill in the use of the English language, either written or spoken.
17. Immature in class.
18. Irresponsible in class.
19. Lacking in good study habits.
20. Lacking in school spirit. (Appendix B, p.147)

The drop-outs differed from non-leavers with respect to the following items when responding to personal

interview questions:

Problems Related to the School

2. They felt they could learn more outside of school.
3. They disliked teachers in high school.
4. They disliked one particular teacher in high school.
5. They were disinterested in school work.
6. They did not discuss the possibility of leaving school with school personnel.
7. They desired courses other than those which they were required to carry.
8. They desired specific vocational instruction other than that which was offered.
9. They felt that classes were too large.
10. In most cases, they did not express a desire for contact with a guidance counselor.
13. They felt certain discipline received was unreasonable.
14. They said they did not receive enough encouragement to stay in school.
16. They, generally speaking, did not like high school.
17. They did not wish to complete high school.

Socio-Economic

18. They preferred work to school.
19. Most of the drop-out's close friends were out of school.
21. They needed money to buy clothes.
22. They needed money to help at home.
23. They felt "left out" of school activities.

24. They preferred to work part time and attend school part time.

Home & Family

26. Their parents suggested that they leave school.
27. Marriage was a primary reason for leaving school. (Appendix B, p.148)

Regardless of size of school, sex differences, area of state, age or grade of drop-out, the following items taken from school records, teacher observations and drop-out responses proved to be significant factors in all the cases and could be utilized as a diagnostic device in locating the potential drop-out within the school system throughout the State of Oregon.

The specific items from the school records were:

Form A

5. Tardiness (a record of nine or more in any one term).
6. A record of three or more unexcused absences.
12. I.Q. score of 90 or below.
18. A student two years older than his grade group.
28. Failure of a required course.
30. Failure in English.

The specific items from teacher observation were:

Form B

2. Easily discouraged.
3. Lack of initiative.
4. Lack of self-confidence.

5. Lack of interest in school.
8. Failure to participate in class.
12. Sullen in class.
18. Irresponsible in class.
19. Poor study habits.
20. Poor school spirit.

The specific items which differentiated drop-outs and non-leavers were:

Form C

5. Expression of disinterest in school work.
6. Discussion relating to possible termination of school attendance.
14. Lack of encouragement to stay.
18. Expressed preference of work to school.

Summary

How can drop-outs be located by school personnel before it is too late? Once gone they are out of range of help from the school. What are the characteristics which may be used to isolate and identify the potential drop-out?

The following information which can be secured from school records may help locate the drop-outs before they leave.

The first sign of a potential drop-out may evince itself in tardiness. A student who is continually tardy to

class may be showing the first visible signs of unrest with the school. It may be as a result of discouragement with studies. It may be lack of interest in the school. Lack of initiative and lack of self-confidence may all contribute to failure of the student to arrive in class on time. Whatever the cause, the time to act is at the first sign of the problem.

Unexcused absences are a danger signal. They may mean that the student has found his friends outside of school or, for one reason or another, he is ready to quit.

Another danger sign, and one which may easily be overlooked, is failure of a required course--particularly that of English. A moment of consideration and it can be readily understood why this is so. Required courses are necessary to graduation; if a student fails them, he must repeat these courses to graduate. The discouraging possibility of facing two concurrent failures is enough to deter continuance of the educational training required. Drop-out is then the easiest immediate solution to his problem.

When a student appears in a class who is overage by several years, it usually means that through illness, failure, or certain other adverse circumstances, his contemporaries have passed him by. This type of student is frequently a drop-out. It is difficult for him to find

friends in the class. He will often feel awkward and unwanted and, as a result, will be inclined to quit. This type of student needs encouragement if he is to stay in school.

I.Q. scores, while their limitations are recognized, can be used as one means of school record information to identify the potential drop-out. It was consistently evident throughout the course of this study that I.Q. scores on any reputable pencil-and-paper test, when below 90, were characteristic of the drop-out group. The "why" of this might be seen in an understanding that these persons tend to lack self-confidence. They can easily be discouraged. More fortunate classmates find it easy to succeed. The low-average student may feel that he is the misfit who stands out in class, therefore it is easier for him to retreat into himself. This student can definitely be helped because this study also showed that low I.Q. often did not relate itself to the grade of the student. The problem presented by the low I.Q. is then, in many cases, one of adequate adjustment to the situation. In this respect the teacher can help. Again, encouragement and understanding are needed; sympathy and patience are necessary ingredients in aiding this type of student.

Through careful observation in class the teacher can often locate the potential drop-out. If the problems of the student cannot be resolved during the time the teacher

has to offer, the student may be referred to a counselor or to someone with time to give special help.

Throughout the schools studied in this state, teachers observed the drop-out to be easily discouraged in their classes. They were inclined to quit trying on assignments almost before they had started. In addition, they lacked initiative; they could not get started "under their own power" and found it difficult to go ahead on their own without supervision. They also lacked self-confidence in their own ability and were reluctant to make an effort to learn lest a mistake evoke ridicule. Their attitude was almost one of knowledge of and resignation to eventual failure.

Teachers also observed that irresponsible behavior was a sign of the potential drop-out. He was dilatory in submitting assignments, procrastination being common. Lack of a sense of responsibility to meet requirements was noted. This irresponsibility sometimes related itself to immature behavior, but not always. In whatever guise it was found, it proved to be a danger signal.

Failure to participate in class proved to be a significant factor in drop-out. The student who was withdrawn, apathetic, sometimes secretive, and often "left out" by the other students, was likely to withdraw. When accompanied by a sullen "I don't care" attitude, this student doubly certain to become a drop-out problem. Sullenness

of the type described above was not always represented by aggressive behavior. More frequently it was not. Stubborn uncooperative disinterest characterized this type of student. His expressed lack of interest in class, and his expressed lack of interest in school led to early termination of his education. This is the same student who repeatedly said, "I would have stayed in school if I had been encouraged to do so." This student was also characterized as lacking in school spirit.

In their response to personal interview items, the drop-outs distinguished themselves from the non-leavers in the following specific ways: When they talked of a disinterest in school work, they were already contemplating leaving school. Any excuse which fulfilled the letter of the law would suffice. A seemingly valid excuse--which represents the disinterest and is not a reason in itself--was the obligation of military service. Even marriage was mentioned as a way out although many girls who had married did not cite marriage as the primary reason for leaving school.

When a student expresses a preference of work to school, and discusses the possibility of leaving school, it is serving notice that he may soon terminate his education. The contented student does not usually entertain such thoughts. They represent the first germ of dissension--the beginning of the end.

Finally, and perhaps the most important reason, was the drop-out's statement that he felt he was not encouraged to stay. Everywhere within the schools studied in the State of Oregon the response of the drop-out indicated this feeling of lack of encouragement. The drop-out often said he did not want more personal contact with his teacher. He sometimes said he did not wish more contact with a counselor. He claimed he did not want to participate more in school activities. He even said he did not feel he was being left out of school activities. But the outward expression was denied by the irrefutable and frequent statement, "I was not encouraged to stay." This means that the encouragement to stay must come from the teacher, and it must be superimposed from without; the potential drop-out will not seek it. Indeed, he may even pretend it is distasteful to him. The fact remains, however, that in the long run he secretly cherished encouragement.

Male drop-outs were different in some respects from female drop-outs. When the male student or his family were receiving welfare aid, it was found that he was more likely to drop from the school roster than was the female student in similar circumstances. It was also found that most school records did not include such information about the student, and that such information was difficult to secure.

Classroom teachers found the male drop-out caused more trouble in class than the female drop-out. He was less likely to get along with the teacher and other members of the classroom group. It was apparent that the behavior of the male drop-out in the classroom is more overt than that of the female. It would appear that it is more difficult for the teacher to recognize the potential female drop-out than the male because they are more adept at masking their true feelings and are probably more socially conscious. This does not mean that the same problems do not exist with the potential female drop-out.

Personal interview of the male drop-out showed that he was more specific in his dislike of teachers. He would often mention a strong dislike for one particular teacher. The female drop-out usually did not do so. The potential male drop-out may be recognized by his concern for courses in vocational instruction which the school is not offering. This indication of unrest on the part of the male student is one means of identifying the potential school leaver.

Female drop-outs were found to be more sensitive to the social aspects of school life than were the males. Failure in school work was a particular trouble spot with them. The potential female drop-out may be identified through low grades and failure in any course work. A "broken home" in the family of a girl is often more likely

to cause drop-out than in the family of a boy. This again brings into focus the sensitivity of the female group to social factors.

Remarks of female drop-outs to questions posed on the personal interview forms indicated more concern for adequate dress and appearance. Money and part-time employment are also of concern to the potential female drop-out. Such feelings are not difficult to identify if the teacher is observant.

The problem of marriage was of greater concern to the female group than the male drop-out. When a girl is observed to be discussing marriage, exhibiting an exaggerated concern over boy friends, and giving evidence of other traits associated with the selection of a mate, she may soon wish to leave school. Specific marriage counseling for girls might be one way to prevent drop-out in these cases.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that definite revisions be made in the keeping of records for students who enter the public high schools of the State of Oregon. The forms for these records should be standardized throughout the state and, while allowances should be made for local differences, certain basic information should be maintained as a requirement. Keeping of these records should not be left to

chance, and it is suggested that the State Department of Education establish a record center which would carry a duplicate of all the information about the student as it is compiled, from his entrance into the public schools at the first grade level through his high school experience. In this manner when a new student registered a duplicate set of his past record would be secured from a central agency.

2. Within the State of Oregon the publicizing of the drop-out problem and a more active interest on the part of the public, the administration and the teachers within the schools, should be encouraged.

3. The functions of the guidance program within the schools of the state should not be left to chance. Specifically, the development of follow-up programs should have a timetable for organization, and periodic reports of progress should be required by administrators.

4. Records of students within large and small schools should not be scattered among different counselors because they are dealing directly with certain individuals. This makes it almost impossible for consistency and accuracy in record keeping. A central place in the school where the records are maintained and readily available for checking out to counselors when needed should aid in increased efficiency and more accurate data.

5. It is further recommended that students be

encouraged to consult with his counselor. While many of the students did not express a need to consult with a counselor, frequent contacts could help the student bring his problems into focus for closer scrutiny.

6. It is not enough to assume that differences between drop-outs and non-leavers are apparent through casual observation on the part of teachers within the school system. The differences between the two groups should be statistically measured over a period of time in order that those factors which are significant may be dealt with, and factors which prove to be of no significance may be discarded as a method of increasing efficiency.

7. It is recommended that schools of various size and in certain geographic areas of the state utilize the information from this study to prepare a diagnostic instrument as a means of identifying the potential drop-outs in the seventh and eighth grades in order that these persons may receive special aid and guidance early in their secondary school experience.

8. Attitudes of drop-outs should be scrutinized. Many times the drop-outs expressed no need for more extra-curricular activities, for further contact with teachers, or for further contact with guidance personnel. Yet an overwhelming majority of them said they felt they would

have stayed in school if they had received further encouragement.

9. Orientation to the high school should be carried out as a regular part of the eighth and ninth grade programs. Many drop-outs reported feeling "left out," yet they continually demonstrated that they would not ask for help. The program of the schools should be carefully explained in advance. Extracurricular activities offered by the school should be explained, and students should be encouraged by teachers and guidance people to enter into these activities.

10. The potential drop-out should be identified in the eighth grade. The characteristics of drop-outs are known; they can be located. A knowledge of where the trouble originates makes it possible to pay special attention to this type of individual. Holding power of the school can be improved in this manner.

11. Problems that are relative to drop-outs in each school should be identified as they apply to a particular community. Follow-up study on a continuing basis will reveal peculiarities within the specific situation of a school and permit a more effective approach to drop-out identification.

12. Adult education programs, through offering of extended school services, can make it possible to reach the lost potential of the school. Those students who

leave school may have temporarily closed the door to school, nevertheless the community needs the benefit of all the educational training its members can secure. Classrooms which echo to the tread of many young feet during the day need not stand idle during the evening while older members of the community chafe for an opportunity to increase vocational and avocational skills.

13. Work experience programs can and should be offered. Many drop-outs quit because they want to adopt an adult role in the community. They quit to go to work. With or without a job, they want to take their place in the adult community. They are too grown-up for school, they say. They feel the school does not offer enough of a challenge. They want to prove themselves as adults through the medium of gainful employment. These students may still profit from school, yet they will quit if they cannot work at a job. Some of both can be provided through programs sponsored by the school and the community. Such programs are economically sound. Students going to school part time and learning a trade or profession part time are not taking jobs from adults. However, each student who quits school occupies, full-time, the place of one adult job; he is part of the labor market. The same student on a part-time job is both learning a salable skill and increasing his understanding of skills learned

in class. When he graduates from high school he will be prepared to accept a responsible position in the adult world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Brewster, Royce E. and Franklin R. Zeran. Technics of follow-up study of school leavers. Los Angeles, California Test Bureau, 1947. 4p. (California. California Test Bureau. Education bulletin no. 17)
2. Buckner, Mabel A. Study of pupil elimination in the New Haven high school. School review 39:532-541. Sept. 1931.
3. The Canadian research committee on practical education. Your child leaves school. Toronto, Canadian research committee, 1950. 127p. (Its report no. 2)
4. Cooperative study of secondary-school standards. Washington, D. C. Evaluative criteria 1950 edition. Wash., D. C., the Association, 1950. 305p.
5. Dillon, Harold J. Work experience program. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 32:250-55. March 1948. (Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual convention)
6. Dixon, Wilfrid J. and Frank J. Massey, Jr. Introduction to statistical analysis. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1951. 370p.
7. Dresher, Richard H. Factors in voluntary drop-out. The personnel and guidance journal 32(5):287-289. Jan. 1954.
8. Dresher, Richard H. Factors in voluntary drop-outs in the public secondary schools of Detroit, Michigan. PhD thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State College, 1953. 95 numbered leaves.
9. Evans, Dean N. How to conduct a high school drop-out study. Bulletin of the national association of secondary school principals 38:33-41. Feb. 1954.
10. Evansville, Indiana. Superintendent of public instruction. Department of guidance. Can we prevent drop-outs. Evansville, Ind. Evansville public schools, Feb. 1953. 8p.

11. Governor's conference on California's children and youth, Sacramento. California's children and youth, 1954 Governors conference, Feb. 25-26, 1954. Sacramento, Calif., State printer, 1954. 126p.
12. Gragg, William L. Findings in Ithaca's continuous survey of drop-outs. The clearing house 26:413-414. Mar. 1952.
13. Grand Rapids, Michigan. Board of education. Report on holding power in the Grand Rapids, Michigan public schools K-14: a progress report of the holding power committee of the Grand Rapids board of education. Grand Rapids, Board of education, 1953. 58p.
14. Hecker, Stanley E. Early school leavers in Kentucky. Lexington, Ky. University of Kentucky, July 1953. 78p. (Kentucky. University. Bureau of school service. Bull. series, v.25, no. 4.)
15. Holbeck, Elmer S. Seven ways to help prevent drop-outs. The nations schools 45:35-36. May 1950.
16. Jensen, John T. Follow-up study of drop-outs from Hillsboro union high school. Master's thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State College, 1952. 61 numbered leaves.
17. Johnson, Elizabeth S. and Caroline E. Legg. Why young people leave school. Bulletin of the national association of secondary school principals 32:14-24. Nov. 1948.
18. Kendall, M. G. and B. Babington Smith. Tracts for computers, tables of random sampling numbers. Cambridge, University press, 1946. 60p. (London. University. University college. Department of Statistics. Tracts for computers series no. 24.)
19. Lanier, J. Armond. Guidance faculty study of student withdrawals. Journal of educational research 43:205-212. Nov. 1949.
20. McCreary, William H. and Donald E. Kitch. Now hear youth. Sacramento, State printer, Oct. 1953. 69p. (California. State dept. of education. Bulletin series, v.22, no. 9, Oct. 1953.)

21. Melcher, George. Why high school pupils leave school. School review 54:255-256. May 1946.
22. Michigan. Department of public instruction, 1952. Michigan holding power study. 8p. Lansing, Michigan. (Michigan. Dept. of public instruction. Bulletin no. 414.)
23. Miller, Leonard M. Graduates and drop-outs in Virginia. School life 34(6):87,93. Mar. 1952.
24. New York (city). Board of education. Bureau of educational and vocational guidance. Guidance project with potential early school leavers; progress report. N.Y. City, Board of education, Mar. 1953. 14p.
25. Oregon association of secondary school principals. Commission on curriculum development. Following up our school leavers. Oregon association of secondary school principals. Oct. 1954. 2p. (Its v.2, no. 2)
26. Oregon. State dept. of education. Division of education, occupational information and guidance service. A preliminary study of drop-outs in Oregon high schools. Salem, Dept. of education, Jan. 18, 1952. 11p.
27. Oregon. State dept. of education. Division of education, occupational information and guidance service. Unpublished supplement to a preliminary study of drop-outs in Oregon high schools. Salem, State dept. of education.
28. Samler, Joseph. High school graduate and drop-out. Journal of experimental education 7:105-109. Dec. 1938.
29. Sando, Rudolph F. How to make and utilize follow-up studies of school leavers. Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual convention of the national association of secondary school principals 36:67-75. Mar. 1952.
30. Smith, C. B. A study of pupils dropping out of Midwestern high school. The school review 52:151-156. Mar. 1944.

31. Snapp, Daniel W. Why they drop-out. Bulletin of the national association of secondary school principals 35:137-141. Oct. 1951.
32. Stewart, John A. A study of various problems related to attendance in the secondary schools of the northwest association of secondary and higher schools. College of education record 22:1-6. Nov. 1954.
33. U. S. Office of Education. Improving school holding power. Some research proposals. Work conference on life adjustment education, Chicago, Illinois, Feb. 5-7, 1951. Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1951. 86p. (Its Circular 291)
34. U. S. Dept. of the Air force. Straight from the shoulder. Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Printing Office, Mar. 1954. 12p.
35. U. S. Office of education. Why do boys and girls drop out of school, and what can we do about it? Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Printing Office, 1950. 52p.
36. Utah. State dept. of public instruction. Manual of procedure for the follow-up study of high school graduates and drop-outs, 1953-1954. Salt Lake City, Department of public instruction, 1954. 15p.
37. Utah. State dept. of public instruction. Manual of procedure for the follow-up study of high school graduates and drop-outs, 1953-1954. Salt Lake City, Department of public instruction, 1954. 16p. (Its supplement)
38. West Virginia Education Association. Improving the holding power of the public schools. West Virginia: a report on a three-year study conducted by the West Virginia education association of the reason why boys and girls quit school. Charleston, West Virginia education association, 1947. 33p.
39. Wherry, Neal M. What are the schools doing about school leavers? Bulletin of the national association of secondary school principals 37:52-54. April, 1953. (Proceedings of the 37th annual convention)

40. Zeran, Franklin R. and Truman Cheney. Foundations of guidance services. Chapter 10, unpublished manuscript submitted to Chartwell House for publication. 1955.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

School _____ Form A-1 Student No. _____

Grade in School _____ Age last birthday _____ Name _____

Information to be secured about the non-leaver from school records.

HOME & FAMILY

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
1. Sex M (male) F (female)	M ()	F ()
2. Has subject transferred two times since 8th grade? Schools _____	Yes ()	No ()
3. Has subject transferred schools three or more times since 8th grade? States _____	Yes ()	No ()
4. Has subject recorded two or more changes of home address since 8th grade attendance?	Yes ()	No ()
5. Does the student have a record of tardiness? (Nine or more in any one term.) Grade(s) _____	Yes ()	No ()
6. Does the student have a record of absences? (Three or more unexcused absences in any one term.) Grade(s) _____	Yes ()	No ()
7. Has the student been considered a disciplinary problem? (Judgment of interviewer from record.)	Yes ()	No ()
8. Is the student from a home "broken" by separation, divorce, desertion or death?	Yes ()	No ()
9. Is a foreign language spoken at home by parents? (Primarily)	Yes ()	No ()
10. Is a foreign language spoken at home by student? (Primarily)	Yes ()	No ()

Form A-1 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured about the non-leaver from school records.

TEST DATA1 2

The first I.Q. test given from 8th grade on is preferred. If several I.Q. tests have been given, the Otis test has first preference. California Test of Mental Maturity has second preference, and then others. Test used _____

11. Does I.Q. test score of student fall at 80 or below? Yes () No ()
12. Does I.Q. test score of student fall between 90 and 81? Yes () No ()
13. Does I.Q. test score of student fall between 100 and 91? Yes () No ()
14. Does reading test score indicate reading problems? (If available.) Yes () No ()
Test used _____

SOCIO-ECONOMIC

15. Has the student participated in two or more extracurricular activities each year of attendance? Yes () No ()
16. Does the student receive books and supplies on a gratuity basis from his school? Yes () No ()
17. Is the student or his family receiving welfare aid? Yes () No ()
18. Is the student two years older than his grade group? 9th (14 years), 10th (15 years), etc. Yes () No ()
19. Does the student refuse to dress down, or is he reluctant to dress down for gym activities? Yes () No ()

Form A-1 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured about the non-leaver from school records.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC (Cont.)

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
--	----------	----------

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| 20. Economic status of family: \$3,200 avg.,
\$2,600 below, \$3,800 above. | Above
Avg () | Avg () |
| 21. Economic status of family? | Below
Avg () | Avg () |

HEALTH

22. Is the student suffering from a physical health handicap? Kind _____ Yes () No ()
23. Does the student have a doctor's excuse from P. E.? Yes () No ()

SCHOLARSHIP (Grade of "A"=4 points, "D"=1.)

24. Is the student's high school grade avg. between "D" and "F"? .99 and 0. Yes () No ()
25. Between "C" and "D"? 1.99 and 1.00 Yes () No ()
26. "C" or above? 2.00 and above. Yes () No ()
27. Has the student ever been put back a grade or more while attending grade or high school? Yes () No ()
28. Has the student failed any required courses in high school?
Course _____ Yes () No ()
29. Has the student failed any elective courses in high school?
Course _____ Yes () No ()
30. Has the student failed English in high school? Yes () No ()
31. Has the student failed mathematics in high school? Yes () No ()

School _____ Form A-2 Student No. _____

Grade in School _____ Age last birthday _____ Name _____

Information to be secured about the drop-out from school records.

HOME & FAMILY

- | | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1. Sex M (male) F (female) | M () | F () |
| 2. Did subject transfer schools two times since 8th grade?
Schools _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 3. Did subject transfer schools three or more times since 8th grade?
States _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 4. Did subject record two or more changes of home address since 8th grade attendance? | Yes () | No () |
| 5. Did the student have a record of tardiness? (Nine or more in any one term.)
Grade(s) _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 6. Did the student have a record of absences? (Three or more unexcused absences in any one term.)
Grade(s) _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 7. Was the student considered a disciplinary problem? (Judgment of interviewer from record.) | Yes () | No () |
| 8. Was the student from a home "broken" by separation, divorce, desertion or death? | Yes () | No () |
| 9. Is a foreign language spoken at home by parents? (Primarily) | Yes () | No () |
| 10. Is a foreign language spoken at home by student? (Primarily) | Yes () | No () |

Form A-2 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured about the drop-out from school records.

TEST DATA1 2

The first I.Q. test given from 8th grade on is preferred. If several I.Q. tests have been given, the Otis test has first preference. California Test of Mental Maturity has second preference, and then others. Test used _____

11. Does I.Q. test score of student fall at 80 or below? Yes () No ()
12. Does I.Q. test score of student fall between 90 and 91? Yes () No ()
13. Does I.Q. test score of student fall between 100 and 91? Yes () No ()
14. Does reading test score indicate reading problems? (If available.) Test used _____ Yes () No ()

SOCIO-ECONOMIC

15. Did the student participate in two or more extracurricular activities each year of attendance? Yes () No ()
16. Did the student receive books and supplies on a gratuity basis from his school? Yes () No ()
17. Was the student or his family receiving welfare aid? Yes () No ()
18. Was the student two years older than his grade group? 9th (14 years), 10th (15 years), etc. Yes () No ()
19. Did the student refuse to dress down, or was he reluctant to dress down for gym activities? Yes () No ()

Form A-2 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured about the drop-out from school records.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC (Cont.)

	1	2
20. Economic status of family: \$3,200 avg., \$2,600 below, \$3,800 above.	Avg ()	Avg ()
21. Economic status of family?	Avg ()	Avg ()

- | | 1 | 2 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| 20. Economic status of family: \$3,200 avg.,
\$2,600 below, \$3,800 above. | Avg () | Avg () |
| 21. Economic status of family? | Avg () | Avg () |

HEALTH

22. Was the student suffering from a physical health handicap? Kind _____ Yes () No ()
23. Did the student have a doctor's excuse from P. E.? Yes () No ()

SCHOLARSHIP (Grade of "A"=4 points, "D"=1.)

24. Was the student's high school grade avg. between "D" and "F"? .99 and 0. Yes () No ()
25. Between "C" and "D"? 1.99 and 1.00 Yes () No ()
26. "C" or above? 2.00 and above. Yes () No ()
27. Was the student ever put back a grade or more while attending grade or high school? Yes () No ()
28. Did the student fail any required courses in high school?
Course _____ Yes () No ()
29. Did the student fail any elective courses in high school?
Course _____ Yes () No ()
30. Did the student fail English in high school? Yes () No ()
31. Did the student fail mathematics in high school? Yes () No ()

School _____ Form B-1 Student No. _____

Information to be secured from teacher about non-leaver
by personal interview.

- | | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1. Is the student unhappy or worried?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 2. Is the student easily discouraged?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 3. Does the student lack initiative in
class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 4. Does the student lack self-confidence
in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 5. Is the student interested in school?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 6. Does the student cause trouble in
class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 7. Is the student secretive or seclusive?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 8. Does the student participate in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |

Form B-1 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured from teacher about non-leaver
by personal interview.

- | | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 9. Does the student get along with the teacher?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 10. Does the student get along with others?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 11. Is the student overly aggressive in class?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 12. Is the student sullen in class?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 13. Is the student resentful of authority?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 14. Does the student suffer from a speech disorder?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| 15. Does the student have a reading problem?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |

Form B-1 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured from teacher about non-leaver
by personal interview.

- | | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 16. Does the student lack skill in use of the English language, written or spoken?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 17. Is the student immature in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 18. Is the student irresponsible in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 19. Does the student have poor study habits?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 20. Does the student have good school spirit?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |

Note anecdote(s) illustrating subject's overall behavior patterns as outlined above:

School _____ Form B-2 Student No. _____

Information to be secured from teacher about drop-out by personal interview.

- | | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 1. Was the student unhappy or worried before he dropped school?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 2. Did the student become easily discouraged?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 3. Did the student lack initiative in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 4. Did the student lack self-confidence in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 5. Was the student interested in school?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 6. Did the student cause trouble in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 7. Was the student secretive or seclusive?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |

Form B-2 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured from teacher about drop-out by personal interview.

- | | | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| 8. | Did the student participate in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 9. | Did the student get along with the teacher?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 10. | Did the student get along with others?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 11. | Was the student overly aggressive in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 12. | Was the student sullen in class?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 13. | Was the student resentful of authority?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 14. | Did the student suffer from a speech disorder?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |
| 15. | Did the student have a reading problem?
Example _____
_____ | Yes () | No () |

Form B-2 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured from teacher about drop-out by personal interview.

- | | | 1 | 2 |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------|
| 16. | Did the student lack skill in use of English language, written or spoken?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| <hr/> | | | |
| 17. | Was the student immature in class?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| <hr/> | | | |
| 18. | Was the student irresponsible in class?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| <hr/> | | | |
| 19. | Did the student have poor study habits?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| <hr/> | | | |
| 20. | Did the student have good school spirit?
Example _____ | Yes () | No () |
| <hr/> | | | |

Note anecdote(s) illustrating subject's overall behavior patterns as outlined above:

School _____ Form C-1 Student No. _____

Information to be secured from non-leaver by personal interview.

PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE SCHOOL

1 2

1. Do you find it difficult to learn a certain subject in school?
Subject _____ Yes () No ()
2. Do you feel you could learn more out of school than in school? Yes () No ()
3. Do you dislike your teachers in high school? Yes () No ()
4. Do you dislike one particular teacher in high school? Yes () No ()
5. Are you disinterested in school work? Yes () No ()
6. Have you discussed leaving school with anyone connected with the school? Yes () No ()
7. Do you wish that you could change to other courses than those you have to carry? Yes () No ()
8. Do you wish specific vocational instruction aside from what is offered? Yes () No ()
9. Do you feel classes are too large? Yes () No ()
10. Do you wish more contact with a guidance counselor? Yes () No ()
11. Do you wish more personal contact with your teachers? Yes () No ()
12. Do you want to participate more in school activities? (Clubs, sports, assemblies, etc.) Yes () No ()
13. Do you feel certain discipline which you received was unreasonable? Yes () No ()

Form C-1 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured from non-leaver by personal interview.

PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE SCHOOL (Cont.)

1 2

14. Do you feel you have received enough encouragement to stay in school? Yes () No ()
15. Do you have a definite career planned when you leave high school? Yes () No ()
16. Do you, generally speaking, like high school? Yes () No ()
17. Do you wish to complete high school? Yes () No ()

SOCIO-ECONOMIC

18. Would you prefer work to school if you had your choice? Yes () No ()
19. Are most of your close friends out of school? Yes () No ()
20. Do you feel you need more spending money? Yes () No ()
21. Do you need money to buy clothes? Yes () No ()
22. Do you need money to help at home? Yes () No ()
23. Do you feel "left out" of school activities? Yes () No ()
24. Would you like an opportunity to work part time and go to school part time? Yes () No ()
25. Are you employed part time outside of school? Yes () No ()

HOME & FAMILY

26. Have your parents suggested that you leave school? Yes () No ()

School _____ Form C-2 Student No. _____

Information to be secured from drop-out by personal interview.

PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE SCHOOL

1 2

1. Did you find it difficult to learn a certain subject in school? Yes () No ()
Subject _____
2. Did you feel you could learn more out of school than in school? Yes () No ()
3. Did you dislike your teachers in high school? Yes () No ()
4. Did you dislike one particular teacher in high school? Yes () No ()
5. Were you disinterested in school work? Yes () No ()
6. Did you discuss leaving school with anyone connected with the school? Yes () No ()
7. Did you wish while in school you could change to courses other than those you had to carry? Yes () No ()
8. Did you wish specific vocational instruction aside from what was offered? Yes () No ()
9. Did you feel classes were too large? Yes () No ()
10. Did you wish more contact with a guidance counselor? Yes () No ()
11. Did you wish more personal contact with your teachers? Yes () No ()
12. Did you want to participate more in school activities? (Clubs, sports, assemblies, etc.) Yes () No ()
13. Did you feel that certain discipline which you received was unreasonable? Yes () No ()

Form C-2 (Cont.) Student No. _____

Information to be secured from drop-out by personal interview.

PROBLEMS RELATED TO THE SCHOOL (Cont.)1 2

14. Do you feel that if you had received more encouragement you would have stayed in school? Yes () No ()
15. Did you have a definite career plan when you left high school? Yes () No ()
16. Did you, generally speaking, like high school? Yes () No ()
17. Do you wish you could complete high school? Yes () No ()
18. Do you prefer work to school? (Would you, if drop-out is unemployed.) Yes () No ()
19. Were most of your close friends out of school when you left? Yes () No ()
20. Did you leave school partly for the reason that you wanted more spending money? Yes () No ()
21. Did you need money to buy clothes? Yes () No ()
22. Did you need money to help at home? Yes () No ()
23. Did you feel "left out" of school activities? Yes () No ()
24. Would you have liked an opportunity to work part time and go to school part time? Yes () No ()
25. Did you have part-time employment before you left school? Yes () No ()

HOME & FAMILY

26. Did your parents suggest that you leave school? Yes () No ()

APPENDIX B

TABLE I

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS*
Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Total gross differences between non-leavers and
drop-outs. Chi-square 27.32.

II. Sub-differences:

Home & Family (Items compared, two through ten.)
Chi-square 224.40.

Intelligence Level (Items compared, eleven through
thirteen.) Chi-square 23.28.

Socio-Economic (Items compared, fifteen through
twenty-one.) Chi-square 00.01.

Health (Items compared, twenty-two and twenty-
three.) Chi-square 00.34.

Scholarship (Items compared, twenty-four through
twenty-nine.) Chi-square 76.71.

III. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE	ITEM	CHI-SQUARE	ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.03	12.	22.40	22.	00.10
2.	21.42	13.	03.60	23.	00.23
3.	17.42	14.	27.15	24.	65.27
4.	21.38	15.	53.59	25.	08.75
5.	69.53	16.	02.44	26.	71.37
6.	36.06	17.	04.22	27.	44.39
7.	45.97	18.	36.02	28.	83.41
8.	07.79	19.	28.86	29.	39.01
9.	00.01	20.	12.02	30.	54.85
10.	00.84	21.	29.42	31.	27.26
11.	09.59				

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE II

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS*
Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	45.95
2.	41.15
3.	54.19
4.	33.01
5.	98.09
6.	05.35
7.	16.69
8.	56.40
9.	11.20
10.	05.95
11.	01.17
12.	29.43
13.	20.58
14.	01.05
15.	20.30
16.	19.32
17.	05.27
18.	63.44
19.	70.61
20.	61.61

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE III

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS*
Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview
of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.05
2.	57.47
3.	19.50
4.	05.91
5.	98.47
6.	94.16
7.	06.55
8.	06.04
9.	10.33
10.	04.39
11.	01.21
12.	01.80
13.	20.24
14.	39.23
15.	00.18
16.	50.88
17.	55.29
18.	92.09
19.	38.88
20.	02.58
21.	06.27
22.	09.67
23.	24.19
24.	05.78
25.	00.98
26.	39.43
27.	78.99

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE IV

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	Not applicable
2.	14.84
3.	07.61
4.	08.11
5.	36.90
6.	39.39
7.	25.39
8.	03.63
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	06.49
12.	17.22
13.	01.26
14.	16.23
15.	25.71
16.	02.04
17.	05.87
18.	32.51
19.	06.76
20.	05.64
21.	15.64
22.	00.00
23.	00.01
24.	43.38
25.	02.71
26.	05.51
27.	02.53
28.	13.05
29.	00.49
30.	40.65
31.	18.87

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE V

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	33.31
2.	23.98
3.	33.79
4.	22.97
5.	55.92
6.	03.89
7.	12.79
8.	27.10
9.	08.76
10.	05.53
11.	01.13
12.	19.27
13.	12.54
14.	00.36
15.	23.67
16.	16.75
17.	01.69
18.	31.24
19.	41.59
20.	39.06

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE VI

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	01.61
2.	41.28
3.	13.36
4.	10.14
5.	75.09
6.	50.07
7.	07.19
8.	13.13
9.	02.75
10.	02.76
11.	00.04
12.	02.11
13.	25.48
14.	53.52
15.	00.10
16.	12.62
17.	20.83
18.	26.67
19.	13.12
20.	04.23
21.	00.00
22.	02.80
23.	05.18
24.	00.40
25.	01.23
26.	00.00
27.	01.05

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE VII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FEMALE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	Not applicable
2.	09.39
3.	09.93
4.	13.45
5.	35.94
6.	54.19
7.	23.05
8.	04.08
9.	00.02
10.	00.84
11.	12.86
12.	07.12
13.	02.60
14.	12.89
15.	27.02
16.	00.65
17.	00.23
18.	07.25
19.	24.67
20.	06.11
21.	11.33
22.	00.62
23.	00.02
24.	25.42
25.	08.76
26.	31.29
27.	22.37
28.	36.89
29.	06.03
30.	20.50
31.	11.70

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE VIII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FEMALE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	12.68
2.	18.99
3.	23.52
4.	11.46
5.	42.99
6.	01.33
7.	04.56
8.	31.97
9.	03.40
10.	01.17
11.	00.22
12.	09.71
13.	08.23
14.	00.83
15.	03.57
16.	07.00
17.	06.68
18.	35.29
19.	31.74
20.	24.92

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE IX

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FEMALE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.99
2.	19.85
3.	08.89
4.	00.03
5.	31.03
6.	46.45
7.	00.80
8.	00.13
9.	07.66
10.	00.57
11.	00.95
12.	00.02
13.	02.64
14.	82.23
15.	00.08
16.	19.75
17.	28.75
18.	40.36
19.	09.81
20.	00.07
21.	00.28
22.	11.31
23.	00.75
24.	02.52
25.	11.72
26.	00.00
27.	39.85

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE X

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE NINE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.07
2.	03.08
3.	04.23
4.	08.87
5.	18.91
6.	37.24
7.	14.32
8.	04.07
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	07.54
12.	05.18
13.	01.85
14.	15.30
15.	19.01
16.	01.33
17.	04.11
18.	14.22
19.	16.17
20.	03.18
21.	11.76
22.	00.66
23.	01.72
24.	23.11
25.	00.35
26.	22.04
27.	17.71
28.	28.19
29.	14.62
30.	18.97
31.	14.62

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XI

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE NINE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	11.98
2.	08.97
3.	16.48
4.	16.54
5.	25.01
6.	01.45
7.	02.08
8.	14.80
9.	05.52
10.	07.26
11.	02.62
12.	04.96
13.	01.45
14.	00.65
15.	07.21
16.	02.13
17.	03.35
18.	16.75
19.	17.37
20.	24.55

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE NINE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.02
2.	18.07
3.	12.26
4.	05.97
5.	20.48
6.	10.94
7.	00.11
8.	09.79
9.	01.56
10.	01.21
11.	07.99
12.	00.61
13.	09.16
14.	36.68
15.	00.94
16.	11.76
17.	16.40
18.	14.62
19.	05.66
20.	03.10
21.	12.17
22.	00.55
23.	05.99
24.	06.84
25.	00.36
26.	08.00
27.	09.03

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XIII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE TEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.34 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.38
2.	06.30
3.	02.47
4.	05.70
5.	17.60
6.	31.34
7.	03.16
8.	00.52
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	03.32
12.	06.38
13.	00.10
14.	03.11
15.	23.83
16.	00.23
17.	02.97
18.	07.74
19.	03.32
20.	04.07
21.	00.57
22.	00.00
23.	01.04
24.	12.53
25.	05.44
26.	22.32
27.	12.86
28.	20.58
29.	12.08
30.	15.90
31.	07.07

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XIV

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE TEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	14.09
2.	09.69
3.	14.88
4.	11.45
5.	37.38
6.	08.03
7.	09.50
8.	11.94
9.	04.38
10.	01.17
11.	00.23
12.	12.41
13.	08.07
14.	00.01
15.	03.14
16.	09.68
17.	00.47
18.	27.60
19.	24.76
20.	12.85

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XV

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE TEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.39
2.	14.83
3.	05.01
4.	06.69
5.	28.74
6.	19.84
7.	01.48
8.	01.43
9.	00.60
10.	04.64
11.	00.51
12.	00.03
13.	14.21
14.	27.99
15.	00.00
16.	21.93
17.	20.33
18.	27.32
19.	19.38
20.	01.24
21.	01.09
22.	04.61
23.	14.21
24.	01.95
25.	00.94
26.	10.28
27.	18.46

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XVI

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE ELEVEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.41
2.	10.67
3.	04.63
4.	09.96
5.	23.79
6.	46.33
7.	18.00
8.	06.15
9.	00.65
10.	00.00
11.	00.81
12.	07.08
13.	01.18
14.	06.27
15.	29.34
16.	01.77
17.	03.98
18.	08.32
19.	09.02
20.	01.02
21.	19.41
22.	02.69
23.	01.42
24.	18.13
25.	01.95
26.	19.82
27.	06.46
28.	15.99
29.	04.73
30.	10.95
31.	10.33

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XVII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE ELEVEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	07.08
2.	13.67
3.	12.09
4.	05.81
5.	21.77
6.	00.61
7.	03.39
8.	15.60
9.	03.81
10.	03.81
11.	00.14
12.	07.39
13.	12.48
14.	02.17
15.	06.70
16.	05.20
17.	03.42
18.	17.48
19.	14.95
20.	17.63

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XVIII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE ELEVEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.10
2.	23.58
3.	06.21
4.	01.12
5.	34.92
6.	22.87
7.	05.16
8.	00.93
9.	02.32
10.	00.06
11.	00.06
12.	01.88
13.	01.10
14.	31.57
15.	00.00
16.	11.58
17.	08.40
18.	22.87
19.	10.60
20.	08.85
21.	05.42
22.	05.42
23.	07.50
24.	00.10
25.	02.71
26.	08.24
27.	23.73

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XIX

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE TWELVE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	01.44
2.	00.31
3.	02.97
4.	00.22
5.	04.93
6.	17.91
7.	02.24
8.	00.08
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	00.30
12.	05.63
13.	01.87
14.	01.50
15.	00.46
16.	00.02
17.	00.00
18.	05.92
19.	00.48
20.	05.31
21.	01.33
22.	02.08
23.	01.66
24.	06.87
25.	01.11
26.	06.60
27.	08.86
28.	20.64
29.	06.24
30.	10.38
31.	02.67

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XX

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE TWELVE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	08.37
2.	05.32
3.	10.14
4.	03.92
5.	16.36
6.	01.33
7.	02.56
8.	10.53
9.	00.30
10.	00.40
11.	00.00
12.	04.09
13.	01.13
14.	00.01
15.	03.75
16.	03.92
17.	00.02
18.	06.92
19.	13.15
20.	06.46

* Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXI

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GRADE TWELVE DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.32
2.	03.94
3.	00.47
4.	01.02
5.	12.25
6.	28.26
7.	03.68
8.	00.04
9.	02.82
10.	00.02
11.	00.09
12.	00.73
13.	01.37
14.	32.26
15.	01.21
16.	01.28
17.	03.18
18.	16.97
19.	03.77
20.	04.40
21.	04.21
22.	00.02
23.	00.32
24.	00.16
25.	00.05
26.	07.64
27.	20.31

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS AGE SIXTEEN AND UNDER.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.08
2.	07.97
3.	07.58
4.	10.43
5.	30.45
6.	53.42
7.	19.94
8.	06.15
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	06.68
12.	10.02
13.	01.70
14.	15.49
15.	23.48
16.	00.34
17.	03.63
18.	05.28
19.	10.19
20.	03.61
21.	06.26
22.	01.69
23.	00.06
24.	30.45
25.	04.85
26.	34.61
27.	12.34
28.	33.29
29.	33.29
30.	32.25
31.	26.26

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXIII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS AGE SIXTEEN AND UNDER.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	38.19
2.	19.95
3.	25.05
4.	20.55
5.	55.69
6.	02.29
7.	07.36
8.	17.66
9.	07.12
10.	12.86
11.	00.03
12.	15.26
13.	10.26
14.	01.63
15.	05.23
16.	10.82
17.	03.91
18.	29.95
19.	29.93
20.	18.25

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXIV

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS
AGE SIXTEEN AND UNDER.* Differences significant at 3.84
and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview
of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.01
2.	26.13
3.	08.97
4.	00.68
5.	32.74
6.	23.02
7.	00.39
8.	03.80
9.	03.33
10.	01.31
11.	01.13
12.	00.14
13.	01.19
14.	62.32
15.	00.38
16.	23.99
17.	15.66
18.	48.82
19.	11.53
20.	00.53
21.	00.44
22.	00.32
23.	08.52
24.	03.90
25.	00.00
26.	12.61
27.	40.22

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXV

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS
AGE SEVENTEEN AND OVER.* Differences significant at
3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.07
2.	12.31
3.	07.96
4.	06.73
5.	30.42
6.	66.39
7.	23.75
8.	01.32
9.	00.06
10.	01.40
11.	02.39
12.	14.91
13.	02.26
14.	09.72
15.	21.91
16.	03.94
17.	02.32
18.	21.19
19.	13.47
20.	05.12
21.	18.38
22.	00.11
23.	00.03
24.	32.67
25.	03.10
26.	36.08
27.	27.54
28.	44.96
29.	15.74
30.	23.20
31.	08.47

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXVI

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS
AGE SEVENTEEN AND OVER.* Differences significant at
3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	12.73
2.	19.45
3.	26.28
4.	10.06
5.	39.58
6.	01.95
7.	06.51
8.	28.52
9.	04.58
10.	00.32
11.	00.94
12.	09.76
13.	08.41
14.	00.23
15.	11.18
16.	06.72
17.	00.13
18.	26.75
19.	33.98
20.	29.32

* Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXVII

STATE-WIDE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS
AGE SEVENTEEN AND OVER.* Differences significant at
3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview
of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.33
2.	21.14
3.	05.90
4.	06.48
5.	32.00
6.	46.91
7.	08.56
8.	06.27
9.	07.26
10.	01.76
11.	00.32
12.	00.00
13.	08.14
14.	47.90
15.	02.10
16.	10.91
17.	17.77
18.	36.02
19.	08.33
20.	00.29
21.	00.06
22.	04.77
23.	09.46
24.	05.09
25.	03.02
26.	20.28
27.	29.64

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXVIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS
OVER ONE THOUSAND ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at
3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A,
Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	02.19
2.	17.42
3.	10.30
4.	19.74
5.	26.11
6.	46.68
7.	22.95
8.	12.28
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	04.14
12.	11.54
13.	07.44
14.	11.48
15.	10.63
16.	05.65
17.	03.92
18.	04.43
19.	11.00
20.	01.56
21.	12.68
22.	00.00
23.	00.39
24.	31.47
25.	02.22
26.	31.00
27.	12.77
28.	39.38
29.	32.92
30.	24.70
31.	16.97

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXIX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS OVER ONE THOUSAND ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	05.82
2.	15.95
3.	26.96
4.	13.54
5.	37.55
6.	08.58
7.	04.01
8.	18.75
9.	03.13
10.	01.35
11.	04.46
12.	07.09
13.	05.87
14.	00.47
15.	09.90
16.	11.12
17.	04.94
18.	23.52
19.	35.65
20.	25.31

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS OVER ONE THOUSAND ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.04
2.	13.03
3.	10.44
4.	00.16
5.	34.11
6.	21.57
7.	04.01
8.	17.31
9.	03.52
10.	00.01
11.	00.00
12.	03.48
13.	04.17
14.	18.59
15.	02.30
16.	12.43
17.	02.20
18.	34.55
19.	06.58
20.	00.12
21.	00.05
22.	00.12
23.	00.28
24.	08.73
25.	00.04
26.	07.14
27.	13.84

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS OF FIVE HUNDRED TO ONE THOUSAND ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.02
2.	01.93
3.	03.19
4.	07.05
5.	21.68
6.	38.76
7.	21.23
8.	00.63
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	03.59
12.	04.12
13.	04.03
14.	06.01
15.	36.11
16.	00.38
17.	01.48
18.	20.41
19.	14.03
20.	07.08
21.	10.94
22.	01.54
23.	00.40
24.	21.82
25.	02.02
26.	28.37
27.	18.28
28.	37.01
29.	03.30
30.	17.37
31.	06.83

* Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS OF FIVE HUNDRED TO ONE THOUSAND ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	22.18
2.	10.18
3.	23.23
4.	12.51
5.	42.25
6.	02.23
7.	06.80
8.	20.22
9.	04.30
10.	03.83
11.	00.05
12.	15.45
13.	09.48
14.	00.19
15.	07.02
16.	11.64
17.	02.50
18.	26.58
19.	25.40
20.	20.35

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS OF FIVE HUNDRED TO ONE THOUSAND ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.34
2.	30.29
3.	04.17
4.	03.51
5.	38.61
6.	30.32
7.	09.14
8.	01.23
9.	02.43
10.	03.19
11.	02.40
12.	00.14
13.	07.63
14.	59.91
15.	02.24
16.	16.09
17.	18.96
18.	40.18
19.	20.74
20.	01.44
21.	04.33
22.	07.05
23.	22.80
24.	00.70
25.	00.01
26.	21.81
27.	21.90

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXIV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS OF FIVE HUNDRED AND UNDER ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	02.45
2.	03.03
3.	00.56
4.	00.46
5.	17.54
6.	39.94
7.	03.01
8.	00.01
9.	01.24
10.	00.00
11.	01.47
12.	05.98
13.	00.37
14.	13.18
15.	15.09
16.	00.20
17.	00.00
18.	07.77
19.	02.38
20.	04.65
21.	03.15
22.	00.52
23.	01.21
24.	05.76
25.	02.93
26.	08.76
27.	09.43
28.	08.01
29.	06.49
30.	09.46
31.	04.36

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS UNDER FIVE HUNDRED ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	13.01
2.	14.42
3.	05.70
4.	07.60
5.	20.80
6.	00.46
7.	06.71
8.	11.94
9.	02.21
10.	00.01
11.	00.28
12.	05.64
13.	02.82
14.	01.09
15.	02.71
16.	00.06
17.	00.16
18.	13.64
19.	09.89
20.	12.41

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXVI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS UNDER FIVE HUNDRED ENROLLMENT.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.78
2.	12.20
3.	01.79
4.	03.99
5.	24.72
6.	31.56
7.	00.00
8.	00.01
9.	01.78
10.	01.10
11.	00.05
12.	00.03
13.	08.47
14.	46.89
15.	00.01
16.	14.43
17.	25.28
18.	14.66
19.	13.35
20.	04.43
21.	04.84
22.	03.63
23.	08.70
24.	00.64
25.	01.17
26.	05.37
27.	37.26

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXVII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS WEST OF CASCADE MOUNTAIN RANGE.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.11
2.	22.67
3.	11.20
4.	17.69
5.	41.15
6.	91.43
7.	29.39
8.	08.36
9.	01.08
10.	00.00
11.	05.19
12.	14.68
13.	01.45
14.	21.09
15.	35.78
16.	01.13
17.	01.57
18.	14.31
19.	13.82
20.	04.29
21.	16.22
22.	00.27
23.	00.99
24.	49.42
25.	05.86
26.	50.15
27.	21.06
28.	59.74
29.	42.53
30.	45.83
31.	25.39

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXVIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS WEST OF CASCADE MOUNTAIN RANGE.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	24.84
2.	30.68
3.	35.23
4.	21.95
5.	73.67
6.	03.12
7.	17.54
8.	38.70
9.	05.78
10.	04.11
11.	00.33
12.	15.38
13.	11.18
14.	01.35
15.	11.72
16.	14.32
17.	04.85
18.	42.27
19.	51.78
20.	48.38

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XXXIX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS WEST OF CASCADE MOUNTAIN RANGE.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.48
2.	34.23
3.	08.33
4.	05.51
5.	71.42
6.	62.47
7.	04.93
8.	05.99
9.	08.48
10.	02.33
11.	00.86
12.	00.72
13.	09.16
14.	69.67
15.	00.64
16.	26.25
17.	27.44
18.	55.55
19.	28.65
20.	02.60
21.	03.40
22.	06.29
23.	07.63
24.	05.29
25.	00.55
26.	13.67
27.	49.18

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XL

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS EAST OF CASCADE MOUNTAIN RANGE.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.12
2.	01.22
3.	03.11
4.	05.03
5.	25.98
6.	37.59
7.	17.77
8.	00.97
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	03.34
12.	06.13
13.	03.64
14.	06.52
15.	25.92
16.	01.01
17.	01.91
18.	20.83
19.	11.49
20.	09.85
21.	08.72
22.	02.53
23.	00.00
24.	12.12
25.	02.75
26.	21.10
27.	18.52
28.	23.45
29.	00.34
30.	07.80
31.	04.80

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS EAST OF CASCADE MOUNTAIN RANGE.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	16.20
2.	09.51
3.	16.57
4.	07.76
5.	27.84
6.	01.35
7.	01.38
8.	14.23
9.	03.87
10.	00.89
11.	00.81
12.	13.52
13.	07.79
14.	00.15
15.	05.96
16.	04.23
17.	00.29
18.	22.05
19.	15.00
20.	11.00

* Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SCHOOLS EAST OF CASCADE MOUNTAIN RANGE.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	01.15
2.	21.09
3.	06.05
4.	01.23
5.	26.24
6.	22.44
7.	04.29
8.	00.74
9.	00.43
10.	00.79
11.	00.19
12.	02.18
13.	11.79
14.-	45.54
15.	01.61
16.	16.01
17.	16.46
18.	26.67
19.	12.60
20.	02.05
21.	04.11
22.	03.27
23.	20.74
24.	00.18
25.	00.23
26.	20.83
27.	20.83

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.24
2.	26.54
3.	11.64
4.	17.57
5.	37.29
6.	78.08
7.	34.31
8.	11.31
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	06.23
12.	08.57
13.	00.70
14.	19.18
15.	34.63
16.	03.32
17.	02.69
18.	06.20
19.	09.86
20.	02.84
21.	16.12
22.	01.06
23.	00.00
24.	49.36
25.	05.13
26.	53.36
27.	16.12
28.	51.34
29.	37.49
30.	48.71
31.	27.09

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLIV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	20.13
2.	23.45
3.	32.32
4.	16.07
5.	74.07
6.	06.33
7.	19.14
8.	38.07
9.	04.82
10.	04.31
11.	00.98
12.	12.05
13.	11.64
14.	04.16
15.	08.92
16.	16.96
17.	08.22
18.	40.37
19.	45.92
20.	52.07

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN WILLAMETTE VALLEY SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	01.40
2.	25.26
3.	09.07
4.	01.96
5.	66.19
6.	48.88
7.	03.43
8.	03.45
9.	04.25
10.	04.74
11.	04.05
12.	01.72
13.	06.67
14.	55.92
15.	00.24
16.	26.26
17.	27.94
18.	37.28
19.	21.01
20.	01.04
21.	03.28
22.	04.40
23.	07.07
24.	01.02
25.	01.64
26.	05.92
27.	41.35

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLVI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN CENTRAL OREGON SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.56
2.	03.78
3.	03.13
4.	19.42
5.	27.64
6.	33.77
7.	20.05
8.	00.75
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	01.04
12.	04.36
13.	03.39
14.	04.41
15.	22.61
16.	01.04
17.	03.18
18.	18.73
19.	09.99
20.	08.35
21.	05.32
22.	01.15
23.	00.00
24.	11.49
25.	00.81
26.	15.61
27.	15.80
28.	20.24
29.	00.04
30.	07.39
31.	04.73

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLVII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN CENTRAL OREGON SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	02.21
2.	03.53
3.	11.90
4.	08.72
5.	24.91
6.	04.36
7.	03.11
8.	16.75
9.	02.98
10.	03.52
11.	01.46
12.	12.02
13.	04.69
14.	00.22
15.	10.08
16.	06.34
17.	01.07
18.	17.69
19.	17.69
20.	09.28

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLVIII

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN CENTRAL OREGON SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	05.62
2.	20.25
3.	06.46
4.	00.28
5.	20.34
6.	20.34
7.	08.63
8.	02.75
9.	00.28
10.	00.04
11.	01.12
12.	01.11
13.	10.07
14.	24.91
15.	01.11
16.	13.23
17.	15.80
18.	15.84
19.	16.92
20.	03.84
21.	06.74
22.	04.87
23.	23.04
24.	00.00
25.	00.00
26.	20.64
27.	10.51

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE XLIX

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SOUTHERN OREGON SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form A, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from school records.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.34
2.	00.36
3.	00.00
4.	00.22
5.	05.62
6.	14.30
7.	02.13
8.	00.00
9.	00.00
10.	00.00
11.	00.00
12.	04.57
13.	01.53
14.	03.07
15.	05.50
16.	01.02
17.	00.99
18.	03.71
19.	04.39
20.	04.13
21.	00.76
22.	00.36
23.	00.36
24.	05.66
25.	01.12
26.	05.50
27.	03.51
28.	11.09
29.	11.09
30.	04.38
31.	02.13

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE L

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SOUTHERN OREGON SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form B, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured from teachers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	02.52
2.	07.66
3.	10.26
4.	07.06
5.	11.04
6.	00.00
7.	05.08
8.	10.26
9.	02.21
10.	00.00
11.	00.00
12.	05.89
13.	00.41
14.	00.36
15.	05.27
16.	00.57
17.	00.00
18.	10.79
19.	16.47
20.	05.85

* Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE LI

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DROP-OUTS AND NON-LEAVERS IN SOUTHERN OREGON SCHOOLS.* Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Chi-square comparison of responses to items on Form C, Parts 1 and 2. Information secured by personal interview of drop-outs and non-leavers.

I. Individual item differences:

ITEM	CHI-SQUARE
1.	00.51
2.	10.07
3.	02.21
4.	06.61
5.	15.39
6.	10.07
7.	01.73
8.	02.59
9.	01.09
10.	00.87
11.	02.19
12.	00.51
13.	03.72
14.	18.13
15.	00.19
16.	02.62
17.	00.46
18.	16.39
19.	04.91
20.	02.03
21.	01.41
22.	04.61
23.	02.12
24.	06.18
25.	00.20
26.	04.82
27.	08.58

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE LII

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF FACTORS WITHIN THE DROP-OUT GROUP*
Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Items from Home and Family section of Form A-2 compared with selected factors as indicated.

Comparison of Home and Family items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 with:

Scholarship	Form A-2, item 24	Chi-square 10.70
	Form A-2, item 25	Chi-square 8.20
	Form A-2, item 26	Chi-square 4.79
	Form A-2, items 27, 28 and 29	Chi-square 15.93
Test Data	Form A-2, item 11	Chi-square 23.58
	Form A-2, item 12	Chi-square 12.34
	Form A-2, item 13	Chi-square 7.53
	Form A-2, item 14	Chi-square 6.61
Health	Form A-2, items 22 and 23	Chi-square 65.67
Socialization	Form A-2, items 15 and 19	Chi-square 3.99
Economic Status	Form A-2, items 16, 17 and 22	Chi-square 91.77

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE LIII

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF FACTORS WITHIN THE DROP-OUT GROUP*
Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Items from Scholarship section of Form A-2 compared with
selected factors as indicated.

Scholarship item 24 compared with:

I.Q.	Form A-2, item 11	Chi-square 38.64
	Form A-2, item 12	Chi-square 8.29
	Form A-2, item 13	Chi-square 00.14
Reading	Form A-2, item 14	Chi-square 00.04

Scholarship item 25 compared with:

I.Q.	Form A-2, item 11	Chi-square 35.67
	Form A-2, item 12	Chi-square 6.93
	Form A-2, item 13	Chi-square 00.01
Reading	Form A-2, item 14	Chi-square 00.00

Scholarship item 26 compared with:

I.Q.	Form A-2, item 11	Chi-square 16.75
	Form A-2, item 12	Chi-square 00.29
	Form A-2, item 13	Chi-square 3.77
Reading	Form A-2, item 14	Chi-square 4.13

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

TABLE LIV

INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF FACTORS WITHIN THE DROP-OUT GROUP*
Differences significant at 3.84 and above.

Items from Socio-Economic section of Form A-2. Economic factors only compared with selected factors as indicated.

Economic items 16, 17 and 22 compared with:

I.Q.	Form A-2, item 11	Chi-square	4.73
	Form A-2, item 12	Chi-square	36.11
	Form A-2, item 13	Chi-square	91.90
Reading	Form A-2, item 14	Chi-square	72.20
Socialization	Form A-2, items 15 and 19	Chi-square	69.56
Health	Form A-2, items 22 and 23	Chi-square	3.89
Scholarship	Form A-2, item 24	Chi-square	105.39
	Form A-2, item 25	Chi-square	97.43
	Form A-2, item 26	Chi-square	47.46
Failure	Form A-2, items 27, 28 and 29	Chi-square	25.79

*Items tested at the 5% level of significance.

APPENDIX C

C
O
P
YOREGON ASSOCIATION
of
SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

September 3, 1954

Dear Fellow Administrator:

Brett R. Stuart is undertaking a doctoral study of Voluntary Drop-Outs from Selected Oregon High Schools. As school administrators, I know that we recognize drop-outs as one of our serious problems.

Mr. Stuart's plan for studying this problem has the support of the State Department, the Education Department at the University of Oregon and Oregon State College and is being supported by funds from the Kellogg Foundation.

The proposed methods of securing data through personal interview of students by one of their own teachers represents a new approach to the problem. This should give more significant and valid data than that obtained by the usual questionnaire. Also, this procedure would help to make the entire staff more conscious of the problems associated with drop-outs and aware of the responsibilities that they individually have in meeting the needs of all school youth.

When you are contacted by Mr. Stuart, I hope that you will give careful consideration to the request to have your school participate in this study.

I hope you have had a good summer vacation and that this school year will be one of your best. See you at

our OASSP conference, October 4 and 5 in Salem.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Clifford J. Skinner

CLIFFORD J. SKINNER
President
OASSP

CJS/jmn

C
O
P
YSTATE OF OREGON
Department of Education
Division of General Education
106 State Library Building
Salem, Oregon

Mr. Brett R. Stuart, a graduate student at Oregon State College, is conducting a study of "Factors in Voluntary Dropouts in Selected Public Secondary Schools in the State of Oregon." He has worked with members of our staff on this problem, and we are of the opinion that the study is worth-while and when completed will supply all who are interested in secondary education with additional information about one of our most perplexing problems--the voluntary dropout.

Since Mr. Stuart's study is limited to twenty schools, one of which is yours, it is extremely important that he have complete returns. Will you please give him time for an interview when he calls on you?

It is also our understanding that it may be possible for members of your staff, who may be selected to participate in the study, to receive graduate credit from the University of Oregon or Oregon State College. Mr. Stuart will explain this to you.

Again, I wish to urge your cooperation in this worth-while study.

Best wishes for a pleasant and successful school year.

Respectfully yours,

/s/ Rex Putnam

REX PUTNAM
Superintendent of Public
Instruction