STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF AND RESPONSES TO OPPORTUNITIES FOR DECISION MAKING AND USE OF COMMUNITY IN FIVE PUBLIC SECONDARY ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

by
Mary Claire McBride

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1977

APPROVAL SHEET

Title of Dissertation: STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF AND RESPONSES TO OPPORTUNITIES FOR DECISION MAKING AND USE OF COMMUNITY IN FIVE PUBLIC SECONDARY ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

Name of Candidate: Mary McBride
Doctor of Philosophy, 1977

Dissertation and Abstract Approved:

Dr. Jean Grambs
Professor of Education
Department of Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF AND RESPONSES TO OPPORTUNITIES FOR DECISION MAKING AND USE OF COMMUNITY IN FIVE PUBLIC SECONDARY ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

Mary Claire McBride, Doctor of Philosophy, 1977

Dissertation directed by: Dr. Jean Grambs
Professor Education
Department of Secondary Education

In the late 1960's the educational literature reported the emergence of a distinct kind of public school labeled "alternative." This term was used to describe a variety of school programs. Within this group of schools were several which claimed to offer students opportunities for individual and collective decision making and use of the community as a learning resource.

The purpose of this study was to examine five such public secondary alternative schools, the perceptions of students concerning these opportunities, and their responses to these opportunities.

The research questions for the study were:

1. Do students in the five schools see these schools offering all students opportunities to make decisions (a) individually concerning their learning and (b) as a group concerning the governance of the school as the schools' literature purports?

2. Do students in the five schools see these schools offering all students opportunities to use the community as a learning resource?

3. How important were the opportunities to make individual learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource in students' decisions to attend the alternative school?

4. Given these opportunities, what choices did a sampling of students actually make?

The methods of data collection were:

1. a review of each school's literature to document the opportunities reported available;

2. researcher observations of selected activities and the environments of the five schools;

3. a questionnaire developed by the researcher voluntarily completed by the students;

4. interviews with students who had completed the questionnaire; and

5. interviews with a staff person in each of the five schools. Students' responses were reported in the form of actual numbers, percentages, and mean scores.

The opportunities for individual decision making to be examined were those the schools' literature reported were available: (1) grade options, (2) independent study, and (3) evaluation of courses and instructors. All schools reported that some type of all-school meeting was involved in the governance of the school. Students reported the mechanics of the meetings and the range of authority of the meetings.

Schools reported use of outside speakers and community persons in the schools and the opportunity for students to take outside learning activities. Students were asked to describe the extent to which these

opportunities were available and the types of outside learning activities they pursued.

The conclusions of the study were:

1. The opportunities to make learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource were important factors in students' decisions to attend; however, "other" factors such as peer pressure within their former schools and better student-teacher relationships in the alternative school were also important.

2. Students reported that they had a range of grade options, opportunities for independent study, and for evaluation of their courses and instructors.

3. Students knew that their schools had all-school meetings, but they were generally confused regarding the meeting's authority on a variety of issues.

4. Students perceived that they had the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource.

5. Although students reported having the opportunity to make learning decisions, over half the students did not take independent study. Almost as many reported that they did not take an outside learning activity.

6. Those who did take independent study and outside learning activities did so in a quarter or less of their courses.

7. The types of outside learning activities which students pursued varied.

Students came to the alternative school partly because of the opportunities that the schools claimed to offer them. Students perceived generally that they had the opportunities which the schools claimed to

offer. Some students participated in all activities; some participated selectively; some did not use any of the opportunities available.

PREFACE

My involvement with alternative schools began in 1972. Prior to that time I had taught social studies in a conventional high school. During that period I had worked on two types of curricular innovations. The first was an educational free-form program which placed the regular curriculum aside for a week and, in its place, substituted a curriculum in the form of mini-courses derived from the interests of students and teachers and taught by students, teachers and persons from the community. This program was offered in 1970 and again in 1971.

The second innovation, an outgrowth of the very successful free-form experiment, was a social studies elective program. This year-long program was divided into nine-week units. Students participating in this program were able to fulfill their history and government requirements by choosing a course each nine weeks. In addition to the traditional topics in American history and government, the courses included topics in economics, sociology, and foreign policy.

In June of 1972, after having taught in the conventional high school for four years, I was interviewed for a position in social studies by a committee of students and teachers at the alternative school in the district and was chosen for that position.

Because the school was part of the public school system, students were required to meet state graduation requirements. However, students were permitted to fulfill these requirements in a variety of ways. An elective program similar to the one in the conventional school was

utilized in the social studies program. In other subject areas, students could propose elective courses, design courses to suit their individual needs, or obtain credit by utilizing the learning resources beyond the school in the community. It was an important goal of the program that the students be permitted to make decisions about their own learning. Another important goal was that students have input in determining the policies of the school. To that end, a weekly Town Meeting was established composed of all teachers and students, which served as the policy making body of the school. Informality characterized relationships between teachers and students; for example, students called teachers by their first names.

These goals, along with the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource, were central to the philosophy and operation of the alternative school. After observing a variety of students participating in the activities of the school, I decided to undertake this study in order to discover whether students attended the school specifically to participate in the opportunities offered, whether they perceived that they had the opportunities the school purported to offer and finally, the extent to which they participated in these activities.

Teaching at the alternative school has been a unique experience. It has differed from teaching in the conventional school in many respects. Student-teacher relationships at the alternative school are less formal and less authoritarian than are those at the conventional school. Teachers at the alternative school serve as advisors to students. Their contact with students expands beyond the subject-area contact of most teachers in the conventional school to include advising students on total

program planning and future goals beyond high school. The nature of the program requires more intensive interaction between student and teacher than at the larger conventional high school. This interaction seems to result in a greater teacher commitment and loyalty to students in the alternative program than teachers might possess in the conventional high school.

The nature of teaching at the alternative school has been sometimes chaotic, exhausting, emotionally intense and joyful but always rewarding. Allan Glatthorn spoke for many alternative school teachers when he wrote: "We will have pretended that we made these schools for the young. All the time it was for our own salvation."[1]

---

[1]Allan A. Glatthorn, Alternatives in Education (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1975), p. 224.

DEDICATION

To My Mother And Father,

who, in their belief in the importance of education, have continuously supported all of their children's endeavors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher wishes to thank the following people for their invaluable assistance in untold ways in aiding in the completion of this research.

Dr. Jean Grambs, Professor of Education at the University of Maryland, for her able direction, judgement and continuous encouragement not only in the completion of this dissertation but throughout the researcher's graduate work at the University of Maryland;

Dr. James Greenberg, Professor of Education, University of Maryland, for his patient reading and constructive suggestions for the improvement of this research;

Dr. Richard Hopkins, Professor of Education, University of Maryland, for his thorough reading and incisive suggestions for the improvement of this research;

Dr. Robert Risinger, Professor of Education, University of Maryland, for his careful reading of this dissertation on short notice at a busy time of the academic year;

Dr. Larry Cuban, Superintendent of Schools, Arlington, Virginia, for his careful reading of this dissertation and his support of Alternative Education in Arlington County;

The many alternative school students and teachers who shared with the researcher their daily experiences in alternative schools;

Dr. Gerry Ward, formerly of Gallaudet College, now of Durham, North Carolina, for his encouragement and able assistance at crucial points "along the way";

Alice Sufit, my colleague in Social Studies and friend in the Woodlawn Program, for her editing of this research and her support in numerous ways, aiding me in the completion of my degree;

Margaret Stevens, formerly of the Woodlawn Program, for her typing of a crucial draft and her moral support given so generously to the researcher over these years;

Mrs. Gina Parish of the Arlington County Professional Library for her constant willingness to aid the researcher with the multitude of details involved in the completion of this project;

Dr. Dorothy Brown, Professor of History and Chairman of the History Department, Georgetown University, for her continuous encouragement, support and advice not only towards the completion of this research but also in the attainment of the researcher's degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

DEDICATION v

ACKNOWLEDGMENT vi

LIST OF TABLES xii

Chapter

1. ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS--BACKGROUND AND AREAS OF INVESTIGATION 1

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 6

RESEARCH QUESTIONS 7

DEFINITION OF TERMS WITHIN THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS 8

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS 11

LITERATURE ON ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS--AN OVERVIEW 11

A REVIEW OF THE STUDIES WHICH PERTAIN TO STUDENT DECISION MAKING AND USE OF THE COMMUNITY AS A LEARNING RESOURCE IN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS 16

THE PLACE OF THE PROPOSED STUDY WITHIN THE CURRENT LITERATURE ON STUDENT DECISION MAKING IN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS 21

3. RESEARCH PROCEDURES 23

SELECTION OF THE SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY 23

RESEARCHER'S ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOLS 24

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION 25

Chapter Page

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND THE USE OF STATISTICAL PROCEDURES 30

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 31

4. DESCRIPTION OF PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENTS--EXCERPTS FROM SCHOOLS' LITERATURE 34

DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOLS 34

SUMMARY 61

5. WHY STUDENTS ATTEND AN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL 62

FACTORS FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE 62

THREE FACTORS WITHIN EACH SCHOOL 66

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SIX ITEMS WITHIN EACH SCHOOL 68

CONCLUSIONS 73

6. INDIVIDUAL DECISION MAKING 75

GRADE OPTIONS 76

GRADE DETERMINATION AND STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE COURSE AND THE INSTRUCTOR 86

INDEPENDENT STUDY 94

CHAPTER SUMMARY 105

CONCLUSIONS 107

7. GROUP DECISION MAKING 109

STRUCTURE AND MECHANICS 109

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER CONTROL OVER THE ALL-SCHOOL MEETING 118

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE ALL-SCHOOL MEETING IN FOUR AREAS: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, DISCIPLINE-PROBLEM SOLVING-INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS, STAFFING, AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT 120

Chapter Page

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING THE AUTONOMY OF THE ALL-SCHOOL MEETING IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOL 146

SUMMARY 149

CONCLUSIONS 151

8. THE USE OF THE COMMUNITY AS A LEARNING RESOURCE 153

USE OF THE COMMUNITY AS A LEARNING RESOURCE (OUTSIDE SPEAKERS, COMMUNITY PERSONS, OUTSIDE LEARNING EXPERIENCES) 154

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE FIVE SCHOOLS REGARDING OUTSIDE LEARNING ACTIVITIES 158

CONCLUSIONS 168

9. LEARNING DECISIONS MADE BY STUDENTS 170

THE EXTENT TO WHICH STUDENTS TOOK INDEPENDENT STUDY 170

THE EXTENT TO WHICH STUDENTS TOOK OUTSIDE LEARNING ACTIVITIES 174

THE TYPE OF OUTSIDE LEARNING ACTIVITIES IN WHICH STUDENTS ENGAGED 177

CONCLUSIONS 180

10. SCHOOL PROFILE 182

DESCRIPTION OF SINGLE SCHOOL 182

A COMPARISON OF THE FIVE SCHOOLS: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES 200

11. CONCLUSIONS: IMPLICATIONS: SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 204

AREAS OF INVESTIGATION AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 204

CONCLUSIONS 205

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 209

Chapter Page

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 213

EPILOGUE 214

BIBLIOGRAPHY 216

APPENDIXES

A. QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTED TO A SAMPLE OF STUDENTS WITHIN THE FIVE SCHOOLS 221

B. INTERVIEW 236

C. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES AND T TESTS 238

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number and Percentage of Respondents to Questionnaire in Each School	27
2.	Observations of Five Activities in Five Alternative Schools	29
3.	Factors in Attendance for Total Sample	65
4.	Factors in Attendance for Schools One-Five	67
5.	Weighted Importance of the Six Items for the Five Schools (mean scores)	69
6.	Grade Options Which Students Perceived Were Available in Their Schools for the Total Sample	77
7.	Grade Options Which Students Said Were Available in Their Schools for Schools One-Five	78
8.	Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Total Sample	80
9.	Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School One	81
10.	Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Two	81
11.	Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Three	82
12.	Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Four	82
13.	Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Five	83
14.	Persons Who Chose Grade Options for the Total Sample (N = 206)	84
15.	Who Chose Grade Options for Schools One-Five	85

Table Page

16. Determination of Grades for the Total Sample 87

17. Determination of Grades for Schools One-Five 88

18. Opportunity to Evaluate the Course and the Instructor for the Total Sample 91

19. Opportunity to Evaluate the Course and the Instructor for Schools One-Five 92

20. Percentage of Subjects Students Could Take on Independent Study Had They Chosen To Do So for the Total Sample 95

21. Percentage of Subjects Students Could Take on Independent Study Had They Chosen To Do So for Schools One-Five 96

22. Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Total Sample (N = 247) 98

23. Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School One 99

24. Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Two 99

25. Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Three 100

26. Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Four 100

27. Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Five 101

28. Activities Within Independent Study for the Total Sample . . 103

29. Activities Within Independent Study for Schools One-Five . . 104

30. Types of Meetings Held in Schools One-Five 110

31. Voting and Representation at All-School Meeting 111

32. Students' Perceptions of the Scheduling of the All-School Meeting 112

33. Students' Perceptions of Who Determined Meeting Time for Schools One-Five 113

Table | Page

34. Students' Perceptions of Agenda Determination for Schools One-Five 114

35. Students' Perceptions of Who Chooses the Chairperson for the All-School Meeting 116

36. Students' Perceptions of Who the Chairperson Usually Was in Schools One-Five 117

37. Students' Perceptions of Teacher Control of the All-School Meeting in Schools One-Five 119

38. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School One 121

39. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School One 122

40. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School One 123

41. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School One 124

42. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Two 126

43. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Two 127

44. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Two 128

45. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School Two 129

46. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Three 131

Table Page

47. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Three 132

48. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing Functions - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Three 133

49. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School Three 134

50. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Four 136

51. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Four 137

52. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing Functions - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Four 138

53. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School Four 139

54. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Five 141

55. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Five 142

56. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Five . . 143

57. Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Resource Management - 5, 6, 11, 12 in School Five 144

58. Percentage of Courses in Which Students Had Outside Speakers for the Total Sample 155

59. Percentage of Courses in Which Students Had Outside Speakers for Schools One-Five 155

Table | Page

60. Percentage of Courses Taught By Persons From the Community for Total Sample 156

61. Percentage of Courses Taught By People in the Community for Schools One-Five 157

62. Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions for the Total Sample 159

63. Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School One . . . 160

64. Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Two . . . 161

65. Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Three . . 162

66. Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Four . . . 163

67. Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Five . . . 164

68. Students' Perceptions of the Teacher's Role in Finding Outside Learning Activities for Students for the Total Sample 166

69. Students' Perceptions of the Teacher's Role in Finding Outside Learning Activities for Students for Schools One-Five 166

70. Students' Perceptions of Their Responsibility to Find An Outside Activity for the Total Sample 167

71. Students' Perceptions of Their Responsibility to Find An Outside Activity for Schools One-Five 167

72. Percentage of Subjects in Which Students Took Independent Study For the Total Sample 172

73. Percentage of Subjects in Which Students Took Independent Study For Schools One-Five 173

74. Percentage of Courses Students Took Away From School For the Total Sample 175

75. Percentage of Courses Students Took Away From School For Schools One-Five 176

Table | Page

76. Number of Outside Learning Activities Per School 179

Chapter 1

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS--BACKGROUND AND AREAS OF INVESTIGATION

> Obviously we need a fresh plan for reform--one that brings out the best in people--one that brings the parties of interest together; one that respects the rights and the responsibilities of each. One that is not imposed, one that will increase satisfaction among parents, students, and teachers; one that can provide quality education to a diverse population.[1]

> See our school is different, the teachers are different here. The kids who attend the school are different, even the janitor is different, you won't find another one like him in the whole state. The difference stems from the way that our school is run, we have a certain quality that I don't think you would find in too many schools. In other words this is a part of my life that I wouldn't give up for anything.[2]

Both statements have common referents; they describe public alternative schools. Historically, there have been alternatives to the public school and within the public school system. Private sectarian and non-sectarian schools of various types existed prior to the establishment of public education. Within the public system, there have been some schools which offered a specific curriculum such as vocational education. An example of such an alternative was the Milwaukee Institute of Technology.[3] Another alternative available to students in some districts was

---

[1]Mario D. Fantini, What's Best for the Children (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1974), p. 145.

[2]Educational Alternatives Project, "Alternative School Students," Changing Schools: An Occasional Newsletter on Alternative Schools (Bloomington, Indiana, 1973), p. 9.

[3]Presently known as Milwaukee Area Technical College.

the type of school which admitted students on a selective basis and offered a curriculum more intensive than that of the conventional school. An example of such an alternative was the Bronx School of Science.

Recently, in the 1960's schools emerged labeled generally as "free schools." These schools existed outside of the public system. One author characterized these schools as committed in varying degrees to libertarian methods, significant student and parent participation in decision making and opposition to the methods and spirit of the conventional public and private schools.[4] Beyond these generalizations these schools were difficult to categorize. They varied in the curricula they offered and the clientele they served. For example, both the Roxbury Community School, Roxbury, Massachusetts, and the Milwaukee Independent School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, were called "free schools." The curriculum of the Milwaukee Independent School was student-oriented; the curriculum of the Roxbury Community School emphasized a traditional skills program. Those free schools which viewed themselves as a small community of teachers and students working together and sharing equally in the decision making process, which offered a curriculum based on student interest and which serve counter-culture middle-class youth are closest to the specific type of public alternative school to be examined in this study.

The free schools were private schools which operated on a tuition basis and offered various programs which their founders felt would

---

[4]Allen Graubard, "The Free School Movement," Harvard Educational Review, 42 (August, 1972), 352.

overcome what they considered to be weaknesses in the conventional education system.

In the late 1960's, the educational literature not only reported the existence of "free schools" but also the emergence of a distinct kind of alternative public school. These alternatives appeared at a time when American colleges and universities, both public and private, found themselves under siege, the targets of students protesting their lack of individual and academic freedom or the institution's involvement in current national domestic or foreign policy.

Higher education was not the sole target of student dissent and dissatisfaction. Many high schools faced student protest in the areas of speech, dress, student conduct, and curricular choices. Some sixty percent of a sample of high school principals surveyed at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary Principals in March, 1969, reported that they had experienced significant student protest in their schools during that school year.[5]

It was against this background of student dissatisfaction and at the urging of small but vocal groups of students, parents, and teachers that some school boards authorized the establishment of public alternative schools within their districts. These alternatives reflected the various needs of specific communities to find an educational pattern quite different from the existing schools.

---

[5] J. Lloyd Trump and Jane Hunt, "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 53 (May, 1969), 151.

Many factors were identified as having contributed to the rapid growth of these schools. Among them were:

1. publications describing the development and growth of alternative schools nation-wide;

2. the willingness of regional accreditation associations to recognize alternative schools; and

3. the willingness of state departments of education to allow flexible graduation requirements.[6]

As a result of these factors, alternative schools were gaining acceptance among educators. In 1973, eighty percent of the professional educators surveyed by Gallup approved of the establishment of alternative schools.[7] By 1975, they numbered approximately 1,250 and they could be found in thirty-nine states.

What is a public alternative school? There is no model which describes all alternative schools. These schools differ in their goals, programs and the clientele that they serve. A University of Massachusetts study surveyed a variety of public schools labeled "alternative" in order to "ascertain the thrust and dimensions of the movement and to determine systematically the diverse range of options represented by these programs.[8] Five categories of schools and their

---

[6]Robert D. Barr, "The Growth of Alternative Public Schools," 1975 ICOPE Report (Bloomington, Indiana: International Consortium for Options in Public Education, 1975), p. 6.

[7]George Gallup, "The Fifth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Towards Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 55 (September, 1973), 42.

[8]National Alternative Schools Program, A National Directory of Public Alternative Schools (Amherst, Massachusetts: School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1974), p. 3.

major programmatic thrusts emerged from the survey:

1. vocationally-oriented and job placement programs;

2. fine arts programs;

3. survival or basic skills programs;

4. programs for students who evidence emotional or behavioral disorders; and

5. programs which provide students with flexible educational environments by allowing them opportunities (a) to make individual and group decisions about their own learning and the governance of the school, and (b) to use the community as a learning resource.

The schools in the first four categories either offered students a prescribed curriculum or served a specific clientele. Schools in the fifth category neither served a specifically defined clientele nor offered a specialized curriculum; rather their claim to be an alternative rested in the flexible educational environment they purported to offer.

The schools to be examined in the proposed study are a selected group of schools which fall in the fifth category of the Massachusetts study. Henceforth, the term "alternative schools" in this study will refer to schools which provide a flexible environment by allowing students to make decisions about their own learning and to use the community as a learning resource.

As the numbers of alternative public schools grew, so did the literature. In its entirety the literature reflected a certain "shotgun" approach to the subject. A review of the educational literature indicated that exploratory studies exist on a variety of topics related to alternative public schools, but there have been few follow-up studies on

any topic. No studies focused on the specific aspects of these schools which made them distinctive from the conventional school and asked: "Do these schools actually do what their literature purports that they do?" Alternative public schools claim to exist in order to respond to student needs unmet by the conventional public school. However, no study examined these programs primarily from the perspective of the student, the consumer of these schools. No study examined a group of schools with similar goals and philosophies and described the differences and similarities of student activities among the schools.[9]

Currently, at a time of taxpayer revolts, shrinking funds for education and increasing rhetoric of "accountability," the honeymoon with alternative schools may be ending; in some districts it is over.[10] Their continued existence may hinge on political, educational, and economic factors, two of which might be: (1) that the programs authenticate their distinctiveness as alternatives by providing students with the programs which they claim to provide, and (2) that students are satisfied with the programs that they offer and continue to choose these programs.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study will supplement the existing literature on alternative schools in two ways.

---

[9]This conclusion was drawn by the researcher after a careful search of the ERIC system; the Index to Current Journals in Education (1966-76); Dissertation Abstracts (1964-77); and the card catalogs at the University of Maryland, the University of Massachusetts, and Harvard University.

[10]Because of budgetary restraints, the district school board closed School Three (one of five in the study) in June, 1976.

1. It will examine selected aspects of these schools which make them distinct from conventional schools, from a stated school perspective and a student perspective.

2. Rather than examine one school, this study will examine five schools which have similar goals and philosophies in order to provide a larger number of cases from which to generalize about alternative schools. Further it will provide data for the schools and their districts which will illuminate how students perceive these schools and the extent to which students utilize some of the opportunities available to them which are crucial to the stated goals of these schools.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study is an attempt to examine in some depth the actual workings of selected public alternate schools to see if, in fact, these schools provide the kinds of unique educational experiences they claim. They purport to offer students opportunities to (1) make individual and group decisions, and (2) use the community as a learning resource. These schools have five other common characteristics. They:

1. are publicly funded;

2. have racially mixed student populations numbering between 100-200 students;

3. operate within a public school system; and

4. have been in existence at least three years.

The research questions for the study are four:

1. Does a sample of students in the five schools see these schools offering all students opportunities to make decisions

(a) individually concerning his/her learning, or (b) as a group concerning the governance of the school?

2. Does a sample of students in the five schools see these schools offering all students opportunities to use the community as a learning resource?

3. How important were the opportunities to make individual learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource as factors in students' decisions to attend the alternative school?

4. Given opportunities to make decisions and to use the community as a learning resource, which choices did a sampling of students actually make?

DEFINITION OF TERMS WITHIN THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Opportunities for Individual Decision Making

The following areas will be examined because these are areas in which students had opportunities to make individual learning decisions advertised as available in all five schools.

1. Grade options: varieties and restrictions;

2. Independent study: availability, activities, accessibility, and utilization;

3. Evaluation of courses and instructors.

Opportunities for Group Decision Making

The items listed below will be considered pertinent to the group decision-making process in these schools. (Some items explore the

extent of student input in the mechanics of group decision making, while others explore the type of authority the group exercises over a variety of issues.)

1. Procedures for making group decisions (some type of all-school meeting);

2. The nature of student input regarding the mechanics of the meetings;

3. The extent of teacher control over the meetings as perceived by the students;

4. The type of authority exercised by the meeting on a variety of issues.

Opportunities to Use the Community as a Learning Resource

Areas to be examined common to all schools in the study will be: (1) the use of community persons within the school as outside speakers and outside teachers and (2) the availability of outside learning activities for students in the community.

The Choices Students Made Within the Realm of Individual Decision Making

Two areas will be examined: (1) independent study and (2) outside learning activities. Within independent study the percentage of students who took this option and the extent to which they did so will be examined. In the area of outside learning activities, the percentage of students who took them, the extent to which they did so, and the types of learning activities in which they engaged will be explored.

Research procedures, sources of the data, and limitations of the study will be described in detail in Chapter Three. The purpose of the study is two-fold. It examines five alternative public schools' stated opportunities for students in specific areas against what students perceive are those opportunities, and it explores the extent to which students utilize some of the opportunities available to them.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

Chapter Two will (1) describe briefly the literature which examines alternative schools in general, (2) review thoroughly the literature on student decision making and use of the community as a learning resource in alternative schools, and (3) suggest where the proposed study supplements the existing literature.

LITERATURE ON ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS--AN OVERVIEW

Several studies exist which focus on a variety of topics on alternative schools. A review of the literature suggests several categories into which studies might be placed: staffing, financing, planning and first-year implementation, climate, formative evaluation, curriculum; student-teacher interaction; and general descriptions of a variety of alternative programs and descriptions of specific programs.[1]

---

[1]The literature reviewed for this study is the product of a careful search of the ERIC system, the Index to Current Journals in Education (1966-76), Dissertation Abstracts (1964-77) and the card catalogs at the University of Maryland, the University of Massachusetts, and Harvard University. Beyond the topics reviewed for this dissertation, the search revealed approximately twenty-five short articles (1-3 pages in length). These articles will not be extensively reviewed because they are not scholarly studies: rather they perform the function of publicizing the existence of alternative schools and exchanging information concerning alternative schools. From within this group, two representative articles will be reviewed for this study. Scholarly studies which examine aspects of alternative schools other than decision making will be described briefly in this chapter.

In the area of staffing two studies exist. Mulcahy examined an inservice year-long training program designed to provide a method for staff in one school to evaluate their tasks and re-order their priorities if necessary.[2] McCauley compared the perceptions of selected alternative school and conventional school staff in four areas: (1) evaluation, (2) task priority, (3) power, and (4) authority.[3]

There is one study which examines the financing of alternative schools. Theroux examined the sources of funding, compared the costs between alternative and conventional schools and cited the areas which comprised the greatest costs for the alternative school.[4]

Three studies examine the planning and first-year activities of specific alternative schools. Bierwirth studied the planning and the first-year implementation of a senior alternative program.[5] Mackin chronicled events in the first year of a first through twelfth grade

---

[2]Eugene Francis Mulcahy, "An Inservice Staff Training Project Conducted at Shanti School in Hartford, Connecticut" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1973), p. 100.

[3]Brian McCauley, "Evaluation and Authority in Alternative Schools and Public Schools" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles, 1972), p. 33.

[4]John B. Theroux, "Financing Public Alternative Schools" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1974), p. 81.

[5]John E. Bierwirth, "A Comparison of Worcester Alternative and Regular High Schools" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1973), p. 242.

alternative program.[6] Pacquin's study was actually a detailed proposal for an alternative school with a strong ecological emphasis. The proposal was never funded; consequently, the school was never established.[7]

One study focused on the nature of the environments of alternative schools. Using the Stearns Activities Index and the Elementary and Secondary Environment Index, Gluckstern examined differences in the environments of five alternative schools.[8]

In the area of evaluation, two works exist. Evaluation of Alternative Schools is a compilation of evaluations of twenty-seven programs labeled "alternative." These schools differed in the programs they offered and the clientele they served. This work is included here because at least two of the schools evaluated were similar in goals and clientele to the schools in the study.[9] The other study, authored by

---

[6]Robert Mackin, "Documentation and Analysis of the Development of the Bent Twig, an Alternative Public High School in Marion, Massachusetts" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1972), p. 195.

[7]Thomas Pacquin, "Documentation and Analysis of the Development of the Camp Greenough Environmental Education Center and Alternative Public High School, Yarmouth, Massachusetts" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1973), p. 161.

[8]Steven Gluckstern, "Assessment of Educational Environments: the Public Alternative School and its Students" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1974), p. 150.

[9]Educational Research Service, Inc., Evaluations of Alternative Schools (Arlington, Virginia, 1977), pp. 1-5.

Gollub, examined the role of formative evaluation in a secondary alternative school over a year-long period.[10]

Barndt's study is the only one which examines some aspect of curriculum. His study was a description and evaluation of a mathematics course which had been introduced in an alternative school.[11]

Three studies explore the nature of student-teacher interaction. Argyris compared student-teacher behaviors of the conventional school with those of three alternative schools.[12] Wilson examined student-teacher interaction and the implications of these interactions for both groups in one alternative school.[13] Having previously identified several variables which would contribute to the needs of Black students Martin examined the interactions between students and teachers in order to determine whether the needs of these students were met in three alternative schools.[14]

Four works can be classified as general descriptions of alternative schools. Bremer's School Without Walls is a description of the

---

[10]Wendy Gollub, "A Case Study in Formative Evaluation" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Harvard University, 1971), p. 164.

[11]R. L. Barndt, "Mathematics via Problem Solving" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Harvard University, 1972), p. 178.

[12]Christopher Argyris, "Alternative Schools, A Behavioral Analysis," Teacher's College Record, 75 (May, 1974), 434.

[13]Stephen Wilson, "You Can Talk to Teachers: Student-Teacher Relations in an Alternative School," Teacher's College Record, 78 (May, 1977), 100.

[14]Floyd Martin, "A Case Study of Three Alternative Schools: An Analysis from a Black Perspective" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1972), p. 6.

origins, philosophy, and implementation of the Parkway Program, Philadelphia. In P.S. 2001 Philip DeTurk highlighted the major flaws in American public education, presented a general definition of an alternative school and described the exciting and often chaotic origins of the Pasadena Alternative School. The book closed with an assessment of the school's first year.

Fantini, in Public Schools of Choice, outlined a network of possible alternatives within the public system. A portion of the book examined the various types of public alternatives in operation in 1972.

Glatthorn's work, Alternatives in Education, is similar to that of Fantini's. Glatthorn presented a blueprint for a variety of alternative programs and schools. He suggested strategies for planning, implementing, and evaluating these alternatives.[15]

Two short articles examined here are representative of the short articles found in the literature on alternative schools. One describes a specific program; the other suggests the range of programs under the label of alternative schools.

Crabtree, in "Chicago's Metro High, Freedom, Choice, Responsibility," described briefly such aspects of the Metro program as curriculum (which included a school without walls component), scheduling, staff and student selection. The author illustrated the difficulties and the challenges involved for students as they try to balance freedom and responsibility.

---

[15]Complete citations for Bremer, Crabtree, Smith, DeTurk, Fantini, and Glatthorn may be found in the Bibliography.

Vernon Smith, in "Options in Public Education: The Quiet Revolution," outlined a variety of schools labeled alternative. He described attributes common to all schools. Among them were (1) students chose to attend these schools; (2) the schools have a comprehensive set of goals; and (3) they possess structures which are flexible and responsive to change. The author concluded by indicating that it is too early to evaluate the impact of alternative schools.

In summary, the literature on alternative schools generally reflects the recent emergence of alternative schools in two ways.

1. There are few studies available. In the areas of financing, alternative school environment, formative evaluation, and curriculum, only one study exists. Three studies are available on the topics of staffing and student-teacher interaction.

2. The content of a portion of the literature emphasized the beginning aspects of alternative schooling. Three studies described the "first year" of specific alternative schools, and four works described generally the range of alternatives in operation and discussed the planning and implementation of these schools.

A REVIEW OF THE STUDIES WHICH PERTAIN TO STUDENT DECISION MAKING AND USE OF THE COMMUNITY AS A LEARNING RESOURCE IN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

There are no studies which examine the ways alternative schools make use of the community as a learning resource. This section will review the four studies available which examine some aspect of student decision making in alternative schools.

Wilson conducted a year-long field observation study of staff and student decision making behaviors in an urban alternative school. He asked the question, "what would become of student decision making in a school which was seriously committed to the principle of freedom"? What shape would student decision making take? He found that the staff's desired level of student participation in decision making did not occur.[16] He cited several barriers to effective student involvement in decision making: students seized on the flexibility to follow somewhat individualistic paths rather than joining in group decision making; although all-school meetings were held for a short period of time during the year, no permanent decision making structures replaced those of the regular school which had been removed; the school encountered and could not overcome the socialization of role expectations that students had learned in previous schools; environmental pressures forced the school administrators to regulate the times of meetings and restrict the use of equipment. The nature of arranging outside courses required an expertise that students did not feel they possessed and thus teachers assumed control in this area; in curricular areas teachers often developed in-school courses in lieu of student participation in originating courses.[17]

Miller examined the organizational nature of selected alternative schools by focusing on the decision-making structures of these schools.

---

[16]Stephen H. Wilson, "A Participant Observation Study of the Attempt to Institute Student Participation in Decision Making in an Experimental High School" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1972), p. 14.

[17]Ibid., p. 218.

Using the data from the University of Massachusetts survey (1974), she asked two questions:

1. What patterns of decision making are operant in forty-six of the alternative schools in the survey?

2. Based on the patterns of decision making that are operant in these schools, what can be inferred about the organizational characteristics of these schools (can these schools be classified on a continuum as possessing formal or informal organizational characteristics)?

Schools were included in the study on the basis of a written statement from each school indicating that the school was different from the other schools in the district in at least three of the following areas: curriculum, decision making, interaction of students and staff, grading, use of noncertified personnel, physical environment, interaction between school, parents, and community, or emphasis on affective goals.

Miller identified four types of decision making patterns operating in these schools. The determinants for including schools in the four types were the various groups within the school included in the decision making process (staff, students, director, and central administration) and the perceived influence structure within the school. The four types identified were:

1. Type I. Schools which had a highly centralized decision making structure. The decisions in the school were made by the director and the central office personnel.
2. Type II. Schools which utilized an adult collaborative structure for making decisions. The director and staff made the decisions; students were excluded from the decision making process.
3. Type III. No consistent pattern is evident in these schools regarding how influential staff and students are in making decisions. Both students and staff perceive that they have input in the decision making process; however, the effect of that input was unclear.

4. Type IV. A committee structure. These schools involved students in a decision-making process in an organized fashion. However, a great deal of power still lay informally in the hands of adults.[18]

In classifying the four types of schools regarding organizational structures, Miller concluded that those schools which are more exclusive in admitting participants to the decision-making process (Type I and Type II) are the schools closest to the formal pole of the continuum. The school (Type IV) which is most inclusive of participants in the decision-making process is closest to the informal pole. The author placed Type III schools in the center of the continuum because their organizations included both formal and informal characteristics.[19]

She concluded that differences in these alternative schools' organizations mirrored differences in the age and size of the school, types of students served, initiation and planning, and staff characteristics.[20]

The monograph, Decision Making in Alternative Schools, is the product of shared experiences of fifteen alternative school participants at a conference in Chicago in 1972. The participants identified common patterns of institutional decision making in the development of alternative schools:

1. Large group meetings proved to be inefficient and ineffective as the primary method of decision making. Some other form of representative governance must be found.

---

[18]Lynn Miller, "Organizational Structure for Decision Making in Alternative Schools" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, 1975), p. 89.

[19]Ibid., p. 102. [20]Ibid., p. 168.

2. Students sustained limited interest in decision making after the abolishment of the petty rules of traditional schools.
3. Staff and a few interested students took over the bulk of the decision making.[21]

To alleviate these difficulties, the participants concluded that clarity of action was vital in four areas:

1. Definition of school goals must be stated;
2. External environmental constraints must be clearly defined (use of building, etc.);
3. Internal understanding and limits (rules made by the school community itself) must be known by all participants; and
4. Conditions for the exclusion of teachers and staff must be spelled out.[22]

Examining the same school which had been the focus of the Wilson study, the Center for New Schools studied student decision making as it affected the organization of the school and found five barriers to effective student decision making. They were (1) the staff would eventually fill the void of student inactivity and make decisions which were in the student domain; (2) the "school without walls" mode of operation conflicted with student decision making; (3) bureaucratic delays within the system discouraged students from making decisions; (4) the communication system at the school was not effective enough to insure that participants had appropriate knowledge of the issues in the school; and (5) once decisions had been agreed upon, it was difficult for students to confront peers in order to enforce the decisions.[23]

---

[21] Center for New Schools, Decision Making in Alternative Schools, Report from a National Conference (Chicago: Center for New Schools, 1972), p. 51.

[22] Ibid., p. 54.

[23] Center for New Schools, "Strengthening Alternative High Schools," Harvard Educational Review, 42 (August, 1972), 322-24.

Classifying the four studies on decision making by research designs, three of the four are descriptive research. Of these three, two are participant observation studies (Wilson and the Center for New Schools); the third is survey research (Miller). The fourth study is a conference report based on the shared experiences of the participants.

In summary, one study (Wilson) examined one school and touched briefly on the realms of decision making for students but focused heavily on why students were not effective decision makers. Another study (Miller) examined organizational characteristics of a variety of alternative schools through a classification of decision making structures. The third study (Center for New Schools) supplemented the Wilson study by citing elements which were barriers to effective decision making. These included: the creative nature of the staff, the nature of specific components of the curriculum, the district's bureaucratic structures, and the nature of communication within the school. Finally, the conference report identified common patterns of student decision making and offered some general recommendations concerning the survival of alternative schools.

THE PLACE OF THE PROPOSED STUDY WITHIN THE CURRENT LITERATURE ON STUDENT DECISION MAKING IN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

In the literature on alternative schools, four studies examine some aspect of student decision making. All of the studies focus primarily on the group governance perspective of decision making. None examine decision making from the perspective of the individual student. All of the studies either describe the structure that group governance

takes (all-school meetings, student-staff committees) or why these structures were not effective. None of the studies ask students if the opportunities to make decisions about their own learning was an important factor in their decision to attend the alternative school. None of the studies describe concretely in what areas students make decisions individually or collectively.

Two patterns emerge regarding the number of schools observed in the four studies. Two studies reported observations of the same school. The other two studies reported observations of a variety of alternative schools some of which did not place a priority on student decision making. None of the studies examine student decision making primarily from the perspective of the students nor ask whether students perceive the school as offering the students the opportunities to make decisions as some of the schools claim.

This study will determine whether the opportunities to make individual and group decisions and use the community as a learning resource were important factors in students' decisions to attend the alternative school. Finally, it will describe the structure and the content of individual and group decision making in these schools.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This chapter will describe the process of school selection, the methods of data collection, the mode in which data will be presented, the statistical procedures performed on segments of the data, and the limitations of the study.

SELECTION OF THE SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY

Previous studies of two or more alternative schools examined schools which were not similar in goals and philosophies. They shared only the label "alternative." The five schools for this study were chosen because, as described in their own literature, they were similar in philosophy and goals, size and composition of student population. They all purported to offer students similar opportunities for individual decision making, for use of the community as a learning resource, and some method by which students could participate in the governance of the school. They were accessible for visitation and surveying (located in the Eastern United States), and they indicated a willingness to be observed. The researcher contacted the schools by letter and phone. The directors gave their permission for the researcher to interview, survey, and observe students and staff. In two instances the all-school meeting was required to do so.

The research was undertaken with the agreement that students and staff would voluntarily complete the questionnaire or consent to be interviewed.

RESEARCHER'S ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOLS

Because of the recent emergence of alternative schools and the attention given to them, many visitors had observed these schools. Students were generally comfortable with visitors and would respond to their questions. However, this researcher was asking students to provide more detailed information than would the average observer. According to the agreement with the director, staff and students would voluntarily give information. In order to obtain the cooperation of students and staff, it was necessary for them to understand the study. The researcher shared with them not only the purposes of the research but also her work as a teacher in an alternative school.

During the first day at each school, the researcher introduced herself to students and staff and observed aspects of the environment such as classes, informal interactions between students and students and staff, activities in the halls, the office, and informal student gathering places.

During the second, third, and fourth days, the researcher continued to observe and asked students to complete a questionnaire. Some of the students who had completed the questionnaire were interviewed regarding specific items on the questionnaire.

Students completed the questionnaire individually and in small groups during their free time between classes at the beginning and the

end of the school day. The field work for the five schools began in February and was completed in May, 1975.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

The methods of data collection were: a review of each school's literature which explained generally the programs, philosophy, and goals of each school; a questionnaire distributed to as many students as possible present at each school over a four-day period; a structured interview given to a sample of students who had taken the survey; observations by the researcher of the general environment of each school and of selected student and staff activities over a four-day period; and an interview with a staff member from each school.

Review of Each School's Literature

The researcher reviewed the literature printed by each school. This review was crucial not only to document the similarities among the program, a characteristic important to the selection of these specific schools, but also to answer the two questions of the study: whether, in fact, students perceived that they had the opportunities for individual and collective decision making and for use of the community as a learning resource.

The literature illustrated the ways in which the students could make decisions, use the community as a learning resource and participate in the governance of the school. Selected excerpts from each school's literature generally illustrating these ways are placed in Chapter 4.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire for this study consisted of sixty-six items developed by the researcher based on selected activities proposed by the research as important in this type of an alternative school. The questions were derived from the researcher's work and observations in one of the schools over a two-year period and from a review of the literature of the five schools in the study. They center on activities which were common to the five schools. The items asked students to describe selected opportunities to make individual and collective decisions and to use the community as a learning resource. Many of the questions asked students to describe the procedures involved and the extent to which these opportunities were available. Some questions asked whether students attended these schools to avail themselves of the opportunities offered.

A pilot study was distributed to a random sample of students at School Five in January, 1975. Randomization of the sample was achieved by use of a table of random numbers. The researcher used Kerlinger's criteria for item-writing in surveys as a guide by which to examine questions and determine their appropriateness and adequacy in the pilot. The criteria are:

1. Is the question related to the research problem and the research objectives?
2. Is the type of question right and appropriate?
3. Is the item clear and unambiguous?
4. Is the question a leading question?

5. Does the question demand knowledge and information that the respondent does not have?
6. Does the question demand personal or delicate material that the respondent may resist?
7. Is the question loaded with social desirability?[1]

Utilizing these criteria (numbers One, Two, and Three were particularly relevant) and student reaction to the pilot, the researcher revised some questions and eliminated others.

Within each school, the researcher stationed herself in various locations in the building and asked as many students as she was able to contact to complete the questionnaire. Only students present in the school were contacted. In each school, two to four students did not wish to complete it. Table 1 indicates the number of students responding to the questionnaire within each school. The final form of the questionnaire appears in appendix A.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Respondents To Questionnaire in Each School

School	Number within each sample responding	Total population of each school	Percentage of total population surveyed in each school
School One	38	165	23
School Two	32	92	35
School Three	47	160	29
School Four	53	105	50
School Five	77	230	33

[1]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973), pp. 485-87.

There were too many items in the final form of the questionnaire. Some were excluded from analysis in the following chapters because they did not relate directly to the research questions in this study.

Structured Interview with Students

An interview was administered to some students who had completed the survey (the minimum number of students interviewed in each school was seven). The questions were designed to supplement and probe beyond the questions in the questionnaire in order to obtain such information as the relationship among all-school meeting, the staff and director in determining policy for the school, the determination of curriculum (student or teacher initiated and directed) within social studies classes, and the activities of such structures in the schools as task forces and advisory groups. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. A copy of the interview schedule appears in appendix B.

Observations

The researcher observed and described physical characteristics of environments of the five schools (identified in the study as Schools One, Two, Three, Four, and Five) in order to provide a clearer picture of these schools. Besides these general observations, it was the intention of the researcher to observe five specific activities in these schools. They were: (1) all-school meetings, (2) student interactions in a variety of settings, (3) staff meetings, (4) student-teacher advisory groups where available, and (5) classes. Table 2 indicates four of the activities that were observed in each school.

Three of the schools did not hold all-school meetings during the four-day period that the researcher was present in the school. In one school, the meeting had been held the week before the researcher visited

Table 2

Observations of Five Activities in Five Alternative Schools

School	All-school meeting	Student interactions in a variety of settings	Staff meetings	Student-teacher advisory groups	Student/teacher interactions in a variety of settings
School One	Not held during visit to school	*	Not held during visit to school	*	*
School Two	Not held during visit to school	*	*	*	*
School Three	*	*	*	Not held during visit to school	*
School Four	Not held during visit to school	*	*	*	*
School Five	*	*	*	Not utilized in this school	*

*Activities observed by the researcher.

the school; in a second school, the meeting was scheduled for the week following the researcher's visit. The third school held all-school meetings on a sporadic basis when the director, staff, and students felt it was necessary to have them. Although all schools utilized the advisor system, one school did not schedule time for the advisor to meet with his advisees as a group. While not directly linked to the survey or the interview questions, the observations gave the researcher a sense of the daily life in these schools and provided the data for the descriptions of the physical environments of these schools found in Chapter 4.

Interview with a Staff Member

The director was interviewed at three of the schools. Due to the pressing schedules of the directors at the other two schools, they were unavailable for interviews; staff members were interviewed at these two schools. The researcher asked the directors and staff members two types of questions from the questionnaire: (1) those which concerned the requirements or restrictions concerning grade options, outside learning courses, and independent study courses; and (2) those which described the type of authority the all-school meeting held over a variety of issues.

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND THE USE OF STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

The type of research for this study can be characterized as descriptive survey research. The data will be reported in percentages. One-way analysis of variance, post-hoc analysis procedures, and a correlated T Test were performed on the six factors affecting student

attendance in order to determine whether there were differences within and among schools. One-way analysis of variance and homogeneity of variance tests were performed on:

1. the opportunities students had to evaluate the course and the instructor;

2. the manner in which grades were determined;

3. the extent to which independent study was actually taken;

4. the opportunities students perceived that they had to take independent study.

These tests were performed in order to determine whether there were significant differences in school response to these items. School response will be considered to differ significantly at the .01 level.

Analysis of variance summary tables and results of these procedures are in appendix C. An inter-rater reliability test was performed on the open-ended responses regarding why individual students chose to attend the alternative school.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Certain aspects of these schools, some of the research methods, and the instruments utilized hindered the complete success of this study and made the conclusions more tentative and guarded than the researcher had anticipated.

Aspects of the Schools

The Literature of the Schools. The schools' literature provided only general descriptions of the schools' philosophies and procedures. For

example, the role of the all-school meeting was described for one school in this way, "the general meeting shall discuss important issues or policy questions." These general statements made it difficult to obtain precise knowledge of specific activities from the perspective of the schools' literature.

The Location of the Schools. The five schools were located in the urban-suburban areas in the Eastern United States. Consequently, the findings in this study might not generalize to rural alternative schools or schools in other geographical locations.

Methodology and Instrumentation

Student Selection. The group of students who completed the questionnaire did not constitute a random sample. To achieve a random sample within the alternative school environment posed difficulties. Among them was the fact that a student's schedule might allow him either to be away from the alternative school for a part of each day or for an entire day. The students sampled were those whom the researcher was able to contact during her presence in the school and within the guidelines established by the administrators. The students completed the survey individually or in small groups at various times of the day.

The Questionnaire. The data obtained in the questionnaire are frequency data. The test of validity for such a questionnaire is usually in the form of a review for clarity and face validity. The original questionnaire was reviewed utilizing Kerlinger's criteria; some questions were clarified and some were omitted. However, even in its final form the

questionnaire was too long for the average student to complete in twenty minutes. Some survey and interview questions were not included in the analysis in the following chapters because they were not considered germane to the questions in the study.

Researcher Bias. While pursuing this study, the researcher was on sabbatical leave from School Five. Students in School Five participated in the pilot study, the revised questionnaire, and were interviewed. The researcher was generally known to students in School Five. These circumstances may contribute to researcher bias not only in the manner in which the researcher perceived the school but also in students' responses to the questionnaire and the interview questions.

Chapter 4

DESCRIPTION OF PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENTS-- EXCERPTS FROM SCHOOLS' LITERATURE

The addition to the essential characteristics as described in Chapter 1 which qualified these schools to be included in this study, this chapter will present the reader with brief descriptions of each school. These descriptions are derived from the observations of the researcher and each school's literature, and will provide the reader with a clearer picture of each school by which to distinguish one school from another rather than distinguishing them solely on the basis of their responses to questionnaire items. Secondly, this chapter will examine the literature prepared by each school regarding the activities which have been selected for analysis in this study. This examination is necessary in order to establish that these schools do purport to offer students opportunities for individual and group decision making and use of the community as a learning resource.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHOOLS

Each school will be briefly described in terms of its geographical location and physical layout, its student and faculty size, curriculum, basic published rules and statements of school goals, purposes or philosophical statements about learning.

School One

Geographical Location and Physical Layout. School One occupies a section of a floor in a vocational high school in a suburb adjacent to a large city in eastern Massachusetts. This school was founded in 1969 as a joint effort of the school district and the school of education of a local university. The school occupies eight rooms in the vocational building. At first glance the visitor sees nothing which clearly differentiates the alternative school environment from that of the technical school, but as one enters the school's tiny office the differences between the technical program and the alternative school become apparent. The office is a central place of communication and interaction for students and staff. The head teacher and the school secretary occupy desks in this room. However, at any given time of the school day, this room will be occupied by teachers and students. Teachers enter between classes to talk either to students, the secretary or the head teacher, or to conduct phone business. The activity in the office is constant; the numbers of people and the intensity of activity vary. In the space of a few minutes the secretary might respond to a phone inquiry about School One, orient visitors to the school, and consult with a teacher or discuss a personal problem with a student.

A room which was previously utilized as a lab-science room in the technical school adjoins the office. The guidance counselors have their desks there. Students are usually present in this room either chatting with one another or with one of the counselors. Other school space includes a student lounge, a crafts room and four classrooms. The crafts

room is the largest of the rooms. Students either work individually or in small groups there all day.

School One has made a small home for itself within the technical high school. An example of the contrast between the technical school and the alternative school is illustrated in the redecoration of one of the alternative school classrooms. This room had been recently carpeted and outfitted with new chairs. The students are quite proud of this room and enforce their all-school meeting rule which forbids eating there. The room is a comfortable classroom but is used for a student lounge when classes are not in session. This environment stands in contrast to the general drabness of the technical school environment. Students seem to be everywhere at School One, talking in small groups or studying alone in the halls, the student lounge or in the classrooms. Bulletin boards line the halls informing the students of new classes to be offered, school events or activities to be held in the local community. Informality in staff and student relationships is evident in the environment of School One.

Student and Staff Size. Sixty freshmen are chosen yearly by lottery from the applicants to represent as closely as possible a cross section of the total school population with respect to race, sex, neighborhood, previous school achievement level, and post high school aspirations.[1]

---

[1]Cambridge Pilot School, "The Cambridge Pilot School," a description of the program of the school, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1974-75, p. 1.

The school enrollment was set at one hundred and eighty students. At the time of this research, student population numbered one hundred and sixty-five. Full-time staff included eight full-time teachers, two guidance counselors, and one administrator. Part-time staff fulfill a variety of roles: community resource persons, tutors, and classroom aides. Their numbers vary at any given time, depending on the course offerings.

Curriculum. Courses in School One may be taken in the following subject areas: English, Social Studies, Mathematics, Languages, Art, Wilderness Living, and Career Education.[2] Students also have access to the full range of curricular and extra-curricular offerings available at the regular high school and the technical high school within the district.[3]

School One utilized an elective system for Social Studies and English classes. The Mathematics program consists of the traditional repertoire of courses but also includes Mathematics' electives. The language program offers instruction in French and Latin.[4]

Rules and Regulations. School One does not employ an open campus policy.[5] During the school day (8:30-2:30), students may not leave the school grounds unless they receive school or parental permission to do so.[6]

---

[2]Ibid., p. 5. [3]Ibid. [4]Ibid., p. 8.

[5]Cambridge Pilot School, "Policy and Procedures," ibid., p. 3.

[6]Ibid.

Since School One is located within another school building, it seemed necessary to make rules regarding student movement in rooms occupied by the host school's staff and students. There are attendance policies for both general school attendance and individual classes. Students are not permitted to cut classes at School One. A cut is an unexcused absence. A student may fail a quarter if he or she has cut a class six times and if special arrangements have not been made with the teacher.[7] Some teachers have more stringent rules regarding attendance.

Philosophy of the School or Stated Purpose. School One attempts to incorporate four basic principles in its day-to-day operations. It (1) seeks to create an environment which promotes cross cultural education, (2) fosters informal non-authoritarian relationships between students and teachers, (3) provides for participatory decision making, and (4) stresses the importance of the needs and concerns of the individual student.[8]

School Two

Geography and Physical Layout. School Two is a regional public alternative school located in the still functioning railroad station in a city in north central Connecticut. It is a regional alternative school

---

[7] Ibid.

[8] Cambridge Pilot School, "The Cambridge Pilot School," ibid., p. 2.

in the sense that students from the city and neighboring suburban school districts may attend it.[9]

School Two is housed in part of the railroad station. The other half of the station is in operation. Trains stop at the station infrequently but occasionally the noise of the train and the engine whistle are reminders that this school is actually lodged in a train station.

As the visitor enters the doors of School Two, one's attention is immediately drawn to the height of the ceilings. Students have constructed a temporary second floor and partitioned this area for classrooms. Quite appropriately, this area is called "the loft." A stairway (also constructed by students) connects the first floor with the loft.

Teachers have their desks close to the entrance of the school. They have consciously placed themselves "out in the open" for greater accessibility for the students. The second room on the right as one enters the school is the office, where the school secretary and head teacher occupy desks. Besides functioning as an administrative center, the office is an area of communication for students and staff. At any given time of the day, one may find at least three students present either talking to the head teacher or the secretary. Beyond the office, students have partitioned and enclosed space for classrooms. Thus, the visitor has the impression of small rooms against the expansiveness of the high ceilings of the railroad station.

---

[9]Shanti School, "Shanti School Information Brochure," Hartford, Connecticut, 1974-75, p. 2.

A main walking and lounging area runs down the center of the building; the classrooms occupy space on either side of this area. Comfortable old chairs and a few bulletin boards line the area. Students are everywhere, talking quietly with teachers at their desks, sitting together in the old chairs or sitting quietly alone. Occasionally a student will shout to another student. One is then conscious of the height of the ceilings, and noises seem to bounce off the walls.

School Two gives the visitor the impression of flexibility in the use of space. There is a tentativeness of style here. One has the feeling that if the students so decided, everything--classes, rooms, rules--could be rearranged the following week.

Student-Staff Size. The school opened in 1971. Students (grades 10-12) are chosen by lottery from the applicants. To insure a balance between city and suburban students, fifty percent of the student positions are allotted to city residents. The impetus for the school came from boards of education, parents, students, and educators in the city and neighboring districts.[10] At the time of the research, February, 1975, ninety-two students attended School Two.

The core faculty numbered eight. Part-time staff, which consisted of professors and students from local colleges and community people provided School Two with a variety of learning resources. The number of part-time staff varied from cycle to cycle, depending on the course offerings.

---

[10] Ibid.

Curriculum. Students at School Two devise their own curricula, subject to state requirements and their own interests and goals.[11] The month of January is designated as project month. Students are expected to design their own month-long experiences outside of school. No regular classes are held during this month. Money is sometimes allotted by the all-school meeting for individual student projects.[12]

School Two utilizes a point system as a way to interpret a variety of learning experiences. Each regular high school credit is divided into sixteen points. The student and his/her advisor negotiate the number of points to be awarded for a particular learning experience.

When the student has accumulated a total of 288 points, he may graduate. A student may also petition a graduation committee (made up of staff and students), present his/her program, and, upon consensus decision by the committee, may graduate.[13]

Rules and Regulations. The all-school meeting is the body responsible for making rules within the school. Rules formulated by the meeting have been stated in the form of policies and cover such areas as voting procedures for community meetings, the work of the task forces (student-staff committees), procedures for staff evaluation, use or possession of

---

[11] Ibid., p. 1.

[12] Statement by Eugene Mulcahy, personal interview, Shanti School, February, 1975.

[13] Shanti School, op. cit., p. 9.

drugs while attending school activities, graduation requirements, and student behavior within the school.[14]

Philosophy or Stated Purpose for the School. School Two's philosophy can be summarized in three basic statements: School Two exists to provide students (1) a relevant community-centered education, (2) an environment in which they are able to make choices about their own curriculum, a curriculum developed in response to staff and student's interests and needs, (3) an environment which sees itself as a community and offers the students an opportunity to participate in the governance of that school.[15]

School Three

Geographical Location and Physical Layout. School Three occupies the second floor of a former school building in a city in north-central Massachusetts. Impetus for founding the school came from parents, students, and teachers of the local district and representatives from the school of education at the state university. The first floor of the building which the school occupies is used for administrative offices for the district. On the second floor, the first area which the visitor encounters is the small alcove which serves as school office,

---

[14]Idem., "Policies of Community Meetings," Hartford, Connecticut, 1973-74.

[15]Idem., "Shanti School Information Brochure," ibid., p. 3.

administrative, and information center. The school secretary has her desk here and each student has a mailbox in the alcove.

The visitor proceeds through a set of doors and down a hall on both sides of which are nine classrooms. These rooms include a crafts room, several classrooms, and a student lounge. In the room down the hall from the office, the head teacher and another member of the staff have their desks. This room is used for classes, the town meeting, and a student lounge. Adjoining this room is a small library in which the visitor may find a class in progress or a small group of students just chatting.

The hall is a central place to meet friends. Bulletin boards line the hall, providing students with a barrage of information on colleges, new classes to be offered, and administrative announcements.

Students and teachers mingle freely in the hall. Students call teachers by their first names. A visitor might hear a teacher talking to a student about his work or just chatting casually about the day's events.

Two words might characterize School Three--people and activity. Students are everywhere, working in small classes or individually, studying quietly, visiting with friends in the office, lounge or the hall.

Student-Staff Size. The school opened in the Spring of 1972 with fifty-five students (10-12) chosen by lottery. Minimum percentages of students were set from each section of the city to insure a representation of students across the city's school population. In June, 1972, the school expanded to 125 students and in September, 1973, enrollment numbered 165.

School Three's student population at the time of this research, February, 1975, was 165. Full-time staff numbered eight. Part-time staff were primarily student interns from local colleges and universities. Their numbers varied depending on the number of outside courses offered in a given cycle.

Curriculum. Students at School Three may choose courses in Mathematics, English, Foreign Languages, Social Studies, Art, Environmental Studies, Music, and Physical Education.

Early in September, School Three holds a "curriculum marathon" at which time students may propose courses to be taught and teachers describe courses that they wish to teach for the year.[16] At different points in the school year, new courses may be introduced and old courses dropped.[17] Students enrolled at School Three may take courses at any of the other high schools in the district or they may receive credit for having taken internships in the community. Establishing an internship and the granting of credit is a process of negotiation between the student and his advisor.[18]

School Three is a public school operating within a school system under the jurisdiction of a school board. This relationship is reflected in School Three's rule that students are required to take basic secondary subjects in some form.

---

[16]Worcester Alternative School, "Year 3 Catalog of Possibilities," Worcester, Massachusetts, 1974-75, p. 8.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Ibid., p. 21.

The procedure utilized in School Three for granting credit in these subjects is a point system. A student and his advisor negotiate the amount of points that a student receives for a given learning experience. School Three indicated that the advantage of such a system lies in its flexibility in reporting a variety of learning experiences and in providing the student with the opportunity to work at his own rate.[19]

Rules and Regulations. School Three has three types of regulations: (1) attendance and course load requirements, (2) specific regulations under course load requirement, and (3) students' rules of behavior while on school property.[20] Rules in the first and third categories apply to all students attending School Three, while rules in the second category apply only to students under sixteen years of age.[21]

Philosophy or Stated Purpose of the School. School Three subscribes to the following three statements about learning: (1) students should be involved in determining their own education as much as possible, (2) school should be communities of learners where staff members act as learning facilitators and resources people, and (3) students should not only work on their own programs but also have a say in the direction of the school.[22]

---

[19] Ibid., p. 15.

[20] Ibid., p. 10.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid., p. 1.

School Four

Geographical Location and Physical Layout. Located in a suburb of eastern New Jersey, School Four opened in September of 1973. The planning and implementation for the school came from students, teachers, and administrators of the district. The school occupies four portable classrooms and one room in an elementary school which also shares the property. The portable classrooms are roomy, brightly colored, and nicely carpeted. Each portable classroom is divided into two large rooms. Beyond the entrance the visitor sees the room on the left side of the classroom divided by partitions. In the half nearest the entrance the teachers have their desks. This area is one in which teachers work quietly at their desks or consult with an individual student. The other half of the room is utilized as a small classroom. Adjoining the teacher's work area and the small classroom are the student lounge and the photography room. At certain times of the day, the lounge is utilized for small classes, but usually it is a place for students to gather. All-school meetings are held in the lounge. The room has an assortment of couches and chairs, a coffee and a soft drink machine.

The other portable classroom is divided into two large rooms. These rooms are primarily used for classes, but students study and visit together in these rooms when the rooms are not in class use. The classroom in the basement of the elementary school is an old classroom which the students were in the process of painting at the time of this research. This room is used for drama and physical education. The visitor gets the idea that physical conditions are somewhat crowded but

not strained. For example, two groups of students can work in the same room and remain undisturbed. One receives the impression that there are people everywhere. Perhaps this is because at least fifty people (all 100-plus students are usually not present at the school at the same time) must occupy four rooms.

The school is situated in a natural setting. The visitor may step out of the portable classroom to the outdoors. On pleasant weather days, students and teachers are outside either to just visit or hold classes there.

Student-Staff Size. One hundred and five students (juniors and seniors) are chosen by lottery from those who apply to insure a cross-section of the community. There are seven full-time faculty; non-full-time faculty are divided into two categories: part-time staff (teachers who come to the alternative school from the regular school) and resource persons (people within the community with expertise in various areas of specialization).[23] There were twenty resource persons teaching at School Four during the 1973-74 school year.

Curriculum. All state and local board curricular requirements for a high school diploma must be met in some form by all students at School Four as a condition for graduation. There are eight areas into which learning experiences may fall: (1) English Literature, (2) Science, (3) Fine Arts, (4) Physical Education, (5) Mathematics, (6) History/

---

[23]Teaneck Alternative High School, "Brochure Describing the Program," Teaneck, New Jersey, 1974-75, p. 5.

Social Sciences, Foreign Language, and (8) interdepartmental courses.[24] In addition to these areas, School Four offers two other learning experiences: (1) a career development experience which exposes students to professional and commercial vocations and (2) a community service project which will provide students with the opportunity to volunteer in some service to the community.[25]

Rules and Regulations. Rules in School Four are listed as five goals for students.

> The student at School Four will be responsible for (1) reporting his daily attendance to his seminar group teacher, (2) attending classes, seminar groups, and town meetings, (3) fulfilling state and local board requirements, (4) satisfying requirements for vocational school, college, or career objectives, and (5) participating in a community service project.[26]

The all-school meeting established a drug policy which provided for disciplinary action to be taken against students who possessed drugs during school activities.

Philosophy or Stated Purpose of the School. The educational philosophy of School Four can be summarized as follows:

> School Four attempts to provide an environment (1) for the student who wants and needs less outside direction than other students might need or prefer and (2) for the student who seeks learning experiences both inside and outside of the standard curriculum.[27]

---

[24] Idem., "The Evaluation of the Teaneck Alternative High School," ibid., p. 4.

[25] Idem., "Brochure Describing the Program," ibid., p. 8.

[26] Idem., "The Evaluation Report of the Teaneck Alternative High School," ibid., p. 5.

[27] Idem., "Brochure Describing the Program," ibid., p. 3.

School Four sees itself as a community in two senses: (1) a large learning community made up of students and teachers who share responsibility for the maintenance and operation of that community and (2) a number of smaller learning communities best described as a seminar group experience, revolving around curricular planning and guidance.[28] School Four aims to develop in the student a sense of responsibility, initiative, motivation, scholarship, creativity, and awareness.[29]

School Five

Geographical Location and Physical Layout. School Five is housed in a former elementary school in a northern Virginia suburb. It was founded in the Spring of 1971 by a group of parents, students, and teachers. The school is situated on a five-acre lot. Two trailers were placed on the property to alleviate the shortage of classroom space. The two rooms closest to the entrance of the main building are a small classroom and the photography room. On the opposite side of the hall next to the classroom is a multi-purpose room which is utilized as a small gymnasium and auditorium. The office in which the school secretary has her desk is across the hall from the multi-purpose room. Constant activity characterizes the office at School Five. Students are in the office to ask a question regarding school programs, use the telephone, or chat with the secretary.

Down the hall from the office are the Biology, Physics, and Art rooms. In the Art room, students work either individually or in small

---

[28] Ibid., p. 4. [29] Ibid., p. 3.

classes at all times of the day. The room across from the Art room is used for Physics and Psychology. At the end of the building, two large rooms are used for English classes and other classes that have need of a large room. The trailers are used for Social Studies and foreign language classes. The halls in the school provide a place for students to get together. Bulletin boards are the major source of communication in the school. Students have a message board, where they receive individual communications from staff and students. At any given time, students may be in the halls talking to friends in the smoking court (an outside area adjacent to the school), lounging in the parking lot or sitting on the lawn.

Staff-Student Size. The school opened with 171 students (juniors and seniors) chosen by lottery from the applicants. Enrollment was expanded the following year to include sophomores and the student population stabilized at 238. The staff numbered eight full-time teachers in 1971 and climbed to ten in 1972. The number of part-time staff varies from quarter to quarter, depending on the course offerings for a given quarter.

Curriculum. All secondary academic subjects are offered at School Five with the exception of Chemistry. Students may take subjects in year-long blocks and on a quarterly or a semester basis. An independent study option is available in all subjects. Students may also receive credit in a subject for taking classes at the technological center within the school district, at one of the neighboring colleges, or by serving an

internship in an institution within the community, for example, a bank, a child care center, or a local governmental agency.

Rules and Regulations. Student regulations at School Five are minimal. Students are required to be present for their classes. At all other times, an open campus policy is in effect. Students must take certain courses required by the state and local district school board for graduation. However, the form in which they may take these classes is quite flexible. Students are required to enroll in a minimum of two courses throughout the year. Drugs and alcohol are not permitted on school property.

Philosophy or Stated Purpose of the School. The basic philosophical assumptions underlying the creation of School Five was that a community of students and teachers was the best judge of its educational needs. A second assumption was that high school students are capable of assuming primary direction over their individual educations.[30]

Summary

In summary, five aspects (geographical location and physical layout, staff-student size, curriculum, rules and regulations, the philosophy or stated purpose of the school) have been described for all five of the schools. All of the schools can be characterized by student-staff informality and constant activity. All of the schools have taken

---

[30]Woodlawn Program, "Proposal to the Superintendent Regarding the Establishment of the Woodlawn Program," Arlington, Virginia, Spring, 1971, p. 1.

pre-existing physical structures and tailored them to their unique purposes. Besides the similarities of geographical location, student population and age of the schools, and programs described in the previous pages of this chapter, it is necessary to document the similarities of the five schools in providing students opportunities for individual and group decisions and use of the community as a learning resource.

Evidence from the Literature of Each School

This section will present documentation from each school's literature which describes the opportunities students have to make individual decisions about their learning, group decisions concerning the governance of their school, and the use of the community as a learning resource.

Opportunities Individual Students Have to Make Decisions About Their Own Learning

Three activities will be examined here. They are: students' options for reporting grades, student evaluation of the course and the instructor, and student opportunities to take independent study.

Options in Reporting Grades.

School One	Letter grades and written comments are the major evaluative techniques used to indicate pupil performance and growth.[31]

---

[31]Cambridge Pilot School, "Policies and Procedures," 1974-75, p. 13.

School Two	Students evaluate and are evaluated at the conclusion of each course, through a form, jointly completed by teacher and student. This form considers the goals which teacher and student initially put forth, their realistic application, and the student's achievement of them.[32] This evaluation system is then translated into a point system whereby students contract for the number of points they will receive for a particular course.[33]
School Three	We had found that the current credit system we are working with is not suited to our educational needs, methods, or philosophy. However, we have considerable difficulty translating our wide variety of learning experiences into credit without curtailing some of the advantages of our educational program. The point system will be able to legitimize learning experiences that differ widely in terms of time, work done, and type of work. The point system will allow students, parents, and others outside the school to know much better how a student stands. Students entering or leaving the alternative school would translate their credits into points on the basis of the par value.[34]
School Four	Evaluation: a student-teacher conference will be required and the student will choose one or more of the

---

[32]Shanti School, "Shanti School Information Brochure," 1974-75, p. 4.

[33]Idem., "Cooperating Teachers' Manual," p. 3.

[34]Worcester Alternative School, "Year 3 Catalog of Possibilities," 1974-75, p. 14.

	following options; a letter grade, pass/fail or a narrative report.[35]
School Five	Students have three types of grade options: credit/no credit or letter grades, or written narratives describing the student's progress.[36]

Student Evaluation of the Course and the Instructor.

School One	Teachers are expected to provide students with periodic opportunities to evaluate their course at least once per marking period.[37]
	Within classes, staff and students determine the procedures of evaluations (after expectations are set) and students are able to define quite precisely how they are to be evaluated.[38]
School Two	Students evaluate and are evaluated at the conclusion of each course through a form jointly completed by teacher and student.[39]
	Students receive a form prior to February 5th on which to evaluate staff.[40]

---

[35] Teaneck Alternative School, "Brochure Describing the Program," 1974, p. 6.

[36] Woodlawn Program, op. cit., p. 3.

[37] Cambridge Pilot School, "Policies and Procedures," p. 2.

[38] Idem., "The Cambridge Pilot School 1974-75," p. 13.

[39] Shanti School, "Shanti School Information Brochure," p. 4.

[40] Idem., "Policies of Community Meetings, 1973-74," p. 2.

School Three	No reference in published literature of the school.
School Four	It is expected that the students will evaluate their own program and the overall program of the school.[41]
	Students will be responsible for participating in the evaluation of himself, the teacher, and the program.[42]
	Evaluation of a student's accomplishments in a given course will be determined jointly by the teacher and the student.[43]
School Five	No reference in school's published literature.

Opportunities for Independent Study.

School One	Students are encouraged to have and develop independent study projects. These students must have a sponsor for these projects.[44]
School Two	Some courses are independent study courses; some are internships, others are group meetings of four to twelve students.[45]

---

[41] Teaneck Alternative High School, "The Evaluation Report of the Teaneck Alternative High School," p. 5.

[42] Idem., "Brochure Describing the Program," p. 2.

[43] Ibid., p. 6.

[44] Cambridge Pilot School, "Policies and Procedures," p. 3.

[45] Shanti School, "1973-74 Internship and Student Teaching Programs," Hartford, Connecticut, p. 1.

School Three	The range of courses include: mini-courses, depth courses, independent study, internships in the community, outside experiences, any course in the regular high school.[46]
School Four	Independent study while not required was an option. During the 1973-74 school year, 60% of the students reported having engaged in independent study.[47]
School Five	Should you not wish to take a regular class, you may take it for independent study.[48]

Opportunities Students in a Group Have to Make Decisions Concerning the Governance of the School

Group Decision Making Structures.

School One	Periodic all-school meetings are held to deal with important issues as requested by students and staff.[49]
School Two	Operating in small learning communities, students and staff make decisions about grades, courses, activities, rules, scheduling locations, evaluation techniques, implementation, and community participation.[50]

---

[46] Worcester Alternative School, "Year 3 Catalog of Possibilities," p. 2.

[47] Teaneck Alternative High School, "The Evaluation Report of the Teaneck Alternative High School," p. 7.

[48] Woodlawn Program, "Proposal to the Superintendent," p. 4.

[49] Cambridge Pilot School, "Policies and Procedures," p. 2.

[50] Shanti School, "Shanti School Information Brochure," 1974-75, p. 6.

	Community meetings are held monthly.[51]
	Other than major policy items, decisions and recommendations to the director will be made through task forces: Administrative, budget, Arts, Communication, Curriculum and Resources, Internal Environment, and ongoing evaluation. Membership on the task forces is open to all members of the community.[52]
School Three	The government of the school is an adapted form of an old New England institution, the town meeting. These are held once a week and items raised range from announcements of films and speeches to discussions concerning the policy and directions of the school.[53]
School Four	Decisions for the internal governance will be made consisting of the entire school body and permanent staff meeting once a week. This group will act as the school's basic governing body in accordance with Board of Education policies and the direction of the superintendent.[54]
	The school committees are Community Resources, Curriculum Maintenance, Clerical and Record Keeping, Hospitality, Social Affairs, and Program Development.[55]

---

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Worcester Alternative School, "Year 3 Catalog of Possibilities," p. 2.

[54] Teaneck Alternative High School, "Brochure Describing the Program," p. 6.

[55] Ibid., p. 9.

School Five

A governing council consisting of all students and teachers would determine policies that controlled the school.[56]

Each student and teacher would have one vote.[57]

That the town meeting was a fundamental policy-making body of the school and that it could over-rule or revise any decision of the head teacher (subject to the higher authority of the Superintendent and the School Board).[58]

Opportunities for Students to Use the Community as a Learning Resource

Student Internships in the Community: Community Persons Teaching in the School.

School One

There are numerous community resource volunteers who work part-time in the school as teachers, tutors, or classroom aides. These volunteers may be from the community, local colleges, and universities.[59]

Students have come into contact with community people with special skills and professions. At various times, we have been joined by a weaver, a metal worker, a goldsmith, and a sculptor.[60]

The wilderness program is an opportunity for students to achieve the skills and understanding necessary to

---

[56] Woodlawn Program, "Proposal to the Superintendent," p. 1.

[57] Ibid. [58] Ibid.

[59] Cambridge Pilot School, "The Cambridge Pilot School, 1974-75," p. 1.

[60] Ibid., p. 10.

	solve group and individual problems in stressful outdoor situations.[61]
School Two	The alternative high school uses the entire metropolitan area as its classroom.[62]
	Students might study lawmaking and enforcement with legislators, lawyers, policemen, judges, or penologists. In addition to taking courses throughout the city, students could work as apprentices in a great variety of vocations, participate in community service programs, or conduct individual research projects.[63]
	The school involves the total community, parents, businessmen, professionals, and government officials.[64]
School Three	It had been decided that the major thrust of the school would be an emphasis on education outside schoolroom walls.[65]
	A student's curriculum or learning experience as they are called are pretty much defined by him--what courses, when, in the school or in the community.[66]

---

[61] Ibid., p. 11.

[62] Shanti School, "Shanti School Information Brochure," p. 3.

[63] Eugene Mulcahy, "Shanti--The Formation of a Public Alternative School," The New School Exchange Newsletter, No. 105 (November 15, 1973), p. 1.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Worcester Alternative School, "Year 3 Catalog of Possibilities," p. 1.

[66] Ibid., p. 2.

	The function of the advisory system will be as follows: to provide a link between the student, a community learning experience, and the school.[67]
School Four	The faculty will serve in a variety of roles . . . approve arrangements between students and community resource persons.[68]
	It is expected that the student will increase the amount of peers, teachers, and community persons in utilizing the extensive resources outside the school.[69]
	The real boundaries of the alternative school will be extended through the utilization of public and private facilities such as schools, colleges, business establishments, museums, parks, offices, vocational sites, and libraries.[70]
School Five	This school is for the student who views the world as a classroom and longs to learn from it as well as from texts and case studies.[71]
	Students were encouraged to use the community as a classroom. Judging from responses to questions in this area at least three quarters of the students did so (statement from a survey given to students in 1972).[72]

---

[67] Ibid., p. 11.

[68] Teaneck Alternative High School, "Brochure Describing the Program," p. 5.

[69] Ibid., p. 2. [70] Ibid., p. 4.

[71] Woodlawn Program, "Proposal to the Superintendent," p. 2.

[72] Idem., "Woodlawn Graduate Evaluation," Arlington, Virginia, Spring, 1973.

> The community often came to the school. Many teachers brought speakers into the school and took classes on field trips. Several times outside teachers taught mini-courses at the school.[73]

SUMMARY

In summary, excerpts from the literature of the five schools report that in all schools students have opportunities to make individual decisions about their own learning. A choice is provided in the manner in which their grades are reported, although Four and Five report a wider range of options than do the other three schools. There are opportunities for the students to evaluate their own work and the course itself, and there are options for taking independent study if they so choose. The literature of each school further reports that structures do exist which provide students opportunities to participate in the governance of their school (an all-school meeting). Finally, each school reports that students are encouraged to use the community as a learning resource.

In Chapters 6, 7, and 8 of this study, data will be presented in order to ascertain whether, in fact, students perceive that these schools offer them the opportunities described in their literature.

---

[73] Idem., "Evaluation--First Year," Arlington, Virginia, Spring, 1972, p. 3.

Chapter 5

WHY STUDENTS ATTEND AN ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL

Chapter 5 will answer the question, "how important were the opportunities to make learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource as factors in students' decisions to attend the alternative school"? The schools in this study indicated that they offered students these opportunities. This question will be examined first in this study in order to determine the importance of these factors in students' decisions to attend the alternative school.

Section 1 will examine the responses of the total sample (five schools together); section 2 will examine how important these factors were within each school; and section 3 will examine the items which made up the factors in order to determine how important specific items were within each school.

FACTORS FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Research Procedures

Students were asked to rate six items, possible reasons to attend an alternative school. They rated the items as "unimportant," "somewhat important," "important," or "very important" in their decision to attend.

The four categories were collapsed to three (important, somewhat important, and unimportant). They were collapsed because the numbers

responding in some categories were small. The use of three categories would provide a broader picture of the total responses. The items rated were:

1. I disliked having the same schedule of classes every day at a regular school.

2. I disliked having to be at school for a specified length of time every day (for example, 8:00-2:30).

3. I wanted an atmosphere where people knew each other and were friendly.

4. I wanted to be able to use the community as a learning resource in more ways than the regular high school provided.

5. I thought that I would not have to work as hard to get good grades as I would at the regular high school.

6. I wanted to make more decisions about my own learning than I could at the regular school.

In terms of the question posed for this study, the items were grouped into three factors: (1) learning decisions (items 1, 2, and 6); (2) opportunities to use the community as a learning resource (item 4); and (3) "other" (items 3 and 5).

In order to give students maximum opportunity to indicate why they attended the alternative school, they were told "If you had another reason for coming to this school which was very important to you, please state it."

These open-ended statements were then categorized by two raters who placed the responses in one of the three categories (learning decision opportunities, use of the community as a learning resource, and

"other"). A Chi square analysis indicated no significant difference between the raters at the .05 level (X^2 = 39.73, 18 df). Table 3 presents the data for the total sample of students' responses to the three factors (learning decision opportunities, use of the community as a learning resource, and "other").

Three items were included in the learning decision factor and two items were included in the "other" factor. These factors were adjusted by dividing the total number responding in the learning decision category by three and the total number responding in the "other" factor category by two in order to more accurately represent the responses for these categories.

One-way analysis of variance procedure was performed on the six items in order to determine whether the mean scores differed significantly (level of significance, .01).

Discussion

Slightly more students reported that the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource was important than did those students who reported that learning decision opportunities and "other" factors were important. In terms of the percentage of students responding, the highest percentage reported that the use of the community as a learning resource was important; the second highest, opportunity for learning decisions; and the third highest, "other" factors.

One-way analysis of variance indicated that there were no significant differences in the mean scores of items one (schedule of the regular school day), two (length of the regular school day), three

Table 3

Factors in Attendance for Total Sample

	Opportunities for learning decisions						Use of the community as a learning resource						Other reasons						Total
	Important		Unimportant		Somewhat important		Important		Unimportant		Somewhat important		Important		Unimportant		Somewhat important		
	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	
Gross**	425	29	113	8	174	12	177	12	17	1	47	3	274	18	188	13	69	5	1,484
Adjusted***	142***	10	38***	3	58***	4	177	12	17	1	47	3	137***	9	94***	6	35***	2	

*Denotes percentage of total responding.

**Numbers include all factors within the category.

***Adjusted to equalize factors in all categories.

(friendly atmosphere of the alternative school), and five (the notion that students would not have to work as hard to get good grades at the alternative school). No interpretation was possible for item 6 (learning decision opportunities) because the homogeneity of variances assumption could not be met and cell sizes differed.

There were differences in the mean scores for item 4 (use of the community as a learning resource). Post-hoc analysis revealed that students in School Four considered the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource more important than did students in School Five.

THREE FACTORS WITHIN EACH SCHOOL

Research Procedures

The research procedures for section 2 are the same as those for section 1. This section will examine the responses within each school (see table 4). The numbers in table 4 have been adjusted as in table 3.

Discussion

No one factor was clearly viewed as important by a larger percentage of students than were the others. In Schools One, Two, Three, and Four, the highest percentage responding reported that the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend the alternative school.

In School Five, the highest number responding reported "other" factors were important. "Other" factors included: (1) negative perceptions of the regular school (peer pressure, intense competition, racial problems, and an impersonal environment) and (2) positive

Table 4

Factors in Attendance for Schools One-Five

School	Total response	Opportunities for learning decisions						Use of the community as a learning resource						Other					
		Important		Somewhat important		Unimportant		Important		Somewhat important		Unimportant		Important		Somewhat important		Unimportant	
		n*	% of n**	n*	% of n**	n*	% of n**	n	% of n**	n	% of n**	n	% of n**	n*	% of n**	n*	% of n**	n*	% of n**
One	218	15	7	9	4	9	4	24	11	10	5	4	2	23	11	9	4	11	5
Two	174	19	11	3	2	7	4	23	13	4	2	1	.5	17	10	4	2	12	7
Three	241	29	12	9	4	11	5	35	15	6	2	4	2	30	12	7	3	19	8
Four	329	35	11	10	3	8	2	49	15	3	1	2	1	35	11	6	2	22	7
Five	488	58	12	20	4	6	1	47	10	24	5	6	1	60	12	10	2	31	6

*Numbers adjusted to equalize factors in all categories.

**Percentage of number responding.

perceptions of the alternative school (a friendly more personal environment, better student-teacher relationships, and personal freedom). "Other" factors were considered important by the second highest number responding in Schools One and Three. Learning decisions opportunities were considered important by the second highest number responding in Schools Two and Five. In School Four, students were evenly divided regarding the importance of these factors.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SIX ITEMS WITHIN EACH SCHOOL

This section will examine within each school the relative importance of specific items which made up the three factors in students' decisions to attend the alternative school.

Research Procedures

Students were asked to respond to the six items by rating them as either "unimportant," "somewhat important," "important," and "very important" in their decision to attend the alternative school. The researcher assigned weights to each response (very important, +4; important, +3; somewhat important, +2; not important, +1; no response, 0). The responses for each item were summed and divided by the number responding within each school to obtain a mean score for the importance of each item. Table 5 illustrates the relative importance of each item within each of the five schools.

A correlated T test procedure was utilized in order to determine whether mean scores differed significantly (the level at which mean

Table 5

Weighted Importance of the Six Items for the Five Schools (mean scores)

School	Number in total sample	One		Two		Three		Four		Five		Six	
		Number of cases	Mean score	Number of cases	Mean score	Number of cases	Mean score	Number of cases	Mean score	Number of cases	Mean score	Number of cases	Mean score
One	38	37	2.05	37	2.45	38	3.39*	38	2.94*	36	1.58	35	3.25*
Two	32	26	2.46	26	2.69	26	3.26*	28	3.21*	28	1.32	27	3.51*
Three	47	43	2.04	44	2.38	45	3.28*	45	3.15*	43	1.32	43	3.74*
Four	53	53	2.26	53	2.45	52	3.48*	53	3.37*	51	1.27	53	3.71*
Five	77	76	2.57	76	2.73	76	3.38*	76	2.80*	75	1.36	75	3.62*

*Three highest mean scores for each school underlined.

scores were said to differ significantly was .01). (T test procedures results are in appendix C.)

Discussion

In all five schools, the three items with the highest mean scores were the opportunity to make learning decisions, the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school, and the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource. T test procedures did reveal some differences among items within each school.

School One. Students considered the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school a more important factor in their decision to attend than the length and the schedule of the regular school day, the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource, and the notion that students would not have to work as hard to get good grades at the alternative school.

Students considered the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource more important than the schedule of the regular school and the notion that students would not have to work as hard to get good grades at the alternative school.

Finally, students considered the opportunity to make more learning decisions than provided by the regular school more important in their decision to attend the alternative school than the length and schedule of the regular school day and the notion that students would not have to work as hard to get good grades at the regular school.

School Two. Students considered the opportunity to make more learning decisions than the regular school offered more important in their decision to attend than the schedule and length of the regular school day and the notion that it was easier to get good grades at the alternative school.

Students said that the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school was more important as a factor in their decision to attend than the schedule of the conventional school day or the notion that it was easier to obtain good grades at the alternative school.

Finally, students saw the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource more important as a factor in their decision to attend than the notion that it would be easier to get good grades at the alternative school.

School Three. Students saw the opportunity to make more learning decisions than the regular school provided as more important in their decision to attend the alternative school than the schedule and length of the conventional school day, the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource, and the notion that students would not have to work as hard to get good grades at the alternative school.

Students considered the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school and the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource more important in their decision to attend than the schedule and length of the school day and the notion that it was easier to get good grades at the alternative school.

School Four. Students said that the opportunity to make more learning decisions than the regular school provided was more important in their decision to attend the alternative school than the schedule and length of the conventional school day, the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource, and the notion that students would not have to work as hard to get good grades at the alternative school.

Students considered the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school more important in their decision to attend than the schedule and length of the conventional school day and the notion that it was easier to make good grades at the alternative school.

Finally, students considered the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource more important in their decision to attend the alternative school than the length and schedule of the conventional school day and the notion that it was easier to get good grades at the alternative school.

School Five. Students felt that the opportunity to make more learning decisions than the regular school provided and the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school were more important as factors in their decision to attend than the schedule and length of the conventional school day, the notion that it was easier to get good grades at the alternative school, and the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource.

They felt that the conventional school schedule, the length of the regular school day, and the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource were more important in their decision to attend than

the notion that it was easier to get good grades at the alternative school.

The three highest mean scores for each school can be identified. They were: (1) learning decision opportunities, (2) friendly atmosphere of the alternative school, and (3) the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource. In some schools, there were differences among these three. In School One, the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school was considered more important as a factor in students' decisions to attend than the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource. In Schools Three, Four, and Five, learning decision opportunities were considered more important as factors than opportunities to use the community as a learning resource. There were no significant differences between the two highest mean scores in each school. Thus, it can not be ascertained which of these items is the most important of the six for any of the schools.

CONCLUSIONS

How important were opportunities to make learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource as factors in students' decisions to attend the alternative school? These factors were important, although it can not be ascertained which factor is most important in each school. Slightly more students considered the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource important than did those who considered learning decisions important.

However, "other" factors were considered important. These included students' perceptions of peer pressure, intense competition,

racial problems and an impersonal environment of the conventional school, and perceptions that the alternative school offered a more personalized environment, better student-teacher relations, and more personal freedom than provided by the conventional school.

Generally, the ideological factors (opportunities claimed to be offered by the alternative school) were important to more students than were the flight factors (circumstances in the conventional school from which students were trying to escape) in their decision to attend the alternative school.

Chapter 6

INDIVIDUAL DECISION MAKING

The literature of each school indicated that students were given opportunities to make learning decisions. Indeed, students said that the opportunities to make decisions about their own learning was an important factor in their decision to attend the alternative school. This chapter will answer the question, "does a sampling of students in the five schools see their schools offering all students opportunities to make learning decisions"?

The chapter will answer this question by examining whether students perceive that they have the opportunities the schools claim to offer and the extent to which they participate in these opportunities. The areas to be examined are: (1) the range and availability of grade options, (2) student evaluation of his/her work, the course, and the instructor, and (3) independent study.

These areas were selected for study for three reasons. The schools' literature reported that students could make learning decisions in these areas. These areas are activities in which students have the opportunity to make choices and exercise judgement. These are activities which may be examined in a concrete way.

Section 1 of this chapter will examine students' perceptions regarding the variety of grade options students were offered, who

determined what options the students would take and the availability of grade options.

Section 2 will examine students' perceptions regarding how grades were determined in courses and the extent to which students were given the opportunity to evaluate the course and the instructor.

Section 3 will explore students' perceptions in three areas regarding independent study: (1) the extent to which students could elect independent study, (2) the restrictions placed on the taking of independent study, and (3) the mode in which topics and materials were selected and the criteria for the grades determined within independent study.

GRADE OPTIONS

Types of Grade Options Available

Research Procedures. Students were asked to indicate from a list of possible grade options the range of options available in their school. Each school's literature described the type of grade options available for its students. The purpose of this question was to ascertain whether students knew the options available to them. Thus, in tables 6 and 7, the data will be reported in two categories: (1) the item which described the grade options as indicated in the school's literature, and (2) the items which described other possible grade options. Table 6 presents students' responses for the total sample, and table 7 for Schools One-Five to the question, "circle the number which most accurately describes what options you have for receiving grades at your

school":

1. Letter grades only.

2. Letter grades, credit/no credit.

3. Letter grades, pass/fail.

4. Letter grades, credit/no credit, pass/fail.

5. Letter grades, written statements describing a student's progress in a particular course.

6. Letter grades, credit/no credit, pass/fail, written statements describing a student's progress in a particular course.

7. Other (please elaborate).

Table 6

Grade Options Which Students Perceived Were Available in Their Schools for the Total Sample

Options stated in the literature		All other options listed		Total number responding	No response	Total sample
N	% of N*	N	% of N*			
111	54	94	46	206	41	247

*Denotes percentage of total responding.

Table 7

Grade Options Which Students Said Were Available in Their Schools for Schools One-Five

	School One	School Two	School Three	School Four	School Five
Grade Options Stated in the Literature	Item 5 8 (31%)*	Item 7 "Other" 15 (68%)*	Item 6 17 (49%)*	Item 6 39 (83%)*	Item 4 32 (42%)*
All Other Options Listed	Items 1, 2, 3 4, 6, 7 18 (69%)*	Items 1, 2, 3 4, 5, 6 7 (32%)*	Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 17 (49%)*	Items 1, 2, 3 4, 5, 7 8 (17%)*	Items 1, 2, 3 5, 6, 7 44 (57%)*
Total Responding	26	22	34	47	76
No Response	12	17	12	5	1

*Percentage of number responding.

Discussion. Within the total sample, slightly over half the number responding knew the grade options which their schools offered.

In School One, less than a third of the students responding indicated that letter grades and written statements were available as stated in the school's literature. In School Two, sixty percent of the students responding rejected the alternatives presented to them in the question and chose the option, "other."

Students in School Two earn points for having completed specific courses. The number of points a student receives is determined by the teacher's written narrative describing their work. None of the alternatives presented to students fit a description of the options available to them. Thus, over half of them correctly chose the alternative labeled, "other."

In School Three, students responding were evenly divided between indicating that their school offered them the options of letter grades, pass/fail, credit/no credit, and written statements describing a student's progress in a particular course as described in School Three's literature and indicating the other alternatives presented to them in the question.

Over three-fourths of the students responding in School Four indicated that they had the opportunity to receive letter grades, credit/no credit, pass/fail and written statements (as the school's literature states).

In School Five, more students said that they had a combination of the options presented in the question than said that they had letter grades, credit/no credit, pass/fail, and written statements (as stated in

the literature). In each school, some students did not respond to the question on grade options. This question appeared on page fourteen of a sixteen-page survey.

Limitations and Restrictions on Grade Options

Research Procedures. Students were asked four questions regarding the availability of grade options. Were options available (1) in only certain classes, (2) to only upperclassmen, (3) to students with a certain grade point average, and (4) to everyone? Table 8 presents students' responses to these questions for the total sample. Tables 9-13 present the responses for Schools One-Five.

Table 8

Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Total Sample

	Available to upperclassmen only		Available to students with a certain GPA*		Restricted to certain classes only		Available to everyone	
	N	(% of N)**	N	(% of N)**	N	(% of N)**	N	(% of N)**
Yes	133	(77)	6	(4)	39	(22)	138	(80)
No	22	(12)	148	(86)	93	(54)	16	(9)
I Don't Know	16	(9)	17	(10)	38	(22)	18	(10)
No Response	76		76		77		75	
Total Sample	247		247		247		247	

*Grade point average.

**Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Table 9

Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School One

	Available to upperclassmen only		Available to students with a certain GPA		Restricted to certain classes only		Available to everyone	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	4	(22)	2	(11)	6	(35)	5	(28)
No	8	(44)	6	(33)	6	(29)	8	(44)
I Don't Know	6	(33)	10	(55)	5	(35)	5	(28)
No Response	20		20		21		20	
Total Sample	38		38		38		38	

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Table 10

Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Two

	Available to upperclassmen only		Available to students with a certain GPA		Restricted to certain classes only		Available to everyone	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	1	(11)	2	(22)	2	(22)	5	(50)
No	7	(77)	6	(66)	5	(56)	1	(10)
I Don't Know	1	(11)	1	(11)	2	(22)	4	(40)
No Response	23		23		23		22	
Total Sample	32		32		32		32	

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Table 11

Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Three

	Available to upperclassmen only		Available to students with a certain GPA		Restricted to certain classes only		Available to everyone	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	0	(0)	1	(3)	6	(23)	20	(77)
No	24	(92)	22	(85)	13	(50)	1	(4)
I Don't Know	2	(8)	3	(12)	7	(27)	5	(19)
No Response	21		21		21		21	
Total Sample	47		47		47		47	

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Table 12

Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Four

	Available to upperclassmen only		Available to students with a certain GPA		Restricted to certain classes only		Available to everyone	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	1	(1)	5	(10)	46	(86)	45	(94)
No	45	(94)	37	(77)	2	(4)	2	(4)
I Don't Know	2	(4)	4	(13)	5	(9)	1	(1)
No Response	5		7		0		5	
Total Sample	53		53		53		53	

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Table 13

Grade Options: Limitations and Restrictions as Perceived by the Students in School Five

	Available to upperclassmen only		Available to students with a certain GPA		Restricted to certain classes only		Available to everyone	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	0	(0)	0	(0)	19	(28)	63	(88)
No	66	(97)	67	(97)	34	(48)	4	(6)
I Don't Know	2	(3)	2	(3)	17	(25)	5	(7)
No Response	9		8		7		5	
Total Sample	77		77		76		77	

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Discussion. The schools' literature stated that grade options were available.

Students in the total sample generally felt that grade options were available to everyone, not limited to certain classes, upperclassmen, or students with a certain grade point average.

In Schools One and Two, the number of students who did not respond was high. Thus, it is difficult to obtain a complete picture of the availability of grade options for these schools. In Schools Three, Four, and Five, students clearly indicated that grade options were available to everyone, and not restricted to certain classes, upperclassmen, or students with a certain grade point average. In the total sample and in three of the schools, students generally knew that grade options were available to them.

Who Chose the Grade Options

Research Procedures. Students were asked to indicate who chose their grade options (parents, the school, the advisor and the student together, the teacher, or the student). For the purposes of this discussion, the responses were categorized by (1) student and (2) other agents (parents, the school, the advisor and student, the teacher). Table 14 presents the data for the total sample. Table 15 presents the data for Schools One-Five.

Table 14

Persons Who Chose Grade Options for the Total Sample (N = 206)

Parents		The School		Advisor and student		Teacher		I	
N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*
9	(4)	25	(12)	66	(32)	11	(5)	95	(46)

Parents, The School, Advisor, Teacher	I Chose
111 (54%)	95 (46%)

*Denotes percentage of the total number responding.

Table 15

Who Chose Grade Options for Schools One-Five

	School One		School Two		School Three		School Four		School Five	
	I Chose	Parents School Advisor Teacher	I Chose	Parents School Advisor Teacher	I Chose	Parents Teacher Advisor School	I Chose	Parents School Teacher Advisor	I Chose	Parents Teacher Advisor School
n	15	7	9	8	16	20	21	32	61	12
% of n	70	30	53	47	44	55	39	60	84	16

Discussion. The schools' literature did not clarify who chose grade options. The intent of the question was to examine the student's role in this process.

The data for the total sample indicated that slightly more students reported that someone either helped them choose their grade options or chose the options for the student than did students who said that they alone chose their grade options.

In Schools Three and Four, more students indicated that they had help from someone in selecting their grade options than did those who said that they chose their own grade options. In Schools One, Two, and Five, more students reported that they chose their own grade options than did students who reported having had help from either teachers, advisors, parents, or the school.

GRADE DETERMINATION AND STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE COURSE AND THE INSTRUCTOR

Grade Determination

Research Procedures. Students were given the statement, "at this school, grades were usually determined by: (1) my own evaluation of my work, (2) the teacher's evaluation of my work, (3) by an equal combination of my evaluation and the teacher's evaluation of my work, (4) partially by my own evaluation but more the teacher's evaluation of my work, and (5) partially by the teacher's evaluation but more my own evaluation of my work."

For the purposes of this discussion, the five categories were collapsed to three: grades determined solely by the teacher or primarily

by the teacher (items two and four), by an equal combination of student and teacher input (item three), and solely or primarily by the student (items one and five). Table 16 presents the data for the total sample. Table 17 presents this data for Schools One-Five.

Table 16

Determination of Grades for the Total Sample

Total Sample	Teacher (Item 2) Primarily the teacher (Item 4)		An equal combination of student and teacher input (Item 3)		My own evaluation (Item 1) Primarily my own evaluation (Item 5)		No response
	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	
247	101	(41)	81	(39)	28	(14)	40

*Denotes percentage of the total number responding.

Table 17

Determination of Grades for Schools One-Five

School	Total Sample	Teacher (Item 2) Primarily the teacher (Item 4)		An Equal Combination of student and teacher input (Item 3)		My Own Evaluation (Item 1) Primarily my own evaluation (Item 5)		No response
		n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	
One	38	23	(82)	4	(14)	1	(4)	10
Two	32	4	(19)	12	(57)	5	(25)	9
Three	47	13	(34)	20	(52)	5	(13)	9
Four	53	38	(79)	8	(16)	5	(13)	5
Five	77	23	(32)	37	(51)	12	(17)	5

*Denotes percentage of total number responding.

The literature of each school reported that students participate in the determination of their grades. Each of the items was assigned a point value. The assumption underlying the point values given for each item is that the highest point value be given to the item which states that the student's grades were determined by his/her evaluation. The lowest point value was assigned to the item which stated that grades were determined by the teacher's evaluation. The point values assigned to the items were: item one +3, item two -3, item three 0, item four -2, item five +2, and students who did not respond, 0. Student responses were summed according to the numerical value for each item and divided by the number of respondents for each school to yield a mean score which describes the level of student input in grade

determination per student. One-way analysis of variance procedures was performed on the mean scores (level of significance--.01). Analysis of variance tables may be found in appendix C.

The mean scores for grade determination of Schools One-Five were:

School One	-1.928
School Two	.238
School Three	- .394
School Four	-1.625
School Five	- .239

Discussion. Viewing the total sample, the highest percentages responding reported that the teacher either solely or primarily determined what their grades would be. The second highest percentage responding reported that grades were determined by an equal combination of student and teacher evaluation.

In School One, most students said that grades were determined solely by the teacher or primarily by the teacher. In School Four, the highest percentage responding said that grades were determined either solely or predominantly by the teacher. In Schools Two, Three, and Five, the highest percentage responding said that grades were determined by an equal combination of student and teacher evaluation. In Schools Three, Four, and Five, the smallest percentage of students responding reported that students solely or predominantly determined their own grades.

Post hoc analysis indicated that the mean scores for Schools One and Four differed significantly from those of Schools Two, Three, and

Five. Generally, students in Schools One and Four reported that grades were determined more by the teacher than the student.

Evaluation of the Course and the Instructor

Research Procedures and Presentation of the Data. Students were asked to respond to this statement: "At this school, I was given the opportunity to evaluate the course and the instructor in:

Item One	None of my courses;
Item Two	0-10% of my courses;
Item Three	10-25% of my courses;
Item Four	25-50% of my courses;
Item Five	50-75% of my courses;
Item Six	75-100% of my courses."

For the purposes of this discussion, Items Two and Three were combined to yield five categories instead of the original six in the questionnaire. Table 18 presents data for the total sample. Table 19 presents the data for Schools One-Five.

Each of the items was assigned a point value. The point values assigned were:

None of my courses	+1
0-10%	+2
10-25%	+3
25-50%	+4
50-75%	+5
75-100%	+6
No response	0

Table 18

Opportunity to Evaluate the Course and the Instructor for the Total Sample

Total sample	None of my courses		Less than 25% of my courses		25-50% of my courses		50-75% of my courses		75-100% of my courses		No response
	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	
247	17	(8)	29	(13)	25	(11)	23	(10)	129	(58)	24

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Table 19

Opportunity to Evaluate the Course and the Instructor for Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	None of my courses		Less than 25% of my courses		25-50% of my courses		50-75% of my courses		75-100% of my courses		No response
		n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	
One	38	4	(11)	9	(26)	4	(11)	4	(11)	14	(40)	3
Two	32	0	(0)	3	(9)	2	(6)	4	(13)	22	(69)	1
Three	47	1	(2)	2	(5)	1	(2)	3	(7)	36	(88)	4
Four	53	9	(19)	10	(20)	6	(12)	7	(14)	19	(37)	3
Five	77	3	(4)	4	(5)	12	(16)	15	(19)	38	(49)	5

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Student responses were summed according to the numerical value for each item and divided by the number responding for each school to yield a mean score which describes the level of evaluation of course and instructor in each school. One-way analysis of variance was performed on the mean scores (level of significance = .01).

The mean scores for the five schools on the level of student evaluation of the course and the instructor were:

School One	4.20
School Two	5.28
School Three	5.60
School Four	4.03
School Five	4.77

Discussion. The literature of each school reported that students have the opportunity to evaluate their courses and instructors.

The data for the total sample indicated that the highest percentage of students responding said that they had the opportunity to evaluate the course and the instructor in 75-100% of their courses. The majority of students reported that they had this opportunity in over half of their courses.

The highest percentage responding within each school indicated that they had the opportunity to evaluate the course and the instructor in 75-100% of their courses. A majority of students in each school reported that they had this opportunity in over half of their courses. Schools Two and Three had similar response patterns in that large percentages of students reported that they had the opportunity to evaluate their courses and instructors in over three-fourths of their

courses. The interpretation of mean scores was not possible since the test for the homogeneity of variances was not met and the cell sizes differed.

Students in Schools One and Four reported within the 25-50% range; students in Schools Two and Five in the 50-75% range; and School Three in the 75-100% range.

INDEPENDENT STUDY

The Extent to Which Students Could Elect Independent Study

Research Procedures. Students were asked the question, "if I had chosen to do so, I could have taken an independent study option within:

Item One	None of my subjects;
Item Two	0-10% of my subjects;
Item Three	10-25% of my subjects;
Item Four	25-50% of my subjects;
Item Five	50-75% of my subjects;
Item Six	75-100% of my subjects."

For the purposes of this discussion, Items Two and Three were collapsed to yield a total of five categories. Table 20 presents the data for the total sample. Table 21 presents data for Schools One-Five.

Table 20

Percentage of Subjects Students Could Take on Independent Study Had They Chosen To Do So for the Total Sample

Total Sample	None of my subjects		25% of less of my subjects		25-50% of my subjects		50-75% of my subjects		75-100% of my subjects		No response
	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	
247	6	(3)	50	(25)	31	(16)	34	(17)	78	(39)	48

*Denotes percentage of total responding.

Table 21

Percentage of Subjects Students Could Take on Independent Study Had They Chosen To Do So for Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	None of my subjects		25% of less of my subjects		25-50% of my subjects		50-75% of my subjects		75-100% of my subjects		No response
		n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	
One	38	2	(10)	6	(30)	4	(20)	2	(10)	6	(30)	18
Two	32	0	(0)	9	(42)	1	(5)	4	(19)	7	(33)	9
Three	47	2	(5)	12	(32)	5	(13)	8	(21)	11	(29)	9
Four	53	0	(0)	14	(32)	8	(18)	6	(14)	16	(36)	9
Five	77	2	(3)	9	(12)	13	(17)	14	(18)	38	(50)	1

*Denotes percentage of total responding.

The literature of each school reports that students had the opportunity to take independent study. The researcher assigned each item a numerical value as follows:

Item One	1
Item Two	2
Item Three	3
Item Four	4
Item Five	5
Item Six	6
No response	0

The greater the opportunity to take independent study, the higher the point value. Student responses were summed according to the numerical value for each item and divided by the number responding for each school to yield a mean score of the level of independent study opportunities per school. One-way analysis of variance was performed on the mean scores (level of significance, .01). Analysis of variance tables are in appendix C.

Discussion. Students in the total sample reported a variety of possibilities regarding their opportunities to take independent study. Students within Schools One, Two, Three, and Four differed regarding the opportunities they had to take independent study. In School Five, more students agreed regarding the potential availability of independent study. Half the students responding said that independent study was available in 75-100% of their courses.

Analysis of variance procedures revealed that there were no significant differences among the mean scores. Students in all schools reported in the 25-50% range.

The Restrictions Placed on Independent Study

Research Procedures. Students were asked to indicate whether independent study was available to everyone, restricted to students with certain grade point averages, or taken only with permission of the advisor. They were asked whether there were any further restrictions placed on the taking of independent study. Table 22 presents this data for the total sample. Tables 23-27 present the data for Schools One-Five.

Table 22

Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Total Sample (N = 247)

	Available to everyone		Available to students with a certain GPA		With permission of the advisor		Further restrictions	
	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*
Yes	184	(81)	4	(2)	56	(25)	43	(19)
No	22	(10)	196	(88)	126	(57)	124	(54)
I Don't Know	21	(10)	23	(10)	41	(18)	62	(27)
No Response	20		24		24		18	
Total Sample	247		247		247		247	

*Denotes percentage of number responding to the question.

Table 23

Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School One

	Available to everyone		Available to students with a certain GPA		With permission of the advisor		Further restrictions	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	18	(58)	3	(9)	8	(24)	6	(18)
No	8	(26)	21	(66)	18	(54)	15	(44)
I Don't Know	5	(16)	8	(25)	7	(21)	13	(38)
No Response	7		6		5		4	
Total Sample	38		38		38		38	

*Denotes percentage of number responding to the question.

Table 24

Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Two

	Available to everyone		Available to students with a certain GPA		With permission of the advisor		Further restrictions	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	24	(89)	0	(0)	1	(3)	2	(7)
No	0	(0)	24	(89)	18	(67)	17	(63)
I Don't Know	3	(11)	3	(11)	8	(30)	8	(30)
No Response	5		5		5		5	
Total Sample	32		32		32		32	

*Denotes percentage of number responding to the question.

Table 25

Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Three

	Available to everyone		Available to students with a certain GPA		With permission of the advisor		Further restrictions	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	32	(76)	1	(2)	14	(36)	9	(22)
No	6	(14)	36	(92)	17	(44)	21	(51)
I Don't Know	4	(9)	2	(6)	8	(21)	11	(27)
No Response	5		8		8		6	
Total Sample	47		47		47		47	

*Denotes percentage of number responding to the question.

Table 26

Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Four

	Available to everyone		Available to students with a certain GPA		With permission of the advisor		Further restrictions	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	37	(73)	0	(0)	31	(63)	12	(23)
No	6	(12)	42	(82)	9	(18)	18	(35)
I Don't Know	8	(16)	9	(17)	10	(20)	21	(41)
No Response	2		2		2		2	
Total Sample	53		53		53		53	

*Denotes percentage of number responding to the question.

Table 27

Restrictions on Independent Study As Perceived by the Students in School Five

	Available to everyone		Available to students with a certain GPA		With permission of the advisor		Further restrictions	
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*
Yes	73	(96)	0	(0)	2	(2)	14	(18)
No	2	(2)	73	(98)	64	(86)	63	(82)
I Don't Know	1	(1)	1	(1)	8	(11)	0	(0)
No Response	2		3		3		0	
Total Sample	77		77		77		77	

*Denotes percentage of number responding to the question.

Discussion. A majority of students in the total sample reported that independent study was available to everyone, not restricted to students with a certain grade point average, nor restricted to students who had permission from their advisor.

A majority of students reported that there were no further restrictions placed on the taking of independent study.

The pattern of responses within each school indicates that Schools Two and Five follow closely the pattern of responses for the total sample. In Schools Three and Four, a majority of students agreed that independent study was available to everyone and was not limited to those students with a certain grade point average. In School Three, students were almost evenly split regarding whether advisor permission

was a prerequisite for taking independent study. In School Four, a majority of the students said that advisor permission was a prerequisite.

A majority of students in School Three reported that no further restrictions were placed on the taking of independent study. In School Four, students were somewhat divided regarding further restrictions.

In School One, a majority of students reported that independent study was available to everyone, did not require permission from the advisor, and was not limited to students with a certain grade point average. Although more students reported that there were no further restrictions than did those who said that there were, over a third of the sample reported that they did not know.

Activities Within Independent Study

Research Procedures. Students who had taken independent study were to describe (1) who chose the topic to be studied, (2) who chose the materials to be used, and (3) who determined the criteria for the grade. For each of these areas, students were given three choices (the student, the teacher, or the student and teacher together). Table 28 presents the data for the total sample. Table 29 presents the data for Schools One-Five.

Table 28

Activities Within Independent Study for the Total Sample

	Choice of Topic		Choice of Materials		Criteria for Grade	
	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*
I Chose	131	(77)	52	(30)	16	(11)
Teacher Chose	15	(9)	24	(17)	30	(22)
Both Chose	25	(15)	58	(43)	90	(66)
Total	171		134		136	

*Denotes percentage of number responding.

Discussion. In the total sample, almost all of the students responding said that they chose the topic to be studied. Regarding who chose the materials to be used, although the highest percentage responding said that both the teacher and the student chose them, many students reported that they chose the materials to be used. In responding to who determined the criteria for the grade, the highest percentage responding said that both the teacher and student did so together.

The pattern of responses within the schools varied from school to school. The number responding in School One was small. Students reported a variety of experiences regarding who chose the topic, the materials to be used, and the criteria for the grade. In School Two, the highest percentage responding reported that they chose the topic, the materials to be used, and the criteria for the grade.

Table 29

Activities Within Independent Study for Schools One-Five

School	Choice of topic							Choice of materials							Criteria for grade							
	I chose		Teacher chose		Both chose		Total	I chose		Teacher chose		Both chose		Total	I chose		Teacher chose		Both chose		Total
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*		n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*		n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	
One	3	(38)	2	(25)	3	(38)	8	2	(25)	3	(38)	3	(38)	8	2	(25)	3	(38)	3	(38)	8
Two	10	(67)	0	(0)	5	(33)	15	13	(65)	2	(10)	5	(25)	20	13	(54)	3	(13)	8	(33)	24
Three	23	(67)	2	(6)	5	(17)	30	10	(34)	6	(21)	13	(45)	29	3	(10)	11	(37)	16	(53)	30
Four	7	(32)	9	(41)	6	(27)	22	6	(30)	8	(40)	6	(30)	20	2	(9)	7	(33)	12	(57)	21
Five	61	(88)	2	(2)	6	(8)	69	34	(49)	5	(7)	30	(43)	69	7	(10)	10	(15)	51	(75)	68

*Denotes percentage of number responding to the question within each school.

In School Three, the highest percentage responded that they chose the topic but student experiences varied regarding who chose the material and who determined the criteria for the grade.

In School Four, the highest percentage responded that the teacher chose the topic; students were somewhat divided regarding who chose the materials. The majority responded that both the teacher and the student determined the criteria for the grade.

In School Five, the largest percentage of students responding reported that the students chose the topic. Students were divided regarding who chose the materials. Three-fourths of the students responded that the teacher and student together determined the criteria for the grade.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

In describing the grade options available to them, more students knew the grade options available to them that did not; however, some students in each school were unaware of the options their school offered. In two of the schools, more students knew the correct options than did not. In three schools, students were somewhat divided on what options were offered by their schools.

Students generally reported that grade options were available to everyone, not limited to certain classes, or upperclassmen, or students with a certain grade point average.

For the total sample, although experiences varied slightly, more students reported that someone helped them choose their grade options than did students who reported that they alone chose them. In two of

the schools, more students reported having chosen their own grade options than did those who received help from parents, teachers, advisors, or the school.

For the total sample, students reported more frequently that the teacher either solely or primarily determined what their grades would be. However, in three of the schools, students most frequently reported that grades were determined by an equal combination of student-teacher input. The mean scores for Schools One and Four differed significantly from Schools Two, Three, and Five.

For the total sample and within each school, students reported most frequently that they had the opportunity to evaluate their courses and instructors in over three-fourths of their courses. No interpretations of mean scores was possible.

Students' perceptions varied in the general sample and within each school regarding the opportunities to take independent study had they chosen to do so. There were no significant differences among the mean scores.

Students generally reported that independent study was available to everyone, and not restricted to students with a certain grade point. In School Four, a majority of students reported that advisor permission was a prerequisite for taking independent study. Students in School Three were somewhat divided regarding whether advisor permission was a prerequisite. Students in the other three schools most frequently reported that it was not a prerequisite.

Of those who reported taking independent study in the total sample, the highest percentage said that they chose the topic to be

studied. Experiences varied regarding who chose the materials to be used and who determined the criteria for the grade.

In three of the schools, students responded most frequently that they chose the topic to be studied; in one school, students said it was the teacher who did so; in another, students reported a variety of experiences regarding who chose the topic. In two schools, students reported a variety of experiences regarding who determined the criteria for the grade. In two of the schools, students most frequently responded that the student and teacher together determined the criteria for the grade. The extent to which students took independent study will be examined in Chapter 9.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter explored three areas of individual decision making in order to answer the research question, "does a sampling of students in the five schools see these schools offering all students opportunities to make decisions individually concerning his/her learning"? It is difficult to give a "yes" or "no" answer to this question, because the data is based on students' perceptions which, viewed either as an individual school or as a total sample, is sometimes conflicting.

Three modes of student participation in the decision making process emerge from this data. The first node is that of student as sole participant. This mode characterizes students' actions in course evaluation and in choosing a topic for independent study. The second mode is student as co-participant with either parent, teacher, or advisor. Students are co-participants in choosing their grade options

and in determining materials and the criteria for their grades on independent study. The third mode is student as non-participant. Students are non-participants in determining what their grades will be. Grade determination is either solely or primarily a teacher activity.

Thus, in these alternative schools within the realm of individual decision making, there are areas in which students operate somewhat autonomously, areas in which they participate with teacher, advisor, and parent, and finally areas in which the teacher is the final determinant of the outcome.

Chapter 7

GROUP DECISION MAKING

This chapter will answer the question, "does a sampling of students in the five schools see these schools offering all students opportunities to make decisions as a group concerning the governance of the school"? Each school's literature reported that some type of all-school meeting was involved in the governance of the school. The researcher was able to observe two of the five all-school meetings. Three of the meetings were not held during the researcher's visits to the schools. Four areas will be examined in order to answer this question: (1) the structure and mechanics of group decision making; (2) students' perceptions of teacher control over the all-school meeting; (3) the type of authority held by the all-school meeting over a variety of issues; and (4) students' perceptions regarding the autonomy of the all-school meeting in the governance of the school.

STRUCTURE AND MECHANICS

Students were asked seven questions regarding the structure and the mechanics of group governance. The two questions relating to structure asked students to describe their schools' procedures for group governance (some type of all-school meeting in which all students may participate). Five questions required students to describe their roles in the organizational activities of scheduling procedures, agenda

determination and chairmanship for the all-school meetings. Data from the five schools will be presented for each question.

Question One: Structure for Group Decision Making

Data Presentations. Students were asked to indicate which of the options describe the group decision making process in their school. Students' responses within the five schools are shown in table 30.

Table 30

Types of Meetings Held in Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	A general meeting	Only small group meetings	Both large and small group meetings	I don't know	Other	No response
One	38	13	0	19	2	2	2
Two	32	13	0	17	1	1	0
Three	47	30	1	11	0	0	5
Four	53	29	0	22	0	0	2
Five	77	64	0	12	0	0	1

Discussion. Most students in Schools One-Four responded that they had either a general meeting or both large and small group meetings. Four schools utilized a small group advisory system. Students in these schools perceived the advisory groups as another way to make group decisions. In School Five, almost all students reported that their school had only an all-school meeting. School Five held only all-

school meetings. Some students reported the use of small group meetings. Perhaps these students were confused because the number of students attending the meeting varied from time to time.

Question Two: Representation for All-School Meeting

Data Presentations. Students were asked to circle the answer which best describes their school. The data for the five schools is presented in table 31.

Table 31

Voting and Representation at All-School Meeting

School	Total sample	A general meeting at which anyone could be present and vote	A general meeting at which only student representatives and teacher representatives could be present and vote	Small group meetings where students and staff could vote	No response
One	38	23	3	7	5
Two	32	20	4	8	0
Three	47	26	2	14	5
Four	53	43	2	5	3
Five	77	73	2	1	1

Discussion. Students in Schools One, Two, Four, and Five reported that they had large group meetings at which anyone could be present and vote. Responses in School Three reflect the fact that students see their advisory groups as a mechanism for making decisions. Similarly, a

portion of students in Schools One, Two, and Four see the advisory groups in the same manner.

Questions Three and Four:
Scheduling for the
General Meetings

Data Presentations. Students were asked two questions regarding the scheduling of the meetings. They were asked to respond to the statement, "our general meeting was regularly scheduled." They were also asked, "who determined the time for the meeting"? Since these questions are closely related, data for these questions will be presented in tables 32 and 33.

Table 32

Students' Perceptions of the Scheduling of the All-School Meeting

School	Total Sample	Yes	No	No response
One	38	19	4	15
Two	32	17	5	10
Three	47	35	3	9
Four	53	50	2	1
Five	77	71	3	3

Table 33

Students' Perceptions Regarding Who Determined Meeting Time for Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	Director	Teachers	Students	Students, teachers, director	Don't know	No response
One	38	2	4	2	11	5	14
Two	32	2	2	1	12	3	12
Three	47	1	0	7	20	11	8
Four	53	2	0	4	27	8	12
Five	77	0	5	6	48	17	1

Discussion. The literature on Schools Two-Five reported that the all-school meetings were regularly scheduled. School One was the only school whose literature reported that meetings were called when students, teachers, or the director felt them necessary. In Schools One-Four, some students did not respond. Generally, students in all five schools reported that meetings were regularly scheduled.

Students in Schools One and Two were somewhat divided regarding who determined the time for the meetings. In Schools Three, Four, and Five, the students most frequently reported that students, teachers, and the director together determined the time for the general meeting.

Question Five: Agenda Determination

Data Presentations. Students were asked to indicate who determined the agenda for the meeting. Their responses are shown in table 34.

Table 34

Students' Perceptions of Agenda Determination for Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	Students	Director	Teachers	Teachers, students, director	Don't know	Other	No response
One	38	2	8	7	2	13	1	5
Two	32	1	1	1	21	0	0	8
Three	47	6	0	1	32	1	0	7
Four	53	13	2	0	26	0	2	10
Five	77	3	0	0	63	5	0	6

Discussion. Students in the five schools most frequently reported that the students, teachers, and director together determined the agenda for the general meeting; however, some students in each school did not respond to the question. The highest percentage of students who did not know who determined the items on the agenda was in School One.

Questions Six and Seven: Choice and Status of Chairperson

Data Presentations. Since these questions are closely related, they will be examined together. Students were asked, "who usually chooses the chairperson for the general meeting?" and they were asked to indicate who the chairperson was (the director, a student, a teacher). Their responses are shown in tables 35 and 36.

Table 35

Students' Perceptions of Who Chooses the Chairperson for the All-School Meeting

School	Total sample	Students	Director	Teachers	Teachers, director, students	General meeting	Other	Don't know	No response
One	38	1	4	5	4	1	10	4	9
Two	32	3	1	0	7	4	4	4	9
Three	47	7	5	1	8	4	11	4	7
Four	53	13	0	0	9	0	25	2	4
Five	77	9	0	0	9	13	21	16	9

Table 36

Students' Perceptions of Who the Chairperson Usually Was in Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	The director	A student	A teacher	Don't know	No response
One	38	11	3	6	5	13
Two	32	6	8	6	4	18
Three	47	0	8	6	4	7
Four	53	0	22	14	4	9
Five	77	1	59	4	9	4

Discussion. Students in all five schools were divided regarding how the chairperson was chosen. Two explanations might account for this situation: (1) it is possible that the students who were surveyed were not familiar with the procedures for choosing a chairperson; and (2) students did not see in the options presented the one which correctly identified their school's procedure for choosing a chairperson. A percentage of students within each school chose the option "other" and wrote in a description of the way the chairperson was chosen.

Students in Schools One, Two, and Three reported that the chairperson could be the director, a student, or a teacher. In Schools Four and Five, most students reported that a student was usually the chairperson.

Summary

Each school's literature reported that they had an all-school meeting. Four schools reported that it was regularly scheduled. The

literature did not specify who determined the times of the meetings or the items on the agenda. Staff members reported that the meetings' time and the agenda items were determined by everyone.

Students generally reported in the five schools that they had an all-school meeting at which anyone could be present and vote. Some students in Schools One-Four say their advisory groups are another way to make group decisions.

Students reported most frequently in all schools that the meetings were regularly scheduled and that teachers, students, and the director together determined the time for the meetings and the items to be included on the agenda.

Students were divided in their descriptions of how the chairperson was chosen; many students within each school indicated "other" as their response to this question. Students could not relate to one specific description within this item which identified the procedures for their specific school.

In Schools One, Two, and Three, students said that the chairperson could be either a student, teacher, or the director. However, in Schools Four and Five, the chairperson was usually a student.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER CONTROL OVER THE ALL-SCHOOL MEETING

Research Procedures and Presentation of the Data

Students were asked to respond to the statement, "teachers really controlled the all-school meeting." They were able to register a

response ranging from strong disagreement to agreement with this statement. For the purposes of this discussion, the five categories were collapsed to three: "agree," "disagree," and "undecided." Students' responses to this statement are found in table 37.

Table 37

Students' Perceptions of Teacher Control of the All-School Meeting in Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	Disagree		Undecided		Agree		No response
		n	% of n*	n	% of n*	n	% of n*	
One	38	16	50	6	19	10	31	6
Two	32	19	86	2	9	1	4	10
Three	47	27	57	7	15	6	13	7
Four	53	48	94	0	0	3	5	2
Five	77	67	91	2	3	5	5	3

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Discussion

The researcher observed the all-school meeting at two of the schools. Based on one observation, it was not clear whether in fact the teachers really controlled the all-school meeting. Of those students responding, nearly all students in Schools Two, Four, and Five reported that teachers did not control the all-school meeting. Although the majority of students responding in Schools One Three reported that

teachers did not control the meeting, these percentages were lower than those in the other schools.

Summary

Students felt generally that teachers did not control the all-school meeting. This feeling was more widespread in Schools Two, Four, and Five than in Schools One and Three.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE ALL-SCHOOL MEETING IN FOUR AREAS: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION, DISCIPLINE-PROBLEM SOLVING-INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS, STAFFING, AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Research Procedures and Data Presentations

The schools' literature reported only general statements regarding the authority of the meeting and did not describe its authority in specific areas. Students were asked to indicate whether the all-school meeting had final, limited, recommending power only, or no authority regarding sixteen activities common to schools. These activities were placed in four categories: (1) curriculum and instruction, (2) discipline, problem solving, and interpersonal relations, (3) staffing procedures, and (4) resource management. Two raters assigned the sixteen activities to the four categories; the raters were in complete agreement. Tables 38-41 present the data for School One.

Table 38

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School One

	Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 1 Planning activities and materials within courses	4	8	9	3	5	8	37
Item 2 Whether credit will be given for one course or other	7	4	8	5	7	6	37
Item 3 Whether credit should be given for specific course at all	2	8	7	2	13	5	37
Item 15 Power to review and change a student's grades	3	7	7	8	6	6	37
Item 16 Power to determine what courses will be offered	7	11	5	3	6	5	37
Total Responding	23	38	36	21	37	30	185
Percentage of Number Responding in School One to the Five Items	12	21	19	11	20		

Table 39

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School One

	Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 4 Rules and regulations as to how students should act	5	12	3	6	5	7	38
Item 13 Resolution of a conflict between a student and teacher	5	6	6	8	9	4	38
Item 14 Resolution of a conflict between two students	3	6	4	9	10	6	38
Total Responding	13	24	13	23	24	17	114
Percentage of Number Responding in School One to the Three Items	11	21	11	20	21		

Table 40

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School One

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 7	Hiring of a state certified teacher	6	9	8	3	7	5	38
Item 8	Dismissal of a state certified teacher	3	9	4	6	10	6	38
Item 9	Hiring of an outside teacher or resource person	4	10	8	5	6	5	38
Item 10	Dismissal of an outside teacher or resource person	3	6	8	5	11	5	38
Total Responding		16	34	28	19	34	21	152
Percentage of Number Responding in School One to the Four Items		11	22	18	13	22		

Table 41

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School One

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 5	Use of equipment at school	4	15	2	3	4	9	37
Item 6	Purchasing of equipment for school	4	14	3	5	6	5	37
Item 12	Budget, and use of funds	4	12	3	7	7	4	37
Item 11	Use of space within the school	10	8	8	2	5	4	37
Total Responding		22	49	16	17	22	22	148
Percentage of Number Responding in School One to the Four Items		15	33	11	12	15		

Discussion

In School One, students were divided regarding the type of authority held by the all-school meeting in the four categories of curriculum and instruction, discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, and staffing and resource management. At least half of the sample reported that the meeting had some authority in curricular areas and staffing and management of resources. Almost a third of the students either did not know what type of authority the all-school meeting held in these areas or did not respond to the question.

Tables 42-45 present the data for School Two.

Table 42

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Two

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 1	Materials and activities within courses	7	8	5	2	3	7	32
Item 2	Credit given for one course or another	9	2	2	6	5	8	32
Item 3	Whether credit be given for a specific course at all	8	5	2	6	4	7	32
Item 15	Power to review and change a student's grade	6	3	3	7	5	8	32
Item 16	Power to determine what courses will be offered	8	4	6	5	2	7	32
Total Responding		38	22	18	26	19	37	160
Percentage of Number Responding in School Two to the Five Items		24	14	11	16	12		

Table 43

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Two

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 4	Rules and regulations as to how students should act	17	3	3	1	1	7	32
Item 13	Resolution of conflict between a student and a teacher	11	3	5	2	2	9	32
Item 14	The resolution of a conflict between two students	13	6	3	2	1	7	32
Total Responding		41	12	11	5	4	23	96
Percentage of Number Responding in School Two to the Three Items		42	13	12	5	4		

Table 44

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Two

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 7	Hiring of a state certified teacher	12	8	1	1	3	7	32
Item 8	Dismissal of a state certified teacher	17	3	1	1	3	7	32
Item 9	Hiring of an outside teacher or resource person	13	7	3	2	1	6	32
Item 10	Dismissal of an outside teacher or resource person	16	5	2	2	1	6	32
Total Responding		58	23	7	6	8	26	128
Percentage of Number Responding in School Two to the Four Items		45	18	5	4	6		

Table 45

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School Two

	Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 5 Use of equipment at school	11	10	3	0	1	7	32
Item 6 Purchasing of equipment for school	7	8	4	2	3	7	32
Item 12 Budgeting and use of funds	11	6	4	1	3	7	32
Item 11 Use of space within the school	10	8	4	1	3	6	32
Total Responding	39	32	15	4	10	27	128
Percentage of Number Responding in School Two to the Four Items	31	25	12	3	7		

Discussion

In School Two, students were divided regarding the type of authority held by the all-school meeting in curriculum and instruction and resource management.

In the area of staffing, almost half of the total sample reported that the all-school meeting had final authority in the hiring and dismissal of state-certified and outside teachers and resource persons. Of the five schools, only School Two had a yearly evaluation of staff conducted by the all-school meeting.[1] In the area of discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, almost half of the total sample reported that the all-school meeting had final authority in determining rules and regulations for student behavior and the resolution of conflicts between a teacher and a student and between two students.

Tables 46-49 present the data for School Three.

---

[1]At the time the researcher visited School Two, students had recently completed evaluation of staff.

Table 46

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Three

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 1	Planning activities and materials to be used within courses	11	16	6	2	7	5	47
Item 2	Whether credit be given for one subject or another	2	8	8	14	10	5	47
Item 3	Whether credit be given for a specific course at all	9	4	5	14	10	5	47
Item 15	Power to review and change a student's grade	1	1	6	22	11	6	47
Item 16	Power to determine what courses will be offered	5	11	12	6	7	6	47
Total Responding		28	40	37	58	45	27	235
Percentage of Number Responding in School Three to the Five Items		12	17	16	25	19		

Table 47

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Three

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 4	Rules and regulations regarding how students should act	17	15	3	4	3	5	47
Item 13	Resolution of a conflict between a student and teacher	3	9	11	12	7	5	47
Item 14	The resolution of a conflict between two students	5	4	11	15	7	5	47
Total Responding		25	28	25	31	17	15	141
Percentage of Number Responding in School Three to the Three Items		18	20	18	22	12		

Table 48

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing Functions - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Three

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 7	Hiring of a state certified teacher	2	6	8	14	11	6	47
Item 8	The dismissal of a state certified teacher	4	3	6	13	15	6	47
Item 9	The hiring of an outside teacher or resource person	4	6	8	11	11	7	47
Item 10	The dismissal of an outside teacher or resource person	3	4	7	11	15	7	47
Total Responding		13	19	29	49	53	26	188
Percentage of Number Responding in School Three to the Four Items		8	12	18	30	33		

Table 49

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School Three

	Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 5 Use of equipment at school	16	12	4	2	6	7	47
Item 6 Purchasing of equipment for school	14	13	4	2	7	7	47
Item 12 Budget and use of funds	13	14	7	2	6	5	47
Item 11 Use of space within the school	24	12	4	0	2	5	47
Total Responding	67	51	19	6	21	24	188
Percentage of Number Responding in School Three to the Four Items	36	27	10	3	11		

Discussion

In School Three, students were divided regarding the type of authority the all-school meeting held regarding curriculum and instruction, discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, and staffing. More students reported that the meeting had either final or limited authority in resource management than in the other three areas.

Within the areas of resource management, over a third of the total sample reported that the all-school meeting held final authority in determining the use and purchasing of equipment, the use of space within the school, the budgeting, and use of funds.

Tables 50-53 present the data for School Four.

Table 50

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Four

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 1	Planning activities and materials to be used within courses	22	16	9	1	1	4	53
Item 2	Whether credit be given for one subject or another	11	11	7	12	7	5	53
Item 3	Whether credit be given for a specific course at all	8	20	11	7	4	3	53
Item 15	Power to review and change a student's goals	1	9	4	28	8	3	53
Item 16	Power to determine what courses will be offered	5	21	12	8	3	4	53
Total Responding		47	77	43	56	23	19	265
Percentage of Number Responding in School Four to the Five Items		19	31	17	23	9		

Table 51

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Four

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 4	Rules and regulations regarding how students should act	21	18	6	3	2	3	53
Item 13	Resolution of a conflict between a student and teacher	2	13	10	16	6	6	53
Item 14	The resolution of a conflict between two students	1	7	9	22	8	6	53
Total Responding		24	38	25	41	16	15	159
Percentage of Number Responding in School Four to the Three Items		15	24	16	26	10		

Table 52

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing Functions - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Four

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 7	Hiring of a state certified teacher	1	2	8	27	11	4	53
Item 8	The dismissal of a state certified teacher	1	1	13	21	9	8	53
Item 9	The hiring of an outside teacher or resource person	7	15	15	6	5	5	53
Item 10	The dismissal of an outside teacher or resource person	7	7	14	12	9	4	53
Total Responding		16	25	50	66	34	21	212
Percentage of Number Responding in School Four to the Four Items		7	12	24	31	16		

Table 53

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Management of Resources - 5, 6, 12, 11 in School Four

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 5	Use of equipment at school	14	15	6	5	7	6	53
Item 6	Purchasing of equipment for school	25	17	5	1	2	3	53
Item 12	Budgeting and use of funds	23	15	9	0	2	4	53
Item 11	Use of space within the school	25	12	6	3	4	3	53
Total Responding		87	59	26	9	15	16	212
Percentage of Number Responding in School Four to the Four Items		41	28	12	4	7		

Discussion

Within School Four in the areas of curriculum and instruction, discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, and staffing, students were divided regarding the type of authority held by the all-school meeting. In the fourth area, resource management, over a third of the sample reported that the all-school meeting had final authority regarding the purchasing and use of equipment, the budgeting and use of funds, and the use of space within the school. Over half the sample reported that the meeting had either final or limited authority in this area.

Tables 54-57 present the data for School Five.

Table 54

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Curricular and Instructional Areas - 1, 2, 3, 15, 16 in School Five

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 1	Materials and activities within courses	22	24	9	9	12	1	77
Item 2	Credit given for one course or another	23	16	11	10	14	3	77
Item 3	Whether credit be given for a specific course at all	32	12	8	5	18	2	77
Item 15	Power and review and change a student's grade	4	10	14	14	34	1	77
Item 16	Power to determine what courses will be offered	24	26	6	8	12	1	77
Total Responding		105	88	48	46	90	8	385
Percentage of Number Responding in School Five to the Five Items		27	23	13	12	23		

Table 55

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Discipline, Problem Solving, Interpersonal Relations - 4, 13, 14 in School Five

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 4	Rules and regulations as to how students should act	28	21	11	7	7	3	77
Item 13	Resolution of a conflict between a student and teacher	10	20	19	3	22	3	77
Item 14	Resolution of a conflict between two students	11	16	17	13	19	1	77
Total Responding		49	57	47	23	48	7	231
Percentage of Number Responding in School Five to the Three Items		22	25	21	10	21		

Table 56

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Staffing - 7, 8, 9, 10 in School Five

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 7	Hiring of a state certified teacher	26	18	12	3	16	2	77
Item 8	Dismissal of a state certified teacher	14	16	11	10	24	2	77
Item 9	The hiring of an outside teacher or resource person	47	13	4	0	10	3	77
Item 10	Dismissal of an outside teacher or resource person	30	10	5	3	26	3	77
Total Responding		117	57	32	16	76	10	308
Percentage of Number Responding in School Five to the Four Items		39	19	11	5	26		

Table 57

Students' Perceptions of the Authority of the All-School Meeting in Resource Management - 5, 6, 11, 12 in School Five

		Final	Limited	Recommending only	No power	Don't know	No response	Total
Item 5	Use of equipment in school	45	19	3	1	7	2	77
Item 6	Purchasing of equipment for school	43	22	4	0	6	2	77
Item 11	The use of space within the school	51	14	6	0	5	1	77
Item 12	The budgeting and use of funds	31	27	8	0	10	1	77
Total Responding		170	82	21	1	28	6	308
Percentage of Number Responding in School Five to the Four Items		56	27	7	.3	9		

Discussion

In the areas of curriculum and instruction, discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, and staffing, students in School Five were divided regarding the type of authority the all-school meeting held.

In the fourth area, resource management, over half the total sample reported that the all-school meeting had final authority in determining the purchasing and use of equipment, and budgeting and use of funds, and the use of space within the school. Over three-fourths of the sample reported that the meeting had either final or limited authority in this area.

Summary

Each school's literature presents a vague picture of the authority of all-school meetings on specific areas. The literature gives a brief general description of the role of the general meeting but does not elaborate on its authority in specific areas. Students in all schools were divided regarding the power of the all-school meeting to determine matters in curriculum and instruction. In the areas of discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, students in Schools One, Three, Four, and Five were divided. In staffing areas, students in Schools One, Three, Four, and Five were divided.

In the area of resource management, students in Schools One and Two were divided, but students in Schools Three, Four, and Five reported that their all-school meetings had final authority in this area.

In only one school, School Two, did a large number of students report that their all-school meeting had final authority in more than one area. They reported that their meeting had final authority in staffing, discipline, problem solving, and interpersonal relations.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING THE AUTONOMY OF THE ALL-SCHOOL MEETING IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOL

Research Procedures

Some students who completed the questionnaire were interviewed; they were asked two questions regarding the all-school meeting: (1) "Do you think that the all-school meeting has enough power in the school?" and (2) "Is there someone or some group which has final authority in deciding issues and policies in the school?"

The researcher's purpose in asking these questions was to examine student's feeling regarding the effectiveness of the all-school meeting and the relationship of the meeting to the director, superintendent, or school board in the governance of the school. The number of students interviewed in each school was:

School One	14
School Two	9
School Three	12
School Four	11
School Five	8

For the purposes of this discussion, the responses for the two questions will be grouped together by school.

Discussion

School One. Of the students interviewed, eight felt that the all-school meeting had power but that there were obstacles to the effective use of that power.[2] The obstacles were: (1) students' reluctance to speak out at the meetings (3 students), (2) student apathy in not attending the meeting (2 students), and (3) a sense that the discussions at the meetings got "bogged down" in detail and that it was difficult to accomplish anything (3 students). These concerns were not shared equally by all of the students interviewed.

Students reported a variety of answers when asked if there was one person or one group which held final authority in the school. One student said that the all-school meeting had final authority; five students said that the head teacher and the staff reserved specific powers for themselves. Two students said that ultimate power belonged to the school board. Three students said that they did not know. Finally, one student reported that the head teacher and town meeting shared final authority.

School Two. Six of the eight students interviewed reported that the all-school meeting had enough power and that the meeting had final authority in all internal matters. Two students said that final authority lay with the director. Students reported further that the school board set

---

[2]Segments of the interviews which were taperecorded with the first six students were inaudible.

limits on budgetary expenditures. One student reported that the director had veto power but that he seldom used it.

School Three. Six of the students interviewed felt that the all-school meeting had enough power but that the students did not use the power that they had. They cited barriers to the effective use of that power: (1) student absenteeism from the meeting; (2) the limits of the authority of the meeting as imposed by the school board; and (3) a reliance on the use of parliamentary procedure which stifled some students who have difficulty speaking in front of a group.[3] Two students reported that the meeting did not have enough power. Two students said that they did not know; one student was not sure; and one student did not attend the meetings. Eight students said that the director had final authority on issues in the school. They noted that he used that authority carefully. Two students said that authority was divided among the meeting, the director, and the school board. Two students reported that final authority lay with the meeting.

School Four. Eight of the students interviewed felt that the all-school meeting had enough power in the school. Much of the responsibility for the governance of the school is held by the seven student-teacher committees. The all-school meeting has veto power over their activities. One student reported that their director had veto power over the actions

---

[3]At the time of this interview, students at School Three had started holding separate meetings infrequently which only students might attend. These meetings were held to provide students the opportunity to discuss matters which they might be hesitant to discuss with the faculty present or in a large group meeting.

of the meeting and that the principal of the regular high school held veto power over the activities of the director of the alternative school. Other responses describing who held final authority in the school were: the principal of the regular high school (1), the town meeting (1), the director of the alternative school (2), the teachers (5), and the principal of the regular high school and the town meeting (2).

School Five. Of the students interviewed, five felt that the all-school meeting had enough power to the extent that it chose to exercise it; one student did not think that the meeting had enough power; two students did not know. Some students reported that apathy among the students was a barrier to the meeting's effective use of power. Students were divided regarding who held final authority in the school. Two students reported that it was the head teacher and the town meeting. Three students said it was the town meeting; one student indicated the school board; one student did not know.

SUMMARY

Students in the five school generally knew that they had a large group meeting regularly scheduled at which anyone could be present and vote. Students in four of the schools saw their small group meetings as another way to make decisions about the school. Generally, they reported that students along with teachers and the director determined the items on the agenda. Students, teachers, or the director could be the chairperson for the meetings in Schools One, Two, and Three. In Schools Four

and Five, a student was usually the chairperson. Some students in each school were confused regarding how the chairperson was selected.

Students were generally confused regarding the authority of the all-school meeting in the areas of curriculum and instruction, discipline and problem solving, staffing, and resource management. The two exceptions to this statement (in the sense of a greater consensus within the sample) were students in School Two who agreed that their all-school meeting had final authority in the areas of staffing, discipline, problem solving, and interpersonal relations. Students in Schools Three, Four, and Five agreed that the meeting had final authority in the area of resource management.

Despite the student confusion about the authority the meeting held in specific areas, those students interviewed felt generally that the all-school meeting had enough power. Students perceived that the barriers to effective use of power lay not within the institutions but within the group members themselves (apathy, absenteeism, inability to speak before a large group).

When students were asked to describe the role of the all-school meeting in relation to the director, superintendent, and school board in the governance of the school, students in Schools Two, Three, and Four reported that the director had veto power over the actions of the all-school meeting. Students in School One perceived that the director and teachers reserved specific powers to themselves. The students in School Five saw the director as an interpreter of school board policy and as an accountant explaining periodically to the meeting the amount of money available for various activities. Students in all schools

reported some agent or group outside of their school who had ultimate authority regarding the governance of the school. In Schools One and Two, it was a school board; in Schools Three and Five, it was the district superintendent; in School Four, it was the principal of the parent school.

Finally, students saw their schools offering them opportunities to make decisions about the governance of their schools. Such a structure (the all-school meeting) did exist. The precise authority of the meeting in determining policy in various areas was uncertain. Nevertheless, students were satisfied as a group that they had enough power. Within four of the schools, the director could veto the actions of the meetings. Ultimate authority in all schools was lodged with either a principal of a home school, the superintendent, or a district board.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter explored the question, "does a sampling of students in the five schools see these schools offering all students opportunities to make decisions as a group concerning the governance of the school?" The schools' literature reported that students had such opportunities in the form of an all-school meeting. Students knew that they had such opportunities. They participated in the mechanics and procedures of the meetings (determination of meeting time, items on the agenda, and chairperson selection).

However, there was no unanimity regarding the precise authority of the meeting to determine specific issues within the school. Students

were closer to agreement that they had more than recommending power in the area of resource management than in other areas. Despite the uncertainty in defining the meeting's authority, students generally felt that the meeting had enough power.

As a mechanism for decision making, the all-school meeting's decisions were counterbalanced either by a director (who generally held veto power over their decisions), a school board (who determined the limits of budgetary expenditures), or the principal of a regular high school (who held veto power over the director and the town meeting of the alternative school).

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF AND RESPONSES TO OPPORTUNITIES FOR DECISION MAKING AND USE OF COMMUNITY IN FIVE PUBLIC SECONDARY ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

by
Mary Claire McBride

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of the University of Maryland in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
1977

Chapter 8

THE USE OF THE COMMUNITY AS A LEARNING RESOURCE

One way in which the five alternative schools say they differ from the regular high school in the public system is that they offer students opportunities to use the community as a learning resource. It is difficult to know what is meant by the "use of the community as a learning resource" from reading the literature of each school. It is not clear whether this type of learning is an integral component of each curricular area or a separate learning experience in conjunction with the regular curricular offerings.

The research question was, "do students in the five schools see these schools offering students opportunities to use the community as a learning resource?" In order to answer this question, the researcher identified ways common to all schools within their literature in which the community was used as a learning resource, ways in which the community people worked in the school to teach and students entered the community to learn. These ways were:

1. the school's utilization of community persons as teachers in the school;

2. the school's use of outside speakers within courses in the school; and

3. the extent to which students utilized outside learning experiences. (The percentage of courses students took in the community

and the type of activities in which they engaged will be examined in Chapter 9.

The research question asked students to assess the extent to which the school offered all students these learning opportunities. In order to obtain student opinion regarding the extent to which the school offered all students these learning opportunities, the researcher asked students four questions regarding outside learning experiences:

1. Were they required?
2. Were they available to everyone?
3. Were they limited to a few?
4. Were they accepted for academic credit?

Finally, in order to clarify the role of student and teacher in organizing and initiating outside learning experiences, students were asked to respond to two statements regarding how outside learning experiences were arranged.

USE OF THE COMMUNITY AS A LEARNING RESOURCE (OUTSIDE SPEAKERS, COMMUNITY PERSONS, OUTSIDE LEARNING EXPERIENCES)

Outside Speakers

Research Question and Presentation of the Data. Students were asked to respond to the statement: "in my classes within the school last year and this year, we had at least one outside speaker, someone who came in once or twice to speak on a particular topic in:

1. None of my courses;
2. 0-10% of my courses;
3. 10-25% of my courses;

4. 25-50% of my courses;
5. 50-75% of my courses;
6. 75-100% of my courses."

Table 58 indicates students' responses for the total sample; table 59 presents responses for Schools One-Five.

Table 58

Percentage of Courses in Which Students Had Outside Speakers for the Total Sample

None		0-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		No response	Total sample
N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	
2	.1	93	47	41	21	27	14	16	8	48	247

*Denotes percentage of total number responding.

Table 59

Percentage of Courses in Which Students Had Outside Speakers for Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	None	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	No response
One	38	5	12	5	0	1	15
Two	32	2	11	5	3	0	21
Three	47	7	21	8	3		8
Four	53	8	26	6	1	4	8
Five	77	0	23	17	20	11	6

Discussion. In the total sample, although student perceptions varied, almost half the number responding reported that they had at least one outside speaker in less than a quarter of their courses.

Responses in Schools One-Four reflected the pattern of responses in the total sample. In School Five, however, almost as many students reported that they had at least one outside speaker in one quarter of their courses as did those who said that they had an outside speaker in one-half to three-quarters of their courses.

Community Persons

Research Question and Presentation of the Data. Students were asked to "circle the percentage of your courses which were taught by persons who did not normally teach at the school but who came to teach a particular skill or study some special subject with you." Table 60 presents student responses for the total sample. Table 61 presents the data for Schools One-Five.

Table 60

Percentage of Courses Taught By Persons From the Community for Total Sample

None		0-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		No response	Total sample
N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*		
46	20	138	59	30	13	13	5	8	3	12	247

*Denotes percentage of total number responding

Table 61

Percentage of Courses Taught By People in the Community for Schools One-Five

School	Total sample	None	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	No response
One	38	9	20	4	0	0	5
Two	32	2	10	5	8	6	1
Three	47	5	18	13	5	2	4
Four	53	8	39	5	0	0	1
Five	77	22	30	21	3	0	1

Discussion. In the total sample, half the students reported that they were taught by a person from the community in less than a quarter of their courses. The response pattern for students in Schools One-Four was similar to the pattern for the total sample. However, in School Five, students reported almost equally that they had outside speakers in none of these courses, in less than a quarter, and between a quarter and one-half of their courses.

Summary

Students perceived that their schools utilized outside speakers and community persons within the school. Most frequently, they reported that these persons were involved in less than a quarter of their courses.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE FIVE SCHOOLS REGARDING OUTSIDE LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Policies

Research Questions and Presentation of the Data. Students were asked four questions in an attempt to pinpoint restrictions and regulations placed on the taking of outside activities. They were:

1. Outside activities were open to everyone who wanted to take them.
2. We were required to take an outside learning activity.
3. Outside activities were open only to upperclassmen.
4. I was given academic credit for activities that I took outside the school in the community.

Table 62 presents the data for the total sample. Tables 63-67 present the data for Schools One-Five.

Table 62

Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions for the Total Sample

	Open to everyone		Required to take outside learning activities		Open to upperclassmen only		Academic credit given for outside learning activities	
	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*
Yes	183	82	37	17	2	.009	164	78
No	10	5	180	80	198	92	23	11
I Don't Know	29	13	7	3	15	77	23	11
No Response	25		23		32		37	
Total	247		247		247		247	

*Denotes percentage of the total responding.

Table 63

Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School One

	Open to everyone	Required to take outside learning activities	Open to upperclassmen only	Academic credit given for outside learning activities
Yes	23	2	1	15
No	3	25	19	7
I Don't Know	4	3	9	4
No Response	8	8	9	12
Total Sample	38	38	38	38

Table 64

Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Two

	Open to everyone	Required to take outside learning activities	Open to upperclassmen only	Academic credit given for outside learning activities
Yes	23	22	0	23
No	1	2	23	1
I Don't Know	2	2	1	1
No Response	6	6	8	7
Total Sample	32	32	32	32

Table 65

Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Three

	Open to everyone	Required to take outside learning activities	Open to upperclassmen only	Academic credit given for outside learning activities
Yes	35	2	0	38
No	2	38	39	2
I Don't Know	4	1	0	1
No Response	6	6	8	6
Total Sample	47	47	47	47

Table 66

Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Four

	Open to everyone	Required to take outside learning activities	Open to upperclassmen only	Academic credit given for outside learning activities
Yes	41	6	1	36
No	2	45	48	6
I Don't Know	7	0	0	7
No Response	3	2	4	4
Total Sample	53	53	53	53

Table 67

Outside Learning Activities: Limitations and Restrictions As Perceived by Students in School Five

	Open to everyone	Required to take outside learning activities	Open to upperclassmen only	Academic credit given for outside learning activities
Yes	61	5	0	52
No	2	70	69	7
I Don't Know	12	1	5	10
No Response	2	1	3	8
Total Sample	77	77	77	77

Discussion. Students in the total sample and within each school reported that outside activities were open to anyone who wanted to pursue them. Students in the total sample and in Schools One, Three, Four, and Five said that students were not required to take an outside learning activity, but students in School Two reported that outside learning activities were required.

Students in the total sample and within the five schools reported that these activities were not restricted to only upperclassmen. Finally, students in the total sample and within the five schools reported that they were given academic credit for outside learning activities.

Procedures--the Arrangement of Outside Learning Activities

Research Questions and Presentation of the Data. Students were asked to respond to two questions regarding who arranged the outside learning activities. The questions were:

1. It was my responsibility to find an outside learning activity if I wanted to take one.

2. Teachers generally found outside activities for students.

Data for these two questions may be found in tables 68-71.

Table 68

Students' Perceptions of the Teacher's Role in Finding Outside Learning Activities for Students for the Total Sample

Yes		No		I don't know		No response	Total sample
N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*		
49	23	102	47	66	30	30	247

*Denotes percentage of total responding.

Table 69

Students' Perceptions of the Teacher's Role in Finding Outside Learning Activities for Students for Schools One-Five

School	Yes	No	I don't know	No response	total sample
One	12	7	10	9	38
Two	14	6	7	5	32
Three	9	21	8	9	47
Four	4	33	12	4	53
Five	10	35	29	3	77

Table 70

Students' Perceptions of Their Responsibility to Find An Outside Activity for the Total Sample

Yes		No		I don't know		No response	Total sample
N	% of N*	N	% of N*	N	% of N*		
134	64	44	21	33	16	36	247

*Denotes percentage of total responding.

Table 71

Students' Perceptions of Their Responsibility to Find An Outside Activity for Schools One-Five

School	Yes	No	I don't know	No response	Total sample
One	8	10	10	10	38
Two	12	8	3	9	32
Three	31	5	1	10	47
Four	34	9	5	5	53
Five	49	12	14	2	77

Discussion. A majority of students in the total sample reported that it was the students' responsibility to find an outside learning activity. Within Schools One-Five, students reported most frequently that it was the student's responsibility to find an outside learning activity. Some students in each of the schools did not know whose responsibility it was to find an outside learning activity.

Although in the total sample students most frequently responded that teachers did not find activities for students, it is difficult to obtain a clear picture of teacher behavior in this area, because almost a third of the students responding said that they did not know. Student responses within each school reflected the response pattern of the total sample for this statement.

Summary

Students reported generally that outside courses were open to everyone and not restricted to upperclassmen. Academic credit was given for the completion of these activities. With the exception of students in School Two, students reported generally that outside learning activities were not required. Although a majority of students reported that it was their responsibility to find an outside learning activity, almost a quarter of the students responding reported that the teachers found the activities.

CONCLUSIONS

The question examined in this chapter was, "do students in the five schools see these schools offering students opportunities to use the community as a learning resource?" Students reported that they

had opportunities to use the community as a learning resource within their schools as their literature indicated. Students reported that they had community persons teaching courses and outside speakers within the school. Community persons were utilized less than outside speakers. These schools offered students the opportunity to pursue activities in the community. Any student may pursue an activity in the community but many students within each school did not do so (the extent to which students utilized the community as a learning resource will be examined in Chapter 9). Only School Two considered this form of student learning an integral part of the curriculum and required students to engage in it. However, even in that school, almost a third of the students did not pursue an activity in the community.

Chapter 9

LEARNING DECISIONS MADE BY STUDENTS

Students perceived that they had opportunities to make decisions and use the community as a learning resource. This chapter will examine the final question in this study: "Given opportunities to make decisions and use the community as a learning resource, what decisions did students actually make?" Three areas will be examined:

1. The number of students who actually took independent study courses.
2. The number of students who took outside learning courses.
3. The type of outside learning courses in which students engaged.

THE EXTENT TO WHICH STUDENTS TOOK INDEPENDENT STUDY

Research Procedures and Presentation of the Data

Data for this question will be reported in two forms: (1) whole numbers and percentages, and (2) mean scores. Students were asked the question "I actually took independent study in:

Item One	None of my subjects;
Item Two	0-10% of my subjects;
Item Three	10-25% of my subjects;
Item Four	25-50% of my subjects;

Item Five	50-75% of my subjects;
Item Six	75-100% of my subjects."

Table 72 presents the data for the total sample; table 73 presents the data for Schools One-Five (items two and three are collapsed in these tables).

Each item was assigned a point value as follows:

Item One	None of my subjects	0
Item Two	0-10% of my subjects	1
Item Three	10-25% of my subjects	2
Item Four	25-50% of my subjects	3
Item Five	50-75% of my subjects	4
Item Six	75-100% of my subjects	5
No Response		0

The assumption underlying the point values for each item is the greater the number of independent study subjects the greater the point value to the numerical value for each item and divided by the number responding for each school to yield a mean score for the level of independent study per school. One-way analysis of variance procedures was performed on the mean scores (level of significance .01).

Mean scores for subjects that students took on independent study for the five schools were:

School One	1.61
School Two	2.51
School Three	2.14
School Four	1.98
School Five	2.93

Table 72

Percentage of Subjects in Which Students Took Independent Study For the Total Sample

None of my subjects		0-25% of my subjects		25-50% of my subjects		50-75% of my subjects		75-100% of my subjects		No response	Total sample
N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	
58	25	135	59	23	10	11	5	1	.004	19	247

*Denotes percentage of total number responding.

Table 73

Percentage of Subjects in Which Students Took Independent Study For Schools One-Five

School	None of my subjects		0-25% of my subjects		25-50% of my subjects		50-75% of my subjects		75-100% of my subjects		No response	Total sample
	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	(% of n)*	n	
One	19	61	10	33	2	6	0	0	0	0	7	38
Two	5	3	19	66	3	10	2	6	0	0	3	32
Three	9	21	29	69	4	14	0	0	0	0	5	47
Four	18	36	31	62	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	53
Five	7	9	46	61	14	18	8	11	1	1	1	77

*Denotes percentage of total number responding.

Discussion

The data for the total sample indicates that of those who took independent study, almost 60% reported that they took independent study in less than a quarter of their subjects. Regarding the percentage of courses students took on independent study, the patterns of responses for Schools Two-Five is similar to that of the total sample. In School One, the highest percentage responding reported that they did not take independent study. Post hoc analysis revealed that the students in Schools Two and Five took a greater percentage of their subjects on independent study than did the students in School One. Students in School Five took a greater percentage of their subjects on independent study than did the students in School Four.

THE EXTENT TO WHICH STUDENTS TOOK OUTSIDE LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Research Procedures and Presentation of the Data

Students were asked to "circle the percentage of your courses which you took away from the school taught by persons in the community, for example, a course taught by an art historian at a museum." Table 74 provides the data for the total sample; table 75 for Schools One-Five.

Table 74

Percentage of Courses Students Took Away From School For the Total Sample

None		0-25%		25-50%		50-75%		75-100%		No response	Total sample
N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*	N	(% of N)*		
110	47	102	43	16	7	6	3	2	.008	11	247

*Denotes percentage of total number responding.

Table 75

Percentage of Courses Students Took Away From School For Schools One-Five

School	None	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	No response	Total sample
One	23	9	1	0	1	1	38
Two	10	18	4	0	0	0	32
Three	20	26	1	0	0	0	47
Four	20	27	2	2	0	4	53
Five	46	20	8	1	1	1	77

Discussion

In the total sample, almost all students reported that they took either none or less than a quarter of their courses in the community. The response patterns within Schools One-Five reflect the responses of the total sample. The school reporting the highest number of students who did not take an outside learning experience was School Five.

THE TYPE OF OUTSIDE LEARNING ACTIVITIES IN WHICH STUDENTS ENGAGED

Research Procedures and Presentation of the Data

Students were given a list of twenty-five outside learning experiences that might be typical of projects in which secondary students might engage. Respondents were asked to check those activities in which they participated.

The five most cited outside learning activities for the total sample were:

1.	Tutoring Elementary Students	44
2.	Working in a Political Campaign	24
3.	Camping	22
4.	Working in a Day Care Center	21
5.	Participation in Dramatic Activities in the Community	17

The five most cited outside learning activities for Schools One-Five were:

School One

1.	Tutoring Elementary Students	7
2.	Working in a Day Care Center	4
3.	Studying Art in a Museum	4
4.	Working in an Elementary Art Program	4
5.	Camping	4

School Two

1.	Participation in Dramatic Activities in the Community	4
2.	Working in a Day Care Center	3
3.	Tutoring Elementary Students	3
4.	Working in a Business	3
5.	Working in a Political Campaign	3

School Three

1.	Other	13
2.	Working in a Day Care Center	7
3.	Tutoring Elementary Students	4
4.	Participation in Dramatic Activities	4
5.	Working in a Hospital	4

School Four

1.	Working in a Political Campaign	12
2.	Tutoring Elementary Students	10
3.	Camping	5
4.	Working in an Elementary Program	4
5.	Participation in Dramatic Activities	4

School Five

1.	Tutoring Elementary Students	17
2.	Camping	11
3.	Other	9
4.	Working in a Political Campaign	7
5.	Studying Art in a Museum	5

Table 76 presents the number of outside learning activities for each school.

Table 76

Number of Outside Learning Activities Per School

School	N	Number of experiences	Student experience ratio*	Total
One	38	50	1.31	
Two	32	40	1.25	
Three	47	89	1.89	
Four	53	55	1.04	
Five	77	84	1.09	
Number of Responses				318
Sample of Students				204

* $\frac{\text{Experiences Per School}}{\text{Number of Students Per School}}$

Discussion

In four of the schools, students reported a wide variety of outside learning experiences. In School Five, students' experiences clustered around six activities. The data in table 76 indicated that some students in each school took more than one outside learning

experience. Tutoring elementary students was the activity most frequently cited in Schools One and Five.

CONCLUSIONS

Independent study is an option exercised by a majority of the students in Schools Two-Five. In School One, quite the reverse is true; a majority of students reported taking no independent study. If students took independent study at all, they generally took it in just one subject.

Outside learning activities are not taken as widely as independent study. Almost half of the total sample reported taking no outside learning courses at all. Over half of the students in Schools One and Five responded in a similar manner. As in the case of independent study, students who take outside learning courses take them in one of their subjects.

The variety of outside learning courses in which students engaged represented a certain degree of student initiative. However, the activities that students most frequently chose were those which could be monitored and coordinated somewhat easily by the alternative school. For example, students in School Five tutored elementary students most frequently. Students in School Four also participated in this activity. School Four shares space with an elementary school. School Five established contacts with several grade schools and placed tutors in these schools.

Participation in community dramatic activities was listed as an activity in which students engaged. This activity is one in which

certain skills can be learned in the school (acting and production) and then taken to the community.

Working in a political campaign (the most frequently listed activity for School Four) can be easily coordinated and monitored by the staff. It is the type of activity which lends itself to the school's scheduling. Students may engage in this activity for a short period of time.

These alternative schools offer students the opportunities to take independent study and use the community as a learning resource. However, many students did not use these modes of learning even in School Two (where outside learning activities are mandatory).

Chapter 10

SCHOOL PROFILE

Five schools were examined in this study. The researcher reviewed the literature of each school and found that these schools purported to offer students an educational environment in which students could make specific decisions about their own learning and the governance of the school and where they could use the community as a learning resource. A sample of students within each school was asked four questions concerning these opportunities. Based on students' responses to these questions and the researcher's observations of the environment, the following profile was drawn of each school.

DESCRIPTION OF SINGLE SCHOOL

School One

School One, lodged in a building which also served as a technical high school, was the only school in the study to be located in such close proximity to another educational program. The restrictions on student movement reflected that proximity. In describing why they came to the alternative school, the highest number reported that their decision to use the community as a learning resource was important. The second highest number said that "other factors" were important. The third highest number of students said that learning decisions were important.

The "other factors" were primarily the positive interpersonal relationships that students found or hoped to find at the school. For example, one student said, "I liked the atmosphere; the people seemed friendly, and I thought that I would be more a part of the school than at a regular school." Of the six items which described reasons why students might attend an alternative school of this type, students ranked the "friendly atmosphere" slightly above the other reasons.

One element within the area of individual decision making was the opportunity for students to choose from a variety of grade options how their grades would be reported. The literature from School One reported that grades could be reported in two ways; however, over half the students did not know what options School One offered. Students were divided whether the opportunity to use the grade options offered were available to everyone, available to students with a certain grade point average, only upperclassmen, or restricted to certain classes. Students reported most frequently that they chose their own grade options.

The second area within individual decision making was grade determination. Most students were divided regarding how their grades were determined. Some said that the teacher or primarily the teacher determined their grades; the other half said that it was the student or primarily the student. In the area of course and instructor evaluation, experiences varied, but students reported most frequently that they evaluated their courses and instructors in over three-fourths of their courses.

Independent study was a fourth area in which students could make learning decisions. They reported generally that independent study was

available to everyone, not restricted to students with a certain grade point average nor required advisor permission. However, students were divided regarding the extent to which independent study was available in their subjects. Independent study was not utilized extensively in School One. Over half the students reported having taken no independent study at all. Few students reported the activities within independent study; thus, it was impossible to detect a pattern of who chose the topic and the materials to be used or determined the criteria for the grade.

In the area of group decision making, students reported that they had both all-school meetings and small group meetings. Anyone could vote at the all-school meeting. The majority of those responding said that the meeting was regularly held. Students were divided regarding who determined the time for the meeting, the items for the agenda, and the procedures for electing a chairperson. Half the sample reported that the teachers did not control the meeting. Perceptions varied regarding the type of authority held by the all-school meeting in the four areas of (1) curriculum and instruction, (2) discipline, problem solving, and interpersonal relations, (3) staffing, and (4) management of resources. Although students could not agree on the precise nature of the all-school meeting's authority, those interviewed felt that the meeting had enough power but that the students themselves were barriers to the effective use of that power. There was no unanimity among students interviewed regarding the agent within the school who held final authority in governing the school. Some students reported that it was the all-school meeting; others said that it was the head teacher; still others reported that it was the staff.

In describing the school's use of the community as a learning resource, the students reported that outside speakers and community persons were involved in less than a quarter of their courses. Students generally agreed that outside activities were open to everyone and were not restricted to upperclassmen. These activities were not mandatory, and academic credit was given for them. Students were divided whether it was the student's or the teacher's resonsibility to find outside learning activities and who usually found them.

Few students actually took outside learning activities, and those who did, did so in less than a quarter of their courses. Of the outside learning activities that students reported taking, three of the five most frequently mentioned were related to working with children either in a teaching or child care capacity. Although students said that the opportunities to make learning decisions were important in their decision to attend the school, students did not know what grade options were offered and the extent to which these options were available. Although students generally knew that they had large and small group meetings, they were uncertain who determined the time for the meeting, the items for the agenda, and how the chairperson was chosen. They were in disagreement whether or not the teachers controlled the all-school meeting. They were confused regarding the nature of the all-school meeting's authority in the four areas examined.

In areas of individual decision making, they chose their own grade options and evaluated their courses and instructors in over three-fourths of their courses. Students knew that there were no restrictions on the taking of independent study; however, few took it.

Finally, in describing outside learning experiences, students were divided regarding who usually arranged the activity--students or teachers; few students actually pursued outside learning activities.

School Two

School Two, housed in a still-functioning railroad station, had the smallest population and the most unusual setting of the five schools in the study. Its unique use of space makes it the most informal of the five educational environments.

In describing why they came to the alternative school, the highest number responding said that the desire to use the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend. The second highest said that learning decisions were important. The third highest reported that "other factors" were important. "Other factors" covered a variety of motives, including better communication between students and teachers, greater relevancy in curricular content, and greater personal freedom. Of the six items which specifically described why students might attend an alternative school, students ranked the opportunity to make learning decisions higher than the other five.

Within the area of individual decision making, the literature of School Two reported a flexible procedure for reporting grades. Over half the sample described this procedure accurately. Students generally reported that these grade options were available to everyone and not restricted to students with a certain grade point average, upperclassmen, or certain classes. Students' experiences varied regarding who actually chose their grade options for them. The highest percentage responding

reported that grades were determined by an equal combination of student-teacher input and that students could evaluate the course and the instructor in over three-fourths of their courses.

In the area of independent study, students varied in their perceptions of the extent to which it was available in their subjects. When available, independent study was available to everyone, not limited to students with a certain grade point average nor requiring permission of the advisor.

Over half of the students reported having taken independent study; they did so in less than a quarter of their courses. In describing activities within independent study, students reported most frequently that they had chosen the topic to be studied and the materials to be used and determined the criteria for the grade.

In describing the opportunities for group decision making, students reported that they had both all-school meetings and small group meetings. They reported that the all-school meeting was regularly scheduled; anyone might attend and vote. Students, teachers, and the director determined the time for the meeting and the items on the agenda. Students were divided regarding who usually chose the chairperson and whether the chairperson was usually the director, a student, or a teacher. Most students reported that the teachers did not control the all-school meeting.

In describing the authority of the meeting, students agreed that it had final authority in two of the four areas: (1) discipline, problem solving, and interpersonal relations, and (2) staffing. Students

interviewed generally felt that the meeting had enough power and held final authority on all internal matters.

In describing the use School Two made of community persons within the school, students reported most frequently that they had outside speakers and community persons involved in less than a quarter of their courses. Students reported that outside learning activities were open to everyone and not restricted to only upperclassmen. They were mandatory, and students received academic credit for having taken them. Perceptions varied regarding who was responsible for finding an outside learning activity and who usually found them. Although students in School Two were required to take these activities, some students did not do so. Those who did reported that they took them in less than a quarter of their courses. Rather than several students choosing the same type of activity, the activities varied from participation in dramatic activities and working in a day care center to working in a small business.

In summary, the highest number of students reported that the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend School Two. In the area of learning decisions, students were familiar with the opportunities available to them. They knew the grade options available but did not always choose the options themselves; they received help from teachers, advisors, or parents. They were familiar with the opportunities to take independent study. Over half the sample took independent study and reported that they chose the topic and the materials to be used and determined the criteria for the grade.

In the area of collective decision making, they knew the type of meetings held in the school and the procedures for the meetings. Teachers did not control the meetings, students reported. Students felt that the meeting had power in the areas of staffing, discipline, problem solving, and interpersonal relations. Furthermore, they said that the meeting had final authority in matters in the school. Students reported that their school utilized outside speakers and community persons.

Although outside activities were mandatory, almost a third of the sample reported that they had not taken them. Those who did, did so in less than a quarter of their courses. Students in School Two engaged in a variety of activities in their outside learning activities.

School Three

School Three, housed on the second floor of an old school building which it shares with the district's administrative offices, contrasted sharply with the rest of the building and the urban area in which it was located.

In describing why they came to the alternative school, the highest number responding said their desire to use the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend. The second highest number reported that "other factors" were important. The third highest reported that learning decision opportunities were important in their decision to attend the alternative school. "Other factors" included a general dissatisfaction with the regular school, a desire for more personal freedom, and a friendlier and more personal environment than the regular school offered. In describing the six items, reasons

why students might come to the alternative school, the students ranked the friendly atmosphere of the alternative school higher than the other five.

In the area of individual decision making, half of the sample knew what grade options were offered; the other half did not. They reported that the grade options were available to everyone and not limited to students with a certain grade point average, upperclassmen, or certain classes. Students were almost evenly divided regarding whether they chose their grade options or received help from parents, teachers, or advisors. Although students' experiences varied, they reported most frequently that their grades were determined by an equal combination of student and teacher input.

In the area of evaluation, students reported most frequently that they evaluated their courses and instructors in over three-fourths of their courses.

Their perceptions varied regarding the extent to which they could have taken independent study had they chosen to do so. Independent study was available to everyone and not limited to students with a certain grade point average. Students were divided regarding whether or not advisor permission was a prerequisite. Over half of the students reported that they took independent study; they did so in less than a quarter of their courses. Within independent study, students reported that they generally chose the topic; however, experiences varied regarding who chose the materials and determined the criteria for the grade.

In the area of group decision making, students reported that they had an all-school meeting which was regularly scheduled. Anyone could attend and vote. Students, teachers, and the director determined the time for the meeting and the items on the agenda. Student opinion varied regarding who usually chose the chairperson and whether the chairperson was usually a student, a teacher, or the director. Over half of the sample reported that the teachers did not control the general meeting. In the four areas of curriculum and instruction, discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, staffing and management of resources, student perceptions varied greatly regarding the authority of the meeting.

Students felt that the meeting had enough power but did not utilize the power that it had. Final authority in the school lay not with the meeting but with the director.

In describing School Three's use of the community as a learning resource, students most frequently responded that there were outside speakers and community persons involved in less than a quarter of their courses. They reported that outside learning activities were open to everyone, not restricted to upperclassmen. Academic credit was given for outside learning activities, and they were not mandatory. Most students said that it was the student's responsibility to find these activities, and they usually did so. Almost half of the sample reported having taken no outside learning activities; those who did, took them in less than a quarter of their courses. The types of activities in which students engaged varied from working in a day care center to tutoring elementary students and working in a hospital.

In summary, the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource was an important factor in students' decision to attend the alternative school. Many students pursued activities in the community. In the area of learning decision opportunities, the experiences and perceptions of students in School Three present a picture of two groups of students within the school--those who understood the norms and procedures and those who did not. Those who utilized the opportunities and those who did not. Half the sample knew what grade options were offered; the other half did not. Most students understood that the options were available to everyone. In choosing grade options, some students reported having chosen them themselves; others received help from parents, teachers, or their advisors. Their experiences varied regarding how the grades were determined. They were generally able to evaluate their courses and instructors. Some students did not know the extent to which independent study was available. They generally agreed that the only restriction placed on independent study was advisor approval. Although some students reported having taken no independent study, over half the sample said that they had done so in less than a quarter of their courses. Their experiences varied regarding who chose the topic to be studied, the materials to be used, and the criteria for the grade.

In the area of group governance, students knew that they had an all-school meeting regularly scheduled. Anyone could attend and vote. Students, teachers, and the director determined the items for the agenda. Students were divided regarding how the chairperson was chosen and who the chairperson usually was. Teachers did not control the meetings,

students reported. Perceptions varied regarding the authority of the meeting in the four areas examined.

Outside speakers and community persons were involved in less than a quarter of the courses. Outside learning activities were open to everyone and were not mandatory. Students had the responsibility of finding such activities and usually did.

Students were evenly divided between those who took outside learning activities and those who did not. Those who did, took them in less than a quarter of their courses and experienced a variety of activities.

In summary, the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource was an important factor in students' decisions to attend the alternative school. Many students pursued activities in the community. In the area of learning decisions, the experiences and perceptions of students in School Three present a picture of two groups of students within the school--those who understood the norms and procedures and those who did not; those who utilized the opportunities and those who did not.

School Four

School Four, housed in two unattached, portable classrooms and two rooms in an adjacent elementary school, had the least amount of physical space of the five schools in the study. In describing why students came to the school, the highest number responding reported that the opportunity to use the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend. Of the six specific items which described

reasons why students came to the alternative school, students ranked the "friendly atmosphere" higher than the others.

In the area of individual decision making, a majority of students knew what grade options were available. Almost all students reported that there were no restrictions on who was able to use the grade options. Over half the sample reported that teachers, advisors, or parents helped them choose their grade options. Over three-fourths of the students reported that grades were determined by the teacher or primarily by the teacher. Perceptions varied regarding the opportunities to evaluate the courses and the instructors.

Students' perceptions varied regarding the extent to which independent study was available. In describing the restrictions placed on independent study, students reported that advisor permission was a prerequisite. Students reported having taken no independent study. Those who took it, did so in less than a quarter of their courses. Within independent study, student experiences varied regarding who chose the topic, the materials to be used, and the criteria for the grade.

In the area of group decision making, students reported that they had both large and small group meetings. The large group meetings were regularly scheduled; students, teachers, and the director determined the items on the agenda. The chairman of the meeting was usually a student from the steering committee. Students reported that teachers did not control the meeting. Perceptions of the authority of the all-school meeting varied in the areas of curriculum and instruction, discipline, problem solving and interpersonal relations, and staffing. In the area of resource management, students were in agreement that the

meeting had final authority. Students felt that the meeting had enough power. The director, not the meeting, had final authority on matters within the school.

In describing School Four's use of the community as a learning resource, students reported that outside speakers and community persons were involved in less than a quarter of their courses. Outside learning activities were open to everyone, not restricted to upperclassmen. These activities were not nandatory. Academic credit was awarded for them. Students reported that it was their responsibility to find these activities, and they usually did so. Half of the students took no outside learning activities. The other half reported that they pursued activities in less than a quarter of their courses. Two activities in which students in School Four most frequently engaged were working on a political campaign and tutoring elementary students.

In summary, although students said that "other factors" were important and were learning decisions, the largest number of students responding said that their desire to use the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend. In the area of learning decisions, students generally knew what grade options were available and the procedures for taking grade options. Some chose their own grade options; others had help from teachers, advisors, or parents. Perceptions varied regarding the extent to which they could evaluate the courses and the instructors. Grades were determined by the teacher or predominantly by the teacher.

Perceptions varied regarding the extent to which independent study was available. Students did agree that advisor permission was a

prerequisite. One-half of the students took independent study; their experiences varied regarding who chose the topic, the materials to be used, and the criteria for the grade.

In the area of group governance, students were aware that they had both large and small group meetings. At the large meetings, anyone could be present and vote. Students, teachers, and the director determined the time for the meeting and the items on the agenda. The teachers did not control the meeting. Perceptions varied regarding the authority of the meeting in three areas. In the fourth area, management of resources, students felt that the meeting had final authority. Students felt that the meeting had enough power, but final authority within the school lay with the director.

School Four's use of the community as a learning resource reflects the pattern of the other schools. Outside teachers and community persons were involved in less than a quarter of the courses. There were no restrictions on who might take outside activities. Students were responsible for finding these activities and usually did so. Students pursued a variety of activities.

In summary, although students said that "other factors" and learning decision opportunities were important, the largest number of students responding said their desire to use the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend.

School Five

School Five, the largest of the schools in the study, is also the one most isolated from the other district educational programs and

institutions. In describing why they attended the school, the highest number of students reported that "other factors" were important in their decision to attend. The second highest number reported that learning decision opportunities were important. The third highest reported that the use of the community as a learning resource was important in their decision to attend. "Other factors" could be categorized in two ways: (1) negative perceptions of the regular school (peer pressure, intense competition, racial problems, and an impersonal environment) and (2) positive perceptions of the alternative school (a friendly more personal environment, better student-teacher relationships, more personal freedom). Of the six specific items which described why students came to the school, students ranked the opportunities to make learning decisions slightly higher than the others.

In the area of individual decision making, half of the sample knew what options were available; the other half did not. They said generally that they chose their own grade options. Students were undecided whether grade options were available in all classes, but they agreed that they were available to everyone and not limited to students with a certain grade point average or upperclassmen. Although experiences varied, over half of the sample reported that grades were determined by an equal combination of student and teacher input. They reported most frequently that they evaluated their courses and the instructor in over three-fourths of their courses. Perceptions varied regarding the availability of independent study. It was available to everyone, not restricted to students with a certain grade point average, nor was advisor permission required.

Over half of the sample reported that they took independent study; they did so in less than a quarter of their subjects. Within independent study, they chose the topic and determined the criteria for the grade. Experiences varied regarding who chose the materials to be used.

In the area of group governance, students reported that they had both large and small group meetings. The large group meeting was regularly scheduled, and anyone could attend and vote. Students, teachers, and the director determined the time for the meetings and the items on the agenda. Students responded most frequently that whoever wished to be chairperson could be. It was usually a student. Students reported that teachers did not control the meetings. They could not agree on the authority of the meeting in three of the four areas examined. In the fourth area, resource management, the meeting had final authority. Students generally reported that the meeting had enough power to the extent that it chose to exert it. They were divided whether the meeting or the head teacher had final authority within the school.

In describing the use School Five made of the community as a learning resource, perceptions varied regarding the percentage of courses in which outside speakers were open to everyone and not restricted to upperclassmen. Outside activities were not mandatory, and students were given academic credit for them. Although experiences varied, students responded most frequently that it was their responsibility to find an outside learning activity. However, both teachers and students found the activities.

Over half of the sample reported having taken no outside learning activity at all. Those who did, said they did so in less than a quarter of their courses. Although experiences varied, students reported two activities most frequently. They were tutoring elementary students and camping.

In summary, students attended School Five primarily for reasons "other" than to make learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource. In the area of individual decision making, some knew the grade options available to them; some did not. They were familier with the availability of grade options. Students generally chose their own grade options. Students generally said that their grades were determined by an equal combination of student and teacher input. There was no unanimity regarding the extent to which students could evaluate the course and the instructor.

Independent study was not available in every course. In the courses in which it was available, it was not restricted to specific persons. Over half of the students took independent study. Within it, they chose the topic and determined the criteria for the grade.

In the area of collective governance, students were confused about the type of meetings the school offered. They reported both large and small group meetings, but actually School Five had only large group meetings. Students knew that the all-school meeting was regularly scheduled and that anyone could attend and vote. The chairperson was usually a student. There was no agreement concerning the meeting's authority in three areas; only in the area of resource management was there consensus that the meeting had final authority. Teachers did not

control the meeting. Students were somewhat divided whether the head teacher or the meeting held final authority on matters within the school.

Students' perceptions varied regarding the extent to which the school used the community as a learning resource. There were no restrictions on the taking of outside learning activities. Experiences varied regarding who was responsible for finding activities and who usually found activities. Many students did not take outside learning activities. Those who did, took them in less than a quarter of their courses. Although experiences varied, students reported most frequently that they tutored elementary students and camped.

A COMPARISION OF THE FIVE SCHOOLS: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Students reported that the opportunities to make individual learning decisions, use the community as a learning resource, and other factors were important in their decision to attend the alternative school.

In Schools One-Four, the highest number of students responding said their desire to use the community as a learning resource in more ways than the regular school provided was an important factor in their decision to attend. In School Five, the highest number of students responding felt that "other factors" were important.

Although in each school a minority of students did not know the restrictions and procedures involved in specific activities included within individual decision making (grade-options, independent study,

grade determination, and evaluation of courses and instructors), most students were familiar with these procedures.

When pressed to describe the range of grade options available, half the students in Schools One, Three, and Five did not know what options were available. In Schools One and Five, students themselves chose their grade options. In Schools Two, Three, and Four, students had help from parents, teachers, or advisors.

In Schools One-Three, students could evaluate the course and the instructor in most of their courses. In Schools Four and Five, experiences varied.

In describing how grades were determined, responses of students in Schools One and Four differed significantly from those in Schools Two, Three, and Five. Students in Schools One and Four reported that grades were determined primarily by the evaluation of the teacher. In Schools Two, Three, and Five, students reported in the range which indicated that students' grades were determined by an equal combination of student and teacher evaluation.

It could not be determined whether there were differences in students' responses in their descriptions of the extent to which they were able to evaluate the course and the instructor.[1]

Although students in all schools clearly understood the rules and procedures for taking independent study, they differed regarding the extent to which they perceived it as being available to them. Students' responses regarding their opportunities to take independent study did not

---

[1]The assumptions for the homogeneity of variances tests could not be met.

differ significantly among schools. Students in Schools Two, Three, and Five chose their topics for independent study, and, in addition, students in School Two also determined the criteria for their grade. Students' experiences for these two activities varied in the other schools.

One-way analysis of variance procedures revealed that students in School Five pursued more independent study subjects than did students in Schools One, Three, and Four and that students in School Two took more independent study topics than students in School One.

In the area of group governance, students were generally aware of the types of meetings their school offered. An exception was that some students in School Five, which has only a large group meeting, reported that they had small group meetings. Students in all schools generally understood the procedures of the all-school meetings and participated in those procedures. However, students in Schools One, Two, and Three were divided in their descriptions regarding how the chairperson was chosen.

Generally, the students did not know the type of authority their all-school meetings held in the four areas examined. The exceptions to this statement were: (1) in Schools Four and Five, the students said that their meetings had authority in the area of resource management (determining the use and purchasing of equipment for the school, budgeting and use of funds, and space determination); and (2) in School Two, students agreed that their meeting had final authority in the areas of staffing (hiring and dismissal of state-certified and outside teachers and interpersonal relations, rules and regulations governing student behavior and the resolution of conflicts between students and between a staff member and a student).

Students interviewed in all schools generally felt that their meetings had enough power. However, in Schools One and Three, students felt that the meeting did not exercise fully the power it held.

In Schools Three and Four, students saw the director as having final authority on matters within the school. In Schools One and Five, some students said that it was the director who held final authority; other students said that it was the all-school meeting. In School Two, students said the all-school meeting had final authority.

In the area of community learning, Schools One-Four utilized outside speakers and outside teachers in less than a quarter of their courses; in School Five, students' perceptions varied on their use.

Students in all schools generally knew the rules and procedures regarding outside learning activities. In Schools One, Two, and Five, perceptions varied regarding whose responsibility it was to find activities and who usually did so. In Schools Three and Four, students were responsible for finding activities and they usually did so.

A percentage of students in every school reported that they took no outside learning activities (in Schools One and Five, it was over half of the sample). In each school, those who took these activities did so in less than a quarter of their courses. No specific activity was clearly preferred by students in Schools One, Two, Three, and Four. Students engaged in a variety of activities. In School Five, students reported that they tutored elementary students and camped.

Chapter 11

CONCLUSIONS: IMPLICATIONS: SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

AREAS OF INVESTIGATION AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The educational literature on alternative schools reflects the recent emergence of these schools. There have been few studies. The studies available are primarily single-school studies. None of the studies examined these schools from predominantly a student perspective. Those studies which examine more than one school focus on a variety of programs labeled "alternative." In these studies a precise definition of alternative does not emerge.

This study has examined in some depth the students' perceptions and the actual workings of selected aspects of five specific public alternative schools similar in size, student composition, philosophies, and opportunities offered students, in order to determine if, in fact, students perceive that they have the opportunities that these schools purport to offer.

The researcher reviewed the literature of each school, observed selected aspects of the schools' environment, surveyed students regarding the opportunities which their school offered, and interviewed students and staff in an effort to probe further and clarify the opportunities available.

The limitations were in the following areas of the study.

1. The questionnaire. Although pretested and revised, the questionnaire in final form was too lengthy for students to complete in a short period of time. Consequently, there is less data for some items than others. Some of the data were not considered germane to the questions asked in the study and were not included in the analysis.

2. Student selection. The group of students who completed the questionnaire do not constitute a random sample. Time limitations for the researcher and the fact that most students are not present within the school to the extent that students are in a conventional school made it impossible to obtain a random sample. The researcher undertook the research with the agreement that students would voluntarily participate and that there would be minimal disruption to the school program. Students completed the surveys individually, on a voluntary basis when their schedules would permit them to do so.

3. The specific nature of these schools. The schools examined in this study form a subgroup within the general category of alternative schools. Consequently, conclusions from this study refer only to these specific types of alternative schools.

Beyond these limitations, conclusions may be drawn concerning these schools.

CONCLUSIONS

A review of the specific literature of these schools has shown that they purported to offer students the opportunities to make

individual learning decisions in these areas: offering students a choice in the manner in which their grades were reported, independent study options, participation in grade determination, and opportunities to evaluate the course and the instructor. These schools purported to offer students opportunities to participate in the collective governance of the school. Furthermore, the schools indicated that they offered students opportunities to use the community as a learning resource.

Were these opportunities important factors in students' decisions to attend these schools? The opportunities to make learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource were important in students' decisions to attend according to the data collected. However, "other factors" were also important. These factors included a variety of motivations and perceptions. For some students, their perceptions of their former-regular-school (peer pressure, intense competition, and an impersonal environment) were important factors in their decision to attend the alternative school. Other students perceived that the alternative school would offer them better student-teacher relationships, a friendlier atmosphere, and more personal freedom than the regular school provided.

Within the area of individual learning decisions, did students perceive that they had the opportunities that the schools purported to offer them? Generally, students knew that they had a range of grade options; however, some students did not know precisely what those grade options were. No clear picture emerged of the extent to which independent study was available. Students' perceptions varied. However, they did report that there were no restrictions on who may take

independent study. Many students reported that they took independent study. They did perceive that they had the opportunity to evaluate their courses and instructors.

Three modes of student participation in individual decision making in these areas emerged from the data. The first mode is that of student as sole participant. This mode characterizes students' actions in choosing to take independent study, in determining the topic to be examined within independent study, and in evaluating the courses and instructors. The second mode is student as co-participant with either parent, teacher, or advisor. Although some students chose their grade options by themselves, generally, students were co-participants with either parents, teachers, or advisors. They were co-participants in determining the materials to be used and the criteria for their grades within independent study. The third mode is student as non-participant or lesser-participant. Students were either non-participants or lesser-participants in determining what their grades would be. Grade determination is either solely or primarily a teacher activity.

Thus, the data indicate, in these alternative schools within the areas examined in individual decision making, there are areas in which students appear to operate autonomously, areas in which they participate with either teacher, advisor, or parent, and, finally, areas in which the teacher is the final determiner of the outcome.

Did students perceive that they had opportunities to make decisions as a group regarding the governance of the school? The literature of each school reported that students had such opportunities and that specific structures were established for group decision making

concerning the governance of the schcol. However, the literature did not describe precisely the nature of these decision making structures' authority to determine specific issues or these structures' relationships to other agents such as the director or the faculty within the school.

Generally, students knew that the school had such governing structures. They reported that students were free to participate in them. Students were familiar with the procedures involved in implementing these structures, but they were confused regarding the precise authority these structures held in determining various issues within the school. However imprecisely defined by the schools' literature and understood by the students, these structures were percevied as having sufficient power within the school. Students knew the boundaries of their collective decision making power. Their group decisions could be vetoed or overruled by the director of the school, a district superintendent, or a school board.

Did students see these schools offering all students opportunities to use the community as a learning resource? Students reported that their schools offered them these opportunities by utilizing community persons and outside speakers in some of the courses within the school. Further, these students saw these schools as encouraging students to take outside learning activities by allowing any student to take them and by awarding credit for the completion of these activities.

Given the opportunity to make learning decisions and use the community as a learning resource, what decisions did students actually make? Independent study was a learning option that many students chose. Although some students utilized this option more extensively, generally,

students chose it in less than a quarter of their courses. Fewer students took outside learning activities than took independent study. Those who did take these activities did so in few of their courses. The types of outside activities in which students engaged varied widely. However, those activities chosen by students most frequently were ones which could be somewhat easily monitored or coordinated by the alternative school.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Students came to the alternative school not only because they wished to participate in the unique opportunities that the school offered but also because they thought that the environment would be friendly and the relationships between students and teachers would be good. Motivations to attend arose both from a desire to get away from the regular school and attend the alternative school. Many students attended the alternative school not to participate in the opportunities offered but rather to seek a smaller, more personalized environment than could be found in the regular school. In each school, some students' perceptions of their opportunities and procedures conflicted with the majority of students' perceptions or the school's literature.

The varying levels of student knowledge and participation might suggest that they came for reasons other than the opportunities to make learning decisions and use of the community as a learning resource offered by the schools.

Students participated in individual learning decisions but were seldom the sole determinants of the outcome. Generally, they could choose or not choose to take independent study or a course in the community.

In the areas where students participated, teachers played important roles. They helped students choose their grade options, selected materials for independent study, and predominantly determined what the students' grades would be. Generally, the schools did not require students to participate in all activities available. Some activities required greater effort on the part of the student to participate than did others. In the areas of evaluation of course and instructors and in grade determination, students could participate routinely and somewhat effortlessly. To take independent study required more student interest, initiative, and the ability to choose and pursue a topic successfully.

Some students participated in all the areas offered by the schools. Some students selectively participated. For example, a student might take a course within the community but not be involved or interested in collective decision making. Still other students might be involved in the opportunities that the school offered within its walls but have no desire to engage in community learning. Finally, some students came not to participate in the opportunities available but because they wanted a smaller, more personalized environment than offered by the regular school.

In the area of collective decision making, students seemed confused about the type of authority their all-school meetings held in

determining school policy; however, students felt that the meetings had enough power. For some of the issues such as curriculum, staffing and budget, the function of the all-school meeting could be viewed as a student forum or a sounding board for student opinion rather than a determiner of policy.

The all-school meeting allowed students to examine issues of concern within the school, exchange ideas with the administrator and the faculty, and vent their frustrations on a scheduled basis.

Administrators could veto the actions of the all-school meeting. However, the nature of the meetings required administrators to be "on the line" to the extent that they would be required to justify and explain their own actions or interpret some aspect of school board policy to staff and students more frequently and more openly than administrators would be required to so in a conventional school.

Fewer students took courses in the community than took independent study. The alternative school legitimized community learning and encouraged it. However, the responsibility to find a course and pursue it in the community belonged to the student. The main curricular thrust of the alternative school was not community learning. This was one option available to students. Those who utilized this option were those who had the energy and interest to do so.

Two situations account for the reality that the use of the community as a learning resource is an option within the curriculum but not necessarily an integral part of the curriculum. They are: (1) budget limitations--the schools must match their students' interests and needs with those of the community people who have the energy, talent,

and commitment to teach in an alternative school, receiving little or no pay; and (2) individual interests and needs of students. Those students who use this option are those who have the interest, energy, and initiative to create this opportunity for themselves in the community. The alternative school legitimizes and encourages their students to use the community as a learning resource, but its main curricular thrust is not community learning.

This study has examined selected activities primarily from a student perspective of five alternative public schools. There is evidence to indicate that students knew that they had opportunities offered by the schools.

They perceived that they shared power with the director in these schools. However, they lacked knowledge of the details of the operating procedures of their programs. Perhaps an understanding of these details was not necessary to their participation in the program; for it could not be concluded that a lack of knowledge of details affected their achievement in the program.

The results of the interviews would indicate that students approve of their alternative school experiences primarily because of the opportunities the schools offer them but also because of the nature of the alternative school environment which students perceive as friendly and supportive. They liked the informal relationships with adults.

From the data collected, it can be inferred that as components of the public school system these alternative schools serve two functions.

1. They offer the public school student an educational alternative to the conventional high school and vocational education programs.

2. They provide a specific educational environment in which students can make decisions about their own learning if they choose to do so.

Many public systems are beginning to respond to students' needs by providing a variety of alternative schools. This study has focused on one type of alternative established in the late 1960's. Assuming cost is not a factor, the type of alternative school examined in the study will survive in the form of a program which serves fewer students because there will exist a wider choice of alternatives.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has focused on alternative school students' perceptions of and responses to selected aspects of their schools. In an attempt to generalize the findings of the study to other similar schools, the researcher examined five schools. Although five may appear to be a small number, it was found for this research that five was almost too many. More data were obtained than could adequately be analyzed. The collection of quantitative data is a necessary first step. However, future studies might incorporate participant observation methodologies and case study approaches in order to gain insight into the qualitative aspects of two of the major areas of this study, student decision making and student use of the community as a learning resource.

A future participant observation study might be longitudinal, examining student participation in decision making in one alternative

school when students initially enter and at later points in order to determine how, in fact, their participation has changed. Such a study might answer the question, "in what ways can teachers aid students in learning how to make decisions?"

This completed study has presented evidence to suggest that students came to the alternative school because the environment was friendly and the relationships between students and teachers were good. A future case study might examine the components of teacher-student relationships in one school in order to assess the influence of these relationships and interactions on student learning.

The alternative schools within this study were established to meet the specific educational needs of students. A future study might examine the activities of the students and the goals of these schools in order to determine whether these schools have outlived their usefulness and whether other types of alternative schools would be more appropriate to the needs of future students.

EPILOGUE

In an attempt to reduce expenditures, the Worcester School Board closed School Three in June, 1976. In September, 1978, at the request of the Arlington, Virginia School Board, School Five will merge with the alternative junior high school program. The impetus for the Board's decision sprang primarily from economic and political factors. At the time the Board made its decision, no evidence was presented to indicate that the merger would harm or help either program educationally. At the time of this writing, the other schools continue to operate.

It was stated earlier in this study that the survival of these alternative schools might hinge on economic, political, and educational factors. Within the public school system, it is often difficult to assess the importance of these factors individually as determinants in educational policy. The first two are interwoven; the third, difficult to define and measure. All have played equally important roles in the development of alternative schools. Research has shown that alternative schools are economically feasible and continue to proliferate. However, given the future fiscal constraints within public education, political and economic may outweigh educational factors in the future. As components of the public school system, those alternative schools in operation can not ignore such factors. Their futures may well depend on them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Bremer, John, and Michael von Moschzisker. School Without Walls: Philadelphia's Parkway Program. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.

DeTurk, Philip H. PS 2001, The Pasadena Alternative School. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1973.

Fantini, Mario D. Public Schools of Choice. New York: Simon Shuster, 1973.

_____. What's Best for the Children. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Anchor Books, 1974.

Glatthorn, Allan A. Alternatives in Education. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1975.

Graubard, Allen. Free the Children. New York: Random House, Pantheon Books, 1972.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

B. PERIODICALS

Argyris, Christopher. "Alternative Schools: A Behavioral Analysis," Teacher's College Record, LXXV (May, 1974), 429-52.

Center for New Schools. "Strengthening Alternative High Schools," Harvard Educational Review, XLII (August, 1972), 313-350.

Crabtree, Mary Frances. "Chicago's Metro High: Freedom Choice Responsibility," Phi Delta Kappan, LVII (May, 1975), 613-15.

Gallup, George. "The Fifth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Towards Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LV (September, 1973), 38-51.

Graubard, Allen. "The Free School Movement," Harvard Educational Review, XLII (August, 1972), 352-73.

Mulcahy, Gene. "Shanti--The Formation of a Public Alternative School," The New Schools Exchange Newsletter, No. 105 (November, 1973), 1-2.

Smith, Vernon. "Options in Public Education: The Quiet Revolution," Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (March, 1973), 434-37.

Trump, J. Lloyd, and Hunt, Jane. "The Nature and Extent of Student Activism," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LIII (May, 1969), 151-58.

Wilson, Stephen H. "You Can Talk to Teachers: Student-Teacher Relations in an Alternative School," Teacher's College Record, LXXVIII (September, 1976), 77-100.

C. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

1. Doctoral Dissertations

Barndt, R. L. "Mathematics Via Problem Solving." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1973.

Bierwirth, John E. "A Comparison of Worcester Alternative and Regular High Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Gluckstern, Steven. "Assessment of Educational Environments: The Public Alternative School and Its Students." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1974.

Gollub, Wendy. "A Case Study in Formative Evaluation." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1971.

Mackin, Robert. "Documentation and Analysis of the Development of the Bent Twig, An Alternative Public High School in Marion Massachusetts."

Martin, Floyd. "A Case Study of Three Alternative Schools, An Analysis from a Black Perspective." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1972.

McCauley, Brian. "Evaluation and Authority in Alternative Schools and Public Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Miller, Lynn. "Organizational Structures for Decision Making in Alternative Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1975.

Mulcahy, Eugene. "An Inservice Staff Training Project Conducted at Shanti School in Hartford, Connecticut." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Pacquin, Thomas. "Documentation and Analysis of the Development of the Camp Greenough Environmental Education Center and Alternative Public High School, Yarmouth, Massachusetts." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Theroux, John B. "Financing Public Alternative Schools." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1974.

Wilson, Stephen H. "A Participant Observation Study of the Attempt to Institute Student Participation in Decision Making in An Experimental High School." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1972.

2. Literature of the Schools

Cambridge Pilot School. "The Cambridge Pilot School." A description of the Program of the School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1974-75.

_____. "Policy and Procedures." Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1974-75.

Shanti School. "Policies of Community Meetings, 1973-74." Hartford, Connecticut, 1973-74.

_____. "Shanti School Information Brochure." Hartford, Connecticut, 1974.

Teaneck Alternative High School. "Descriptions of the Programs." Teaneck, New Jersey, 1974-75.

_____. "The Evaluation of the Teaneck Alternative High School." Teaneck, New Jersey, 1974.

Worcester Alternative School. "Year 3 Catalog of Possibilities." Worcester, Massachusetts, 1974-75.

Woodlawn Program. "Evaluation--First Year." Arlington, Virginia, 1972.

_____. "Proposal to the Superintendent." Arlington, Virginia, 1971.

_____. "Woodlawn Graduate Evaluation." Arlington, Virginia, 1973.

3. Interviews

Staff Member. Personal interview. School One, Cambridge, Massachusetts. February, 1975.

Staff Member. Personal interview. School Two, Hartford, Connecticut. February, 1975.

Staff Member. Personal interview. School Three, Worcester, Massachusetts. February, 1975.

Staff Member. Personal interview. School Four, Teaneck, New Jersey. March, 1975.

Staff Member. Personal interview. School Five, Arlington, Virginia. May, 1975.

Students. Personal interview. School One, Cambridge, Massachusetts. February, 1975.

Students. Personal interview. School Two, Hartford, Connecticut. February, 1975.

Students. Personal interview. School Three, Worcester, Massachusetts. February, 1975.

Students. Personal interview. School Four, Teaneck, New Jersey. March, 1975.

Students. Personal interview. School Five, Arlington, Virginia. May, 1975.

4. Other Sources

Barr, Robert. The Growth of Alternative Public Schools. 1975 ICOPE Report, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 106898. September, 1975.

Center for New Schools. Decision Making in Alternative Schools. Report from a National Conference. Chicago: Center for New Schools, 1972.

Educational Research, Inc. Evaluation of Alternative Schools. Arlington, Virginia, 1977.

National Alternative School Program. A National Directory of Public Alternative Schools. Amherst, Massachusetts, 1974.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTED TO A SAMPLE OF STUDENTS WITHIN THE FIVE SCHOOLS

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTED TO A SAMPLE OF STUDENTS WITHIN THE FIVE SCHOOLS

Dear Student:

Thank you for taking part in this research on alternative schools. Your answers will be anonymous; thus, please do not sign your name.

Perhaps the following explanations will be helpful to you.

Consider an outside learning experience to be one in which a student spends at least 75% of his time away from the school for that particular course.

Independent study can be considered in two ways. It could be an option that you exercise apart from a regular class, for example, independent study English, or it could be that you might take a particular class but want to go on independent study within that class.

Thank you for your cooperation.

INDICATE BY CIRCLING YOUR ANSWER TO THE RIGHT OF EACH STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER THIS STATEMENT WAS (1) UNIMPORTANT, (2) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT, (3) IMPORTANT, OR (4) VERY IMPORTANT AS A FACTOR IN YOUR DECISION TO COME TO THIS SCHOOL.

1. I disliked having the same schedule of classes every day at a regular high school. (1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

2. I disliked having to be at school for a specified length of time every day (for example, from 8:00 to 2:30 at a regular high school. (1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

3. I wanted an atmosphere where people knew each other and were friendly. (1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (3) Very Important

4. I wanted to be able to use the community as a learning resource in more ways than the regular high school provided for. (1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

5. I thought I would not have to work as hard to get good grades at this school as I would at a regular school. (1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

6. I wanted to make more decisions about my own learning than I could at the regular high school. (1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

7. If you had another reason for coming to this school which was very important to you, please give that reason here.

IN THE BLANK NEXT TO EACH SUBJECT BELOW, WRITE THE NUMBER WHICH REPRESENTS THE NUMBER OF TIMES YOU HAVE TAKEN AN INDEPENDENT STUDY OPTION WITHIN THAT SUBJECT.*

8. Mathematics_____
9. History_____
10. Government_____
11. Psychology_____
12. Economics_____
13. Foreign Language_____
14. Music_____
15. Art_____
16. Drama_____
17. Biology_____
18. Physics_____
19. Chemistry_____
20. Basic Science_____
21. English_____
22. Physical Ed._____
23. Sociology_____
24. Other_____

25. Many alternative schools have some way for providing for group decision making about various issues in the school. Please indicate by circling one of the options which best describes your school.

    1. Our school has some type of all-achool meeting called a general meeting, full community meeting, town meeting, etc.

    2. Our school has only a small group meeting where a small number of teachers and students meet regularly to decide policy for the school.

    3. Our school has both large and small group meetings where students meet with staff to decide policy for the school.

    4. I don't know.

    5. Other (please describe briefly).

26. Circle the answer which is most accurate.

    I actually took an independent study option in:

    1. None of my subjects
    2. 0-10% of my subjects

---

*Questions not included in the analysis in this study.

3. 10-25% of my subjects
4. 25-50% of my subjects
5. 50-75% of my subjects
6. 75-100% of my subjects.

27. Circle the percentage of your courses which were taught by persons who did not normally teach at the school but who came in to teach a particular skill or study some special subject with you.

1. None of my courses
2. 0-10% of my courses
3. 10-25% of my courses
4. 25-50% of my courses
5. 50-75% of my courses
6. 75-100% of my courses

28. Circle the percentage of your courses which you took away from the school taught by persons in the community (for example, a course taught by an Art Historian at a museum).

1. None of my courses
2. 0-10% of my courses
3. 10-25% of my courses
4. 25-50% of my courses
5. 50-75% of my courses
6. 75-100% of my courses

29. Circle the percentage which applies to your situation.

At this school I was given the opportunity to evaluate the course and the instructor in:

1. None of my courses
2. 0-10% of my courses
3. 10-25% of my courses
4. 25-50% of my courses
5. 50-75% of my courses
6. 75-100% of my courses.

30. Circle the answer which best describes your school.

1. Our school has a general meeting which anybody could attend and vote.

2. Our school has a general meeting at which only student representatives and teacher representatives could attend and vote.

3. Our school has small group meetings with students and staff at which students and staff vote on school policies.

TO THE RIGHT OF EACH STATEMENT BELOW, CIRCLE WHETHER THE GENERAL MEETING HAD (1) FINAL AUTHORITY, (2) LIMITED AUTHORITY, (3) RECOMMENDING POWER ONLY, (4) NO AUTHORITY TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT THE FOLLOWING ISSUES. IF YOU DO NOT KNOW, PLEASE CIRCLE, DK.

31.	Planning activities and materials to be used within the courses offered in the school.	(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK
32.	Whether credit should be given for a specific course, at all.	(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK
33.	Whether credit for a course will be given for one subject or another (for instance, whether a course will be for English or Social Studies credit).	(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK
34.	Rules and regulations as to how students should act.	(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK
35.	Use of equipment in the school.	(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK
36.	Purchasing of equipment for the school.	(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK
37.	The hiring of a state certified regular teacher.	(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

38. The dismissal of a state certified regular teacher.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

39. The hiring of an outside teacher or resource person.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

40. The dismissal of an outside teacher or resource person.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

41. The use of space within the school (for example, whether a particular room should be a student lounge only or a work-study room.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

42. The budgeting and use funds.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

43. The resolution of a conflict between a student and a teacher.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

44. The resolution of a conflict between two students.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

45. The power to review and change a student's grade.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

46. The power to determine what courses will be offered in the school.
(1) Final Authority (2) Limited Authority (3) Recommending Power Only (4) No Authority (5) DK

INDICATE BY CIRCLING (1) YES, (2) NO, OR (3) I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS CHARACTERIZE YOUR SCHOOL.

47. Independent study could be taken by anyone.
(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

48. Independent study could be taken only if you had a certain grade point average.
(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

49. Independent study could be taken only with permission from your advisor. (1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

50. Are there any other restrictions placed on the taking of independent study? (1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

If you marked yes to the above question, please elaborate briefly.

51. Circle one answer which best describes your school.

1. The students usually choose the chairperson for the general meeting.
2. The director usually chooses the chairperson for the general meeting.
3. The teachers usually choose the chairperson for the general meeting.
4. The director, teachers, and students together choose the chairperson for the general meeting.
5. The general meeting elects its own chairperson.
6. I don't know.
7. Other (please elaborate).

IN THE SUBJECTS BELOW, INDICATE THE NUMBER OF FIELD TRIPS YOU HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE LAST YEAR AND THIS YEAR.

52. Mathematics_____
53. History_____
54. Government_____
55. Psychology_____
56. Home Economics_____
57. Other_____
58. Foreign Language_____
59. Music_____
60. Art_____
61. Drama_____
62. Biology_____
63. Physics_____
64. Shop (auto mechanics)_____
65. Chemistry_____
66. Basic Science_____
67. English_____
68. Physical Ed._____
69. Sociology_____

ON THE LINES PROVIDED, WRITE IN THE LAST TWO INDEPENDENT STUDY COURSES YOU TOOK; THEN, CIRCLE ONE FROM EACH CATEGORY WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE SITUATION FOR THAT COURSE. IF YOU TOOK ONLY ONE INDEPENDENT STUDY, THEN, FILL IN THE BLANK FOR ONE COURSE. IF YOU NEVER TOOK INDEPENDENT STUDY, THEN, JUST LEAVE IT BLANK.

Course_____

70. 1. I chose the topic to be studied.

    2. The teacher chose the topic to be studied.

    3. The teacher and I together chose the topic to be studied.

71. 1. I chose the reading materials and other things to be used.

    2. The teacher and I together chose the reading materials and other things to be used.

    3. The teacher chose the reading materials and other things to be used.

72. 1. The teacher determined the criteria for the grade.

    2. I determined the criteria for the grade.

    3. The teacher and I together determined the criteria for the grade.

CIRCLE THE ANSWER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR SITUATION.

73. Our general meetings were regularly scheduled.

    1. Yes

    2. No

74. Who determined the time for the meeting?

    (1) The Director (2) The Teachers (3) The Students

    (4) The Director, Teachers, and Students together

    (5) I Don't Know

FOR THE QUESTIONS BELOW, INDICATE BY CIRCLING WHETHER YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE (SD), DISAGREE (D), ARE UNDECIDED (U), AGREE (A), OR STRONGLY AGREE (SA) WITH THE STATEMENTS.

IF YOU HAD BOTH TYPES OF MEETINGS, ANSWERS QUESTIONS. IF YOU HAD ONLY ONE TYPE OF MEETING, ANSWER ONE OF THESE TWO QUESTIONS WHICH PERTAINS TO YOU. IF YOU HAD NO MEETINGS OF ANY KIND, LEAVE QUESTIONS BLANK.

75. Teachers really controlled the general meetings.

SD D U A SA

76.* Teachers really controlled the small meetings.

SD D U A SA

77.* I felt that I had a lot to say about my own education here at this school.

SD D U A SA

78.* I was treated as an adult at this school.

SD D U A SA

79.* I was encouraged to challenge teachers' statements in classes here.

SD D U A SA

80.* This school encouraged me to use resources outside the classroom for learning.

SD D U A SA

INDICATE BY CIRCLING EITHER (1) YES, (2) NO, OR (3) I DON'T KNOW AS TO WHETHER THESE STATEMENTS CHARACTERIZE YOUR SCHOOL.

81. We were required to take at least one outside learning course. (1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

82. I was given academic credit for courses I took outside the school. (1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

---

*Questions not included in the analysis in this study.

83.	Outside courses were open to anyone who wanted to take them.	(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know
84.	Outside courses were open to only to upperclassmen.	(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know
85.	Teachers generally found outside courses for students.	(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know
86.	It was my responsibility to find outside courses if I wanted to take them.	(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

TO THE RIGHT OF EACH STATEMENT, CIRCLE THE WORD WHICH BEST DESCRIBES HOW FREQUENTLY THE GENERAL MEETING DECIDED ONE OF THESE ISSUES.*

87.	Whether credit should be given for a specific course at all.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
88.	Whether credit for a course will be given for one subject or another (for instance, whether a course will be for English or Social Studies credit.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
89.	Rules and regulations as to how students should act.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
90.	Use of equipment in the school.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
91.	Purchasing of equipment for the school.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
92.	The hiring of a state certified regular teacher.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
93.	The dismissal of a state certified regular teacher.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often

*Questions not included in the analysis of this study.

94.	The hiring of an outside teacher or resource person.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
95.	The dismissal of an outside teacher or resource person.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
96.	The use of space within the school (for example, whether a particular room should be a student lounge or a work room.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
97.	The budgeting and use of funds.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
98.	The resolution of a conflict between a student and a teacher.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
99.	The resolution of a conflict between two students.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
100.	Reviewing and changing a student's grade.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often
101.	Determining what courses will be offered in the school.	(1) Never (2) Hardly Ever (3) Sometimes (4) Often (5) Very Often

TO THE RIGHT OF EACH STATEMENT, CIRCLE WHETHER IT WAS (1) UNIMPORTANT, (2) SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT, (3) IMPORTANT, OR (4) VERY IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION TO ATTEND THE GENERAL MEETING. IF YOU NEVER ATTENDED ANY OF THE GENERAL MEETINGS OR IF YOU DID NOT HAVE GENERAL MEETINGS, PLEASE LEAVE THIS QUESTION BLANK.*

102.	I attended the meeting because I was interested in the items on the agenda.	(1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

---

*Questions not included in the analysis in this study.

103. I attended because I had nothing else to do at the times that the meeting was scheduled.

(1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

104. I attended the meeting because I felt that students going to this school ought to attend the meetings.

(1) Unimportant (2) Somewhat Important (3) Important (4) Very Important

105. If there is another reason why you attended the meeting which was important to you, please give it here.

IF YOU HAD MORE THAN ONE GRADE OPTION AT YOUR SCHOOL, THEN, PLEASE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS.

106. These options are available to everyone.

(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

107. These options are available to upperclassmen only.

(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

108. These options are available in certain courses only.

(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

109. These options are available to students with a certain grade point average.

(1) Yes (2) No (3) I Don't Know

110. Circle the number which most accurately describes what options you have for receiving grades at your school.

1. Letter grades only
2. Letter grades, credit/no credit
3. Letter grades, pass/fail
4. Letter grades, credit/no credit, pass/fail
5. Letter grades and written statements describing a student's progress in a particular course
6. Letter grades, credit/no credit, pass/fail, written statements describing a student's progress in a particular course
7. Other (please elaborate)

CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH MOST ACCURATELY DESCRIBES YOUR SITUATION.*

111. How many courses are you taking at the present time?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 more than 7

CIRCLE THE ANSWER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR SITUATION.*

112. What percentage of the number of general meetings held have you attended over the last year and a half?

1. 0-5%
2. 0-10%
3. 10-25%
4. 25-50%
5. 50-75%
6. 75-100%

CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR SITUATION.

113. If I had chosen to do so, I could have taken an independent study option within:

1. None of my subjects
2. 0-10% of my subjects
3. 10-25% of my subjects
4. 25-50% of my subjects
5. 50-75% of my subjects
6. 75-100% of my subjects

CIRCLE THE ANSWER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR SCHOOL.

114. At this school, grades were usually given in courses:

1. By my own evaluation of my work
2. By the teacher's evaluation of my work
3. By an equal combination of my evaluation and the teacher's evaluation of my work
4. Partially by my own evaluation but more the teacher's evaluation of my work
5. Partially by the teacher's evaluation but mainly by my own evaluation of my work

---

*Questions not included in the analysis in this study.

115. Circle one of the following which best describes your situation.

1. My parents chose my grade options
2. The school chose my grade options
3. My advisor and I chose my grade options
4. I chose my grade options
5. The teacher chose my grade options

CIRCLE THE ANSWER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR SITUATION.

116. In my classes within the school last year and this year, we have had at least ONE OUTSIDE SPEAKER, someone who came in once or twice to speak on a particular topic in:

1. None of my courses
2. 0-10% of my courses
3. 10-25% of my courses
4. 25-50% of my courses
5. 50-75% of my courses
6. 75-100% of my courses

117. Circle one answer from the statements below which best describes your situation.

1. The students determine the agenda for the general meeting.
2. The director determines the agenda for the general meeting.
3. The teachers determine the agenda for the general meeting.
4. The teachers, students, and director together determine the agenda for the meeting.
5. I don't know.

118. To what extent do you feel that this school provided you with independence and opportunities to make decisions about your own learning? Please elaborate; you may use the back of the paper.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW

QUESTIONS ASKED OF STUDENTS WHO HAD COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW

QUESTIONS ASKED OF STUDENTS WHO HAD COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are students required to attend classes here?
2. Do students teach classes here?
3. How are English and Social Studies Courses determined here?
4. Who determines what will be taught in the English and Social Studies Classes here?
5. Did you ever disagree with a teacher about a grade?
6. Have you ever taken an Independent Study Course here?
7. Are there any decisions about your own learning that you can't make and would like to make?
8. Do you think that the All-School Meeting has enough power?
9. Is there any one person in the school or group which has final authority to decide policy or issues in the school?
10. What do you like most about this school?
11. What do you like least about this school?

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES AND T TESTS

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES AND T TESTS

1. One-way analysis of Variance Tables for Items One-Six.
2. Correlated T Test for six items in Schools One-Five.
3. One-way analysis of Variance Tables for:
   (a) Grade determination;
   (b) Opportunities to evaluate the course and the instructor;
   (c) Opportunities for independent study; and
   (d) Subjects in which students took independent study.

Results of one-way analysis of variance and T Test procedures were considered significant at the .01 level.

Item 1

Dislike Having the Same Schedule of Classes at Conventional School

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	11.7276	2.9319	3.264	.013
WITHIN GROUPS	233	209.2640	.0981		
TOTAL	237	220.9916			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	99 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	38	2.0263	.9149	.1484	1.0000	4.0000	1.7256 TO 2.3271
GRP02	27	2.4444	.9740	.1875	1.0000	4.0000	2.0591 TO 2.8298
GRP03	44	2.0682	.9250	.1395	1.0000	4.0000	1.7869 TO 2.3494
GRP04	53	2.2642	.9436	.1296	1.0000	4.0000	2.0041 TO 2.5242
GRP05	76	2.5789	.9697	.1112	1.0000	4.0000	2.3574 TO 2.8005
TOTAL	238	2.3109	.9656	.0626	1.0000	4.0000	2.1876 TO 2.4342

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2121, P = 1.000 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = .065, P = .989
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 1.133

Item 1 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP01	GRP03	GRP04	GRP02	GRP05
MEAN	2.0263	2.0682	2.2642	2.4444	2.5789

Item 2

Dislike Having to be At School for a Specified Length of Time

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	5.3504	1.3376	1.149	.334NS
WITHIN GROUPS	233	271.2042	1.1640		
TOTAL	237	276.5546			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	37	2.4595	1.0953	.1801	1.0000	4.0000	2.0943 TO 2.8247
GRP02	28	2.7143	1.0838	.2048	1.0000	4.0000	2.2940 TO 3.1345
GRP03	44	2.3864	1.1251	.1696	1.0000	4.0000	2.0443 TO 2.7284
GRP04	53	2.4528	1.1019	.1514	1.0000	4.0000	2.1491 TO 2.7565
GRP05	76	2.7368	1.0246	.1175	1.0000	4.0000	2.5027 TO 2.9710
TOTAL	238	2.5630	1.0802	.0700	1.0000	4.0000	2.4251 TO 2.7010

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2144. P = 1.000 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = .150. P = .960
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 1.206

Item 2 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.36 4.36 4.36 4.36

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP03	GRP04	GRP01	GRP02	GRP05
MEAN	2.3864	2.4528	2.4595	2.7143	2.7368

Item 3

Friendly Atmosphere of the Alternative School

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	.7982	.1995	.290	.884 N/S.
WITHIN GROUPS	236	162.3139	.6878		
TOTAL	240	163.1121			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	58	3.3947	.8555	.1388	1.0000	4.0000	3.1135 TO 3.6759
GRP02	28	3.3214	.8630	.1631	1.0000	4.0000	2.9868 TO 3.6561
GRP03	47	3.3191	.8873	.1294	1.0000	4.0000	3.0586 TO 3.5797
GRP04	52	3.4808	.7538	.1045	1.0000	4.0000	3.2709 TO 3.6906
GRP05	76	3.3816	.8160	.0936	1.0000	4.0000	3.1951 TO 3.5680
TOTAL	241	3.3859	.8244	.0531	1.0000	4.0000	3.2813 TO 3.4905

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2251, P = .962 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = .374, P = .829
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 1.385

Item 3 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP03	GRP02	GRP05	GRP01	GRP04
MEAN	3.3191	3.3214	3.3816	3.3947	3.4808

Item 4

Opportunity to Use the Community as a Learning Resource

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	11.9209	2.9802	3.383	.010
WITHIN GROUPS	235	207.0125	.8809		
TOTAL	239	218.9333			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	38	2.9474	1.0641	.1726	1.0000	4.0000	2.5976 TO 3.2971
GRP02	20	3.2143	.8325	.1573	1.0000	4.0000	2.8915 TO 3.5371
GRP03	45	3.1556	.9760	.1455	1.0000	4.0000	2.8623 TO 3.4488
GRP04	53	3.3774	.7653	.1051	1.0000	4.0000	3.1664 TO 3.5883
GRP05	76	2.8026	.9936	.1140	1.0000	4.0000	2.5756 TO 3.0297
TOTAL	240	3.0667	.9571	.0618	1.0000	4.0000	2.9450 TO 3.1884

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2603, P = .231 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = 1.592, P = .172
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 1.933

Item 4 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP05	GRP01	GRP03	GRP02
MEAN	2.8026	2.9474	3.1556	3.2143

SUBSET 2

GROUP	GRP01	GRP03	GRP02	GRP04
MEAN	2.9474	3.1556	3.2143	3.3774

Item 5

Easier to Obtain Good Grades at the Alternative School

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	2.1667	.5417	.900	.466
WITHIN GROUPS	232	139.6561	.6020		
TOTAL	236	141.8228			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	36	1.5833	.8409	.1402	1.0000	4.0000	1.2988 TO 1.8679
GRP02	29	1.4138	.8667	.1609	1.0000	4.0000	1.0841 TO 1.7435
GRP03	46	1.3478	.7664	.1130	1.0000	4.0000	1.1202 TO 1.5754
GRP04	51	1.2745	.6951	.0973	1.0000	4.0000	1.0790 TO 1.4700
GRP05	75	1.3600	.7648	.0883	1.0000	4.0000	1.1840 TO 1.5360
TOTAL	237	1.3797	.7752	.0504	1.0000	4.0000	1.2805 TO 1.4789

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2413 P = .542 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = .591 P = .672
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 1.555

Item 5 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP04	GRP03	GRP05	GRP02	GRP01
MEAN	1.2745	1.3478	1.3600	1.4138	1.5833

Item 6

Opportunity to Make More Learning Decisions Than Conventional School Provided

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	5.4234	1.3558	2.673	.033
WITHIN GROUPS	232	117.6906	.5073		
TOTAL	236	123.1140			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	35	3.2571	.9500	.1606	1.0000	4.0000	2.9308 TO 3.5835
GRP02	28	3.5357	.7927	.1498	1.0000	4.0000	3.2284 TO 3.8431
GRP03	46	3.6957	.6279	.0926	1.0000	4.0000	3.5092 TO 3.8821
GRP04	53	3.7170	.4953	.0680	2.0000	4.0000	3.5805 TO 3.8535
GRP05	75	3.6267	.7310	.0844	1.0000	4.0000	3.4585 TO 3.7949
TOTAL	237	3.5949	.7223	.0469	1.0000	4.0000	3.5025 TO 3.6874

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .3537, P = .003 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = 4.932, P = .001
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 3.680

Item 6 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.38 4.38 4.38 4.38

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP01	GRP02	GRP05	GRP03	GRP04
MEAN	3.2571	3.5357	3.6267	3.6957	3.7170

Correlated T Test for Items in School One

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC1	37	2.0541	.911	.150	-.4054	1.066	.175	.448	.005	-2.31	36	.027
ITEMC2		2.4595	1.095	.180								
ITEMC1	38	2.0263	.915	.148	-1.3684	1.324	.215	-.117	.483	-6.37	37	.000
ITEMC3		3.3947	.855	.139								
ITEMC1	38	2.0263	.915	.148	-.9211	1.477	.240	-.110	.513	-3.84	37	.000
ITEMC4		2.9474	1.064	.173								
ITEMC1	36	2.0000	.862	.144	.4167	1.156	.193	.079	.648	2.16	35	.037
ITEMC5		1.5833	.841	.140								
ITEMC1	35	2.0857	.919	.155	-1.1714	1.505	.254	-.295	.085	-4.61	34	.000
ITEMC6		3.2571	.950	.161								
ITEMC2	37	2.4595	1.095	.180	-.9189	1.479	.243	-.131	.441	-3.78	36	.001
ITEMC3		3.3784	.861	.142								
ITEMC2	37	2.4595	1.095	.180	-.4595	1.445	.238	.104	.539	-1.93	36	.061
ITEMC4		2.9189	1.064	.175								
ITEMC2	35	2.4000	1.090	.184	.8571	1.115	.189	.344	.043	4.55	34	.000
ITEMC5		1.5429	.817	.138								
ITEMC2	35	2.4571	1.120	.189	-.8000	1.511	.255	-.058	.739	-3.13	34	.004
ITEMC6		3.2571	.950	.161								
ITEMC3	38	3.3947	.855	.139	.4474	1.083	.176	.380	.019	2.55	37	.015
ITEMC4		2.9474	1.064	.173								

School One (continued)

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC3	36	3.3889	.671	.145	1.8056	1.283	.214	-.124	.473	8.44	35	.000
ITEMC5		1.5833	.841	.140								
ITEMC3	35	3.3714	.877	.148	.1143	1.051	.178	.341	.045	.64	34	.524
ITEMC6		3.2571	.950	.161								
ITEMC4	36	2.9167	1.079	.180	1.3333	1.549	.258	-.291	.085	5.16	35	.000
ITEMC5		1.5833	.841	.140								
ITEMC4	35	2.9429	1.083	.183	-.3143	1.078	.182	.443	.008	-1.72	34	.094
ITEMC6		3.2571	.950	.161								
ITEMC5	34	1.5588	.824	.141	-1.6765	1.364	.234	-.172	.330	-7.16	33	.000
ITEMC6		3.2353	.955	.164								

Correlated T Test for Items in School Two

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC1	26	2.4615	.989	.194	-.2308	.992	.195	.547	.004	-1.19	25	.247
ITEMC2		2.6923	1.087	.213								
ITEMC1	26	2.4615	.989	.194	-.8077	1.021	.200	.406	.040	-4.04	25	.000
ITEMC3		3.2692	.874	.171								
ITEMC1	26	2.4615	.989	.194	-.6923	1.289	.253	.007	.971	-2.74	25	.011
ITEMC4		3.1538	.834	.164								
ITEMC1	27	2.4444	.974	.187	1.0000	1.301	.250	.030	.884	3.99	26	.000
ITEMC5		1.4444	.892	.172								
ITEMC1	26	2.4615	.989	.194	-1.0385	1.076	.211	.299	.138	-4.92	25	.000
ITEMC6		3.5000	.812	.159								
ITEMC2	28	2.7143	1.084	.205	-.6071	1.133	.214	.339	.077	-2.83	27	.009
ITEMC3		3.3214	.863	.163								
ITEMC2	28	2.7143	1.084	.205	-.5000	1.171	.221	.276	.156	-2.26	27	.032
ITEMC4		3.2143	.833	.157								
ITEMC2	28	2.7143	1.084	.205	1.3929	1.286	.243	.027	.891	5.73	27	.000
ITEMC5		1.3214	.723	.137								
ITEMC2	27	2.7778	1.050	.202	-.7407	.984	.189	.462	.015	-3.91	26	.001
ITEMC6		3.5185	.802	.154								
ITEMC3	28	3.3214	.863	.163	.1071	.994	.188	.313	.105	.57	27	.573
ITEMC4		3.2143	.833	.157								

School Two (continued)

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEM03	28	3.3214	.863	.163	2.0000	1.122	.212	.006	.974	9.43	27	.000
ITEM05		1.3214	.723	.137								
ITEM03	27	3.3333	.877	.169	-.1852	1.001	.193	.291	.140	-.96	26	.345
ITEM06		3.5185	.802	.154								
ITEM04	28	3.2143	.833	.157	1.8929	1.066	.201	.066	.739	9.40	27	.000
ITEM05		1.3214	.723	.137								
ITEM04	27	3.2222	.847	.163	-.2963	.912	.176	.390	.044	-1.69	26	.103
ITEM06		3.5185	.802	.154								
ITEM05	28	1.3929	.875	.165	-2.1429	1.145	.216	.059	.765	-9.90	27	.000
ITEM06		3.5357	.793	.150								

Correlated T Test for Items in School Three

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC1	43	2.2465	.925	.141	-.3721	1.024	.156	.511	.000	-2.38	42	.022
ITEMC2		2.4186	1.118	.170								
ITEMC1	44	2.0682	.925	.139	-1.2727	1.149	.173	.150	.331	-7.35	43	.000
ITEMC3		3.3409	.634	.126								
ITEMC1	42	2.0476	.936	.144	-1.0714	1.369	.211	-.006	.969	-5.07	41	.000
ITEMC4		3.1190	.993	.153								
ITEMC1	43	2.0465	.925	.141	.6744	1.085	.165	.205	.188	4.08	42	.000
ITEMC5		1.3721	.787	.120								
ITEMC1	43	2.0465	.925	.141	-1.6512	1.110	.169	.024	.876	-9.75	42	.000
ITEMC6		3.6977	.638	.097								
ITEMC2	44	2.3864	1.125	.170	-.9545	1.413	.213	-.020	.899	-4.48	43	.000
ITEMC3		3.3409	.634	.126								
ITEMC2	42	2.3095	1.093	.169	-.8571	1.424	.220	.064	.687	-3.90	41	.000
ITEMC4		3.1667	.986	.152								
ITEMC2	43	2.3488	1.110	.169	1.0233	1.102	.168	.348	.022	6.09	42	.000
ITEMC5		1.3256	.747	.114								
ITEMC2	43	2.3488	1.110	.169	-1.3953	1.383	.211	-.264	.087	-6.62	42	.000
ITEMC6		3.7442	.581	.089								
ITEMC3	45	3.2889	.695	.133	.1333	1.254	.187	.103	.499	.71	44	.479
ITEMC4		3.1556	.976	.145								

School Three (continued)

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC3	46	3.3043	.891	.131	1.9565	1.192	.176	-.028	.852	11.13	45	.000
ITEMC5		1.3478	.766	.113								
ITEMC3	46	3.3043	.891	.131	-.3913	1.043	.154	.090	.553	-2.54	45	.014
ITEMC6		3.6957	.626	.093								
ITEMC4	45	3.1556	.976	.145	1.8000	1.375	.205	-.226	.136	8.78	44	.000
ITEMC5		1.3556	.773	.115								
ITEMC4	45	3.1556	.976	.145	-.5333	1.120	.167	.080	.601	-3.19	44	.003
ITEMC6		3.6889	.633	.094								
ITEMC5	46	1.3478	.766	.113	-2.3478	1.140	.168	-.329	.025	-13.97	45	.000
ITEMC6		3.6957	.626	.093								

Correlated T Test for Items in School Four

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC1	53	2.2642	.944	.130	-.1887	1.110	.153	.419	.002	-1.24	52	.222
ITEMC2		2.4528	1.102	.151								
ITEMC1	52	2.2885	.936	.130	-1.1923	1.103	.153	.161	.255	-7.79	51	.000
ITEMC3		3.4808	.754	.105								
ITEMC1	53	2.2642	.944	.130	-1.1132	1.050	.144	.259	.061	-7.72	52	.000
ITEMC4		3.3774	.765	.105								
ITEMC1	51	.2745	.943	.132	1.0000	1.296	.181	-.240	.090	5.51	50	.000
ITEMC5		1.2745	.695	.097								
ITEMC1	53	2.2642	.944	.130	-1.4528	1.030	.141	.081	.565	-10.27	52	.000
ITEMC6		3.7170	.495	.068								
ITEMC2	52	2.4231	1.091	.151	-1.0577	1.447	.201	-.205	.146	-5.27	51	.000
ITEMC3		3.4808	.754	.105								
ITEMC2	53	2.4528	1.102	.151	-.9245	1.253	.172	.136	.333	-5.37	52	.000
ITEMC4		3.3774	.765	.105								
ITEMC2	51	2.4510	1.083	.152	1.1765	1.260	.176	.045	.755	6.67	50	.000
ITEMC5		1.2745	.695	.097								
ITEMC2	53	2.4528	1.102	.151	-1.2642	1.146	.157	.134	.340	-8.03	52	.000
ITEMC6		3.7170	.495	.068								
ITEMC3	52	3.4808	.754	.105	.0962	.975	.135	.182	.197	.71	51	.480
ITEMC4		3.3846	.771	.107								

School Four (continued)

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC3		3.5200	.735	.104								
	50				2.2400	1.117	.158	-.209	.145	14.18	49	.000
ITEMC5		1.2800	.701	.099								
ITEMC3		3.4906	.754	.105								
	52				-.2308	.899	.125	.011	.938	-1.85	51	.070
ITEMC6		3.7115	.498	.069								
ITEMC4		3.3529	.770	.108								
	51				2.0784	1.262	.177	-.484	.000	11.76	50	.000
ITEMC5		1.2745	.695	.097								
ITEMC4		3.3774	.765	.105								
	53				-.3396	.758	.104	.338	.013	-3.26	52	.002
ITEMC6		3.7170	.495	.068								
ITEMC5		1.2745	.695	.097								
	51				-2.4314	.855	.120	.007	.963	-20.32	50	.000
ITEMC6		3.7059	.502	.070								

Correlated T Test for Items in School Five

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEMC1	76	2.5789	.970	.111	-.1579	.939	.108	.558	.000	-1.47	75	.147
ITEMC2		2.7368	1.025	.118								
ITEMC1	76	2.5789	.970	.111	-.8026	1.296	.149	-.047	.687	-5.40	75	.000
ITEMC3		3.3816	.816	.094								
ITEMC1	76	2.5789	.970	.111	-.2237	1.484	.170	-.143	.219	-1.31	75	.193
ITEMC4		2.8026	.994	.114								
ITEMC1	75	2.5600	.962	.111	1.2000	1.219	.141	.016	.891	8.52	74	.000
ITEMC5		1.3600	.765	.088								
ITEMC1	75	2.5733	.975	.113	-1.0533	1.138	.131	.134	.253	-8.02	74	.000
ITEMC6		3.6267	.731	.084								
ITEMC2	76	2.7368	1.025	.118	-.6447	1.240	.142	.106	.363	-4.53	75	.000
ITEMC3		3.3816	.816	.094								
ITEMC2	76	2.7368	1.025	.118	-.0658	1.482	.170	-.078	.504	-.39	75	.700
ITEMC4		2.8026	.994	.114								
ITEMC2	75	2.7200	1.021	.118	1.3600	1.259	.145	.027	.818	9.36	74	.000
ITEMC5		1.3600	.765	.088								
ITEMC2	75	2.7200	1.021	.118	-.9067	1.176	.136	.130	.268	-6.68	74	.000
ITEMC6		3.6267	.731	.084								
ITEMC3	76	3.3816	.816	.094	.5789	1.203	.138	.127	.274	4.20	75	.000
ITEMC4		2.8026	.994	.114								

School Five (continued)

T - T E S T

VARIABLE	NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	(DIFFERENCE) MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	CORR.	2-TAIL PROB.	T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
ITEM03	75	3.3733	.818	.094	2.0133	1.180	.136	-.110	.349	14.78	74	.000
ITEM05		1.3600	.765	.088								
ITEM03	75	3.4000	.805	.093	-.2267	1.008	.116	.142	.223	-1.95	74	.055
ITEM06		3.6267	.731	.084								
ITEM04	75	2.7867	.990	.114	1.4267	1.357	.157	-.183	.117	9.10	74	.000
ITEM05		1.3600	.765	.088								
ITEM04	75	2.8267	.978	.113	-.8000	1.090	.126	.211	.070	-6.35	74	.000
ITEM06		3.6267	.731	.084								
ITEM05	74	1.3243	.704	.082	-2.2973	1.155	.134	-.289	.013	-17.10	73	.000
ITEM06		3.6216	.735	.085								

Item 32

Students' Perceptions of Grade Determination

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	119.3515	29.8379	12.419	.000
WITHIN GROUPS	201	482.9252	2.4026		
TOTAL	205	602.2767			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	28	-1.9286	1.3859	.2619	-3.0000	3.0000	-2.4660 TO -1.3912
GRP02	21	.2381	1.7293	.3774	-3.0000	3.0000	-.5491 TO 1.0253
GRP03	38	-.3947	1.6528	.2681	-3.0000	3.0000	-.9380 TO .1485
GRP04	40	-1.6250	1.2484	.1802	-3.0000	3.0000	-1.9875 TO -1.2625
GRP05	71	-.2394	1.6773	.1991	-3.0000	6.0000	-.6364 TO .1576
TOTAL	206	-.7718	1.7140	.1194	-3.0000	6.0000	-1.0073 TO -.5364

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2489, P = .456 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = 1.535, P = .188
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 1.919

Item 32 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GROUP1	GROUP4
MEAN	-1.9250	-1.6250

SUBSET 2

GROUP	GROUP3	GROUP5	GROUP2
MEAN	-.5347	-.4594	1.2361

Item 47

Students' Perceptions of Their Opportunities to Evaluate the Course and the Instructor

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	76.8578	19.2145	7.620	.000
WITHIN GROUPS	233	587.5162	2.5215		
TOTAL	237	664.3740			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	35	4.2000	1.8439	.3117	1.0000	6.0000	3.5666 TO 4.8334
GRP02	32	5.2812	1.3255	.2343	1.0000	6.0000	4.8033 TO 5.7592
GRP03	43	5.6047	1.0941	.1669	1.0000	6.0000	5.2679 TO 5.9414
GRP04	51	4.0392	1.9592	.2743	1.0000	6.0000	3.4882 TO 4.5902
GRP05	77	4.7792	1.5185	.1731	1.0000	6.0000	4.4346 TO 5.1239
TOTAL	238	4.7521	1.6743	.1085	1.0000	6.0000	4.5383 TO 4.9659

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .3071, P = .016 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = 4.485, P = .001
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 3.206

Item 47 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.38 4.46 4.56 4.66

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS - (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP04	GRP01	GRP05
MEAN	4.6392	4.2000	4.7792

SUBSET 2

GROUP	GRP01	GRP05	GRP02
MEAN	4.2000	4.7792	5.2012

SUBSET 3

GROUP	GRP05	GRP02	GRP03
MEAN	4.7792	5.2012	5.6047

Item 31

Students' Perceptions of Their Opportunities for Independent Study

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	22.3076	5.5769	2.336	.056
WITHIN GROUPS	194	463.1599	2.3874		
TOTAL	198	485.4674			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	20	3.9000	1.8035	.4033	1.0000	6.0000	3.0559 TO 4.7441
GRP02	21	4.2381	1.6095	.3512	2.0000	6.0000	3.5055 TO 4.9707
GRP03	38	4.1842	1.6083	.2609	1.0000	6.0000	3.6556 TO 4.7129
GRP04	44	4.3864	1.5130	.2281	2.0000	6.0000	3.9264 TO 4.8464
GRP05	76	4.8553	1.4395	.1651	1.0000	6.0000	4.5263 TO 5.1842
TOTAL	199	4.4623	1.5658	.1110	1.0000	6.0000	4.2434 TO 4.6812

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2543, P = .380 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = .483, P = .751
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 1.570

Item 31 (continued)

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL

4.39 4.39 4.39 4.39

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP01	GRP03	GRP02	GRP04	GRP05
MEAN	3.9000	4.1842	4.2381	4.3864	4.8553

Item 43

Percentage of Subjects in Which Students Actually Took Independent Study

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE	D.F.	SUM OF SQUARES	MEAN SQUARES	F RATIO	F PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	4	52.2371	13.0593	11.965	.000
WITHIN GROUPS	223	243.3902	1.0914		
TOTAL	227	295.6272			

GROUP	COUNT	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95 PCT CONF INT FOR MEAN
GRP01	31	1.6129	.9193	.1651	1.0000	4.0000	1.2757 TO 1.9501
GRP02	29	2.5172	1.1219	.2083	1.0000	5.0000	2.0905 TO 2.9440
GRP03	42	2.1429	.8431	.1301	1.0000	4.0000	1.8801 TO 2.4056
GRP04	50	1.9800	.9145	.1293	1.0000	5.0000	1.7201 TO 2.2399
GRP05	76	2.9342	1.2257	.1406	1.0000	6.0000	2.6541 TO 3.2143
TOTAL	228	2.3465	1.1412	.0756	1.0000	6.0000	2.1976 TO 2.4954

TESTS FOR HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

COCHRANS C = MAX. VARIANCE/SUM(VARIANCES) = .2915, P = .048 (APPROX.)
BARTLETT-BOX F = 2.561, P = .036
MAXIMUM VARIANCE / MINIMUM VARIANCE = 2.114

MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

SCHEFFE PROCEDURE
RANGES FOR THE .050 LEVEL -

4.39 4.39 4.39 4.39

HOMOGENEOUS SUBSETS (SUBSETS OF GROUPS, NO PAIR OF WHICH HAVE MEANS THAT DIFFER BY MORE THAN THE SHORTEST SIGNIFICANT RANGE FOR A SUBSET OF THAT SIZE)

SUBSET 1

GROUP	GRP01	GRP04	GRP03
MEAN	1.6129	1.9800	2.1429

SUBSET 2

GROUP	GRP04	GRP03	GRP02
MEAN	1.9800	2.1429	2.5172

SUBSET 3

GROUP	GRP02	GRP05
MEAN	2.5172	2.9342

2743

July 28,1978

Dear Director:

I apologize for not having answered your letter requesting biographical information. I misplaced your letter.

The information that you requested I believe is the following:

Mary McBride
Born: Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 2/14/44
B.A. History- University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, Cal. 1966
M.A. History Georgetown University 1970
Title of Thesis: The Political and Social Thought of T. Thomas Fortune, Black Journalist

Ph.D. Secondary Education- Social Studies- University of Maryland
1977- Title of Dissertation: Students' Perceptions of and Responses to Opportunities for Decision Making and the Use of the Community in Five Public Alternative Secondary Schools.

Again I am sorry for this delay,

Mary McBride

Mary McBride