MOTIVATION TO RETURN AND SUBSEQUENT SATISFACTION

AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ENROLLED IN

MONTREAL AREA OUTREACH SCHOOLS

by

David J. Hatfield

A Thesis

Submitted to

The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in

Administration and Policy Studies in Education,

March, 1987.

ABSTRACT

This study examined motivation for return to school, subsequent satisfaction, and the relationship between motivating factors and satisfaction among students enrolled in five small schools in the Montreal area dedicated to the education of adolescents who wish to return.

Statistical analysis of questionnaire data revealed that major motivating factors for return to school were related to a desire for academic success rather than social or personal reasons. Younger returned dropouts were more likely to be motivated by the desire to obtain job skills than their older counterparts.

Age and sex did not account for significant differences in motivation or subsequent satisfaction with school. Returned dropouts were generally well-satisfied with their current school experience. Major components of satisfaction were academic success and a variety of items related to teacher empathy, and competence.

While there were no significant differences in satisfaction among participating schools, satisfaction scores were higher for those mid-way through alternative schools than for those students just beginning or nearing graduation.

i

RESUME

Cette étude éximina la motivation pour le retour à l'école, la satisfaction subséquente, et la relation entre les elements de motivation et la satisfaction parmis les éleves inscrits à cinq petites écoles dans la region de Montréal dévouées à l'éducation des adolescents qui désirent retourner.

L'analyse statistique des données de questionnaire montra que les éléments majeurs de motivation pour le retour à l'école furent reliés à un désir pour un succès académic plutot que pour des raisons sociales ou personnelles. Les décrocheurs plus jeunes furent plus probable d'etre motivés par le désir d'obtenir des compétences pour le marché du travail que les élèves plus agés.

L'age, et le sexe n'accompta pas pour des differences significants dans la motivation ou la satisfaction subséquante avec l'école. Les décrocheurs ré-inscrits à l'école furent, en général, satisfaits de leurs expériences actuels à l'école. Les composants majeurs de satisfaction furent le succès académic et une varieté de faits reliés à la sympathie et compétence du professeur.

Meme s'il n'y avait pas de differernces significants de satisfaction parmis les écoles participants, les résultats furent plus éléves parmis les éléves à mi-chemin dans les écoles alternatives que parmis les étudiants commençant ou finissant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

Among the many problems that educators face today, one of the most serious and widespread is that of the high school dropout: the student who leaves school before graduation or completion of a program of study. Many such adolescents have been pushed out of school; some have opted out; all are regarded as failures. They are often identified as "helpless", "trouble making", or "delinquent" (Fine & Rosenberg, 1983). They account for approximately 25% of the high school population in the United States, and no doubt a similar proportion in Canada. Thus, these students represent a significant loss to the school system, and their absence from the regular schools represents a considerable loss in revenues to local school boards which are funded by government grants on a per capita basis. Further, there is the social cost involved in the many young people who fail to reach their true potential, and are forced to accept low paying jobs or social security benefits for much of their working lives.

Much research effort has gone into the identification of causes of dropping out and those students likely to fail to remain in school (Fine & Rosenberg, 1983; Beck & Muia, 1980;

1

Crespo & Michelena, 1981). The literature reveals some
uncertainty in terms of whether such students are alienated
and helpless (Beck & Muia, 1980) with a weak self image
(Cervantes, 1965), or whether they are resisters, "unwilling
to accommodate to a hidden curriculum that fails to meet her
or his needs... aware of the contradictions of one of our
major social institutions" (Fine & Rosenberg, 1983, p. 259).

Such basic research has resulted in various types of
action plans to address the problem. One approach is the early
identification of likely dropouts with subsequent remedial
action to improve the child's chances of staying in school to
graduation (Phillips, 1984). This, of course, does not address
the concerns of adolescents who have already reached a level
of frustration with high school education and dropped out. For
those students there is an increasing number of experimental
programs and schools designed to give former dropouts an
opportunity to continue their education. Some take the form of
special programs within the traditional school, while others
are housed in separate "store front" type buildings (Raywid,
1984; Mahan, 1983).

These experimental schools are the subject of this study
which looks at factors contributing motivation to return to
school, and to student satisfaction with schools in one large

urban school board in the Montreal area catering to the needs of former dropouts who decide to continue their education. Outreach schools appear to be able to attract, keep and educate students who otherwise refuse to attend high school. They, thereby fulfill a need for a particularly difficult segment of the adolescent population. There is a clear need to better understand such schools in order to know whether their wider application is justified.

1.2 CONTEXT

Local Quebec school boards have gradually become aware of the magnitude of the dropout problem, and of the potential for re-integrating these students into the system of secondary education. In some measure this has been due to the fact that it has been possible to fund the programs out of government money generated by the students themselves. That is, high school age students not registered in school represent funds lost to the school boards. If these students can be persuaded to register in a school, the funds accruing to them become available to the boards. The challenge has been to provide schools attractive to youngsters who have dropped out of regular high schools, and thereby persuade them to return. Most school boards in the Montreal area have attempted to address the problem, and a variety of approaches have been

taken. The Montreal Catholic School Commission (the largest board in Quebec), has in its French sector, one large high school devoted to dropouts. The program is organized more in the manner of a C.E.G.E.P. than a high school. Each subject is taught in two large time blocks each week rather than being scheduled on a daily basis. Students are free to register for as many or as few courses as they wish. An attempt is made to ensure that even students who are there full time do not meet more than three teachers per week. Students are encouraged to work part time, as many are partially or totally supporting themselves. In its English sector, this same board has created space for a dropout school on the vacant top floor of a large comprehensive high school. These students have their own teachers, a separate entrance, and a unique timetable despite being housed in an otherwise regular secondary school. In the English Protestant system, the answer has been to create small schools and to locate them away from existing high schools. They are occasionally housed in a separate wing of an existing elementary school, or they are in rented commercial space. Most of these schools teach traditional core subjects, but add a heavy component of life skills. In this way they attempt to address the socio-affective domain of their students in addition to making possible the acquisition of high school leaving credits.

In a variety of ways then, over the past ten years, the Montreal area has seen the growth of a network of independent, publicly funded schools dedicated to the education of dropouts who want to continue their education. Many of these students have been out of school for more than six months and refuse to return to a regular high school. They do, however, see a purpose in continuing their education and are prepared to enter a program designed to give them another chance. Once enrolled, most stay in their new school. It appears that they are finding more satisfaction in these alternative schools than they were in the regular high schools which they left.

There were features of the regular system which caused these students to drop out. Fine and Rosenberg (1983) state, "Dropping out of high school needs to be recognized not as aberrant and not as giving up. Often it voices a critique of educational and economic systems promising opportunity and mobility, delivering neither (p. 258)." This study looks at the factors which motivate such students to return to school, and to student satisfaction with schools in one large urban school board in the Montreal area catering to the needs of former dropouts who decide to continue their education.

1.3 THE PROTESTANT SCHOOL BOARD OF GREATER MONTREAL
OUTREACH SYSTEM

The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal (PSBGM)
is the largest Protestant board in Quebec, and serves a
largely English speaking clientele. It prides itself on its
innovations; it was one of the first to introduce French
immersion programs in its schools. It currently offers a wide
range of alternative programs to cater to the needs of its
diverse population. Several of its alternative high schools
attract highly motivated, academically oriented students. The
schools may boast a fine arts curriculum, a high level of
student participation in decision making, or a "private
school" flavour, but in its own way, each attempts to serve
the needs of a particular group within the total school
population. Another feature of the PSBGM system is a group of
schools jointly administered by the Ministry of Education and
the Ministry of Social Affairs. These units, often located in
hospitals, meet the needs of children who are physically or
mentally handicapped, or who have been placed in the custody
of the state.

The PSBGM Outreach system caters to youngsters who are
neither highly academically motivated, nor in need of
institutional care. They do, however, require a form of

alternative education. They have dropped out of the regular schools, but are sufficiently motivated to seek admission to schools opened expressly for them. Most of these schools cater to students who are over sixteen years of age, but there are children as young as thirteen in the system. Most schools teach traditional core subjects such as mathematics and English, but two units in particular focus on job skills in the form of workshop components. In both cases the students' experience is more akin to being at work than being in school. Only one school formally tests its students for placement in special education, although for the purposes of staffing and funding, all Outreach schools are considered to be dealing with students requiring special education. One school serves the exclusive needs of Haitian immigrants to Montreal, and operates in the French language.

This study concentrated enquiry in five schools which had four things in common. First, they were mandated to accept dropouts from the regular schools. Second, they were small, off-site units. Third, they were academic rather than workshop programs. Fourth, they operated in English. A profile of the schools follows.

1.4 PROFILE OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

The five schools selected for participation in the study are all operated by the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal. They are all public schools funded out of regular grants by the Quebec government. Each school is operated as an autonomous unit with a head teacher. In addition to the teaching staff specified below, each school has a variable allocation of several thousand dollars per year to hire part time help. Some schools obtain the services of one person as a part time employee, while others hire several persons to fulfill specific functions each week. Four of the schools are run exclusively by the board's student services department; the fifth is administratively linked to a regular high school, and is run jointly by the director of student services and the local regional director. None of the schools is a neighbourhood school. All schools have students travelling across the city in order to attend that particular program.

SCHOOL 1:

Population: 36 full time students; three teachers.

Location: The school is housed in a separate wing of an
   elementary school in a predominantly working class
   neighbourhood.

Curriculum: The program is aimed at the acquisition of basic
   skills and credits in secondary one, two, and three. Students
   are tested for special education placement, and these
   requirements are met in the curriculum.

Clientele: This school is directed towards younger dropouts in
   the 13 to 15 age range. Many are in need of special education.

SCHOOL 2:

Population: 50 full time students; 20 part time students; six
   teachers.

Location: The school occupies a double duplex in a middle class
   suburb of Montreal.

Curriculum: The school offers a full grade 10 and 11 program.
   Students are expected to be able to follow the regular course
   of studies.

Clientele: Students are at least 16 years of age, and of average
   academic ability or better.

SCHOOL 3:

Population : 45 students, some full time, others with partial
programs. There are three full time teachers.

Location: Separate quarters in an elementary school in a middle
class suburb of Montreal.

Curriculum: The school caters to students at the grade 9 and 10
level. There is a heavy emphasis on volunteer work in the
community.

Clientele: Students are 16 years of age or older, and are
expected to be at the low end of the average ability range or
better.

SCHOOL 4:

Population: 45 students divided into two groups. There are three
full time teachers.

Location: Rented commercial office space in a middle class suburb
of Montreal.

Curriculum: This school takes on group of students from September
to January, and a second group from January to June each year.
The program focuses on the acquisition of basic skills, and
prepares the students for return to regular high school, entry
to another Outreach school, or the job market.

Clientele: At least 16 years of age. Many are academically weak,
though not necessarily in need of special education.

SCHOOL 5:

Population: 45 students, and three full time teachers.

Location: Rented office space on a main commercial artery
bordering on a predominantly working class area of mid-town
Montreal.

Curriculum: The focus of the program is the acquisition of grade
10 and 11 credits leading to high school graduation. In
addition there is emphasis on life skills, and volunteer work
components.

Clientele: At least 16 years of age, and of low average ability
or better.

1.5 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study is to examine motivation for
return to school, subsequent satisfaction, and the
relationship between motivating factors and subsequent
expressed satisfaction among students enrolled in Outreach
schools in the Montreal area. These schools are defined as
autonomous institutions catering to the needs of students who
have dropped out of the regular high school system. Factors
influencing return to school were obtained through interviews
with teachers experienced in interviewing applicants for
places in Outreach schools, and through interviews with former
participants in Outreach programs, not participating in the

study. Colton and White (1985) established that student satisfaction in high schools could be determined by assessing the extent to which the educational environment contained reinforcing events and rewarding resources. Dissatisfaction arose from a lack of reinforcing events and/or the presence of punishing ones. Factors contributing to student satisfaction with school were developed based on those used in the Colton and White (1985) study.

This study looks at 10 factors which motivate return to school and 22 factors which contribute to satisfaction with school. The factors contributing to satisfaction were tested in a pilot study conducted in Montreal in February 1986. Student satisfaction with their Outreach school is measured as a function of background characteristics, and ten motivational factors leading to the return to school.

The following research questions are addressed:

1. What are the personal characteristics of Outreach students
   with respect to:
   age;
   sex;
   time out of school;
   previous educational level;
   time required to attain secondary V leaving certificate?

2. What reasons do Montreal Outreach students state as primary
   motivators for returning to school?

3. Do differences in motivation exist between sub-groups which
   differ in background characteristics?

4. To what extent are Montreal Outreach students satisfied with
   their present school experience?

5. To what extent is satisfaction different according to
   background characteristics?

6. Are there differences in student satisfaction between various
   Montreal Outreach schools?

7. What is the relationship between satisfaction with school and factors motivating return?

1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS

Dropout

For the purposes of the present study the term dropout refers to any student who has left the regular system.

P.S.B.G.M.

The Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal; an autonomous public school board in the Province of Quebec responsible for the education of children who are not of the Catholic faith, and who live in the city of Montreal and its neighbouring suburbs.

Outreach System

The group of schools under the jurisdiction of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal catering to the needs of dropouts.

College d' Enseignement General et Professionel (C.E.G.E.P.)

An public institution in the Province of Quebec responsible for the education of students during the years following completion of high school, and prior to entry into university.

M. E. Q.

Ministere de L' Education du Quebec. The Quebec Ministry of Education.

Expressed Motivators

Those reasons identified by individual participants as their motive(s) for participation in an Outreach program.

Satisfaction Factors

The various academic and interpersonal dimensions of the high
school environment on which the respondents were required to
rate their levels of satisfaction.

Background Characteristics

Demographic variables such as age, sex, time out of school,
which are used in the study as bases for subanalyses of
responses.

2.0 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The review of literature concentrates on three areas of
research concerning high school dropouts. Firstly, an
examination is made of the characteristics of dropouts. This
is followed by a discussion of alternative high school
programs aimed at those students who opt out of the regular
polyvalent secondary school. The review concludes with a
section dealing with literature relating to student
satisfaction with school. Although studies have tended to
concentrate on dropouts rather than those who return to school,
and alternative programs are mostly for non-dropout students,
it is believed that this review of research presents a
theoretical basis for the specific study of student
satisfaction within the Outreach schools in the Montreal area.

2.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT

Beck and Muia (1980) identify dropping out as the most
serious problem facing educators today. Grant (1975) states
that in the U.S.A. 25 per cent of children fail to complete
high school. The decision to drop out is rarely made
impulsively; in many cases, the dropout is "a person with

16

serious personality and environmental conflicts, rather than an immature personality who simply decides to walk away from his responsibilities (Millard, 1965, p. 24)".

Hicks (1969) describes a sequence of steps which typically precede the student's decision to leave school. First, he loses interest in his schoolwork; the consequence is lowered grades. He becomes frustrated and begins to skip class, thus coming in to conflict with the school authorities. Rebelling, he exhibits disruptive behaviour for which he is forced to leave class or is suspended from school. His parents become involved at this point which increases his defensiveness and negativism. This ultimately results in his decision to quit school.

Cervantes (1965) presents statistics that describe the "typical" dropout as more likely to be male than female (53% male; 47% female) and to be a slum dweller rather than a suburbanite. Typical affective characteristics of the dropout include low self-esteem, little desire for self growth, and limited commitment to accepted social values. Furthermore, the lower the socioeconomic level of his family, the greater is a student's chance of becoming a dropout (Bachman, 1972). Cervantes (1965) reports that 80% of the fathers and 70% of the mothers in dropouts' families did not complete high

17

school, and 30% and 25% respectively did not even finish sixth grade. In addition, dropping out is most frequent among children who come from large families or broken homes. Dropouts also report higher levels of parental punitiveness in their homes than do graduates (Cervantes, 1965, and Bachman, 1972).

2.2.1 Dropout Attitudes

Jones (1977) reports that dropouts nearly always display feelings of alienation (rootlessness, hopelessness, and estrangement) from their schools, homes, neighborhoods, and/or society in general. Students who have been rejected because of language, race, culture or religion are extremely susceptible to alienation. Potential dropouts' feelings of not belonging are compounded by retardation at school with the consequent separation from peers.

More recently, Fine and Rosenberg (1983) take issue with the portrait of dropouts as "hopeless, inadequate, or too poorly motivated to compete in traditional academic settings. They state,

> ...empirical data demonstrate that many
> adolescents who leave school are academically
> and intellectually above-average students,

18

keenly aware of the contradictions between
their academic learning and lived
experiences, critical of the meritocratic
ideology promoted in their schools, and
cognizant of race/class/gender discrimination
both in school and in the labor force. These
dropouts are often willing to challenge
authorities over a perceived injustice (Fine,
1983), and at the same time are unwilling to
accommodate to the social relationships and
definitions of knowledge that schools
legitimate... In rejecting this hidden
curriculum, dropouts in fact are resisting
the dominant ideology of school and work. But
their critique of schools has been
unrecognized - deligitimated by the
prevailing view that dropouts are deviant,
lazy, or inadequate (p. 259).

2.2.2 Academic Factors

Schreiber's (1962) research indicated that a poor student

who fails either of the first two grades has only a 20% chance

of graduating; he also found failure in the eigth or ninth

grade to be crucial in the student' decision to drop out.

Curley (1971) found that dropouts are held back five times

more often than are graduates. Howard and Anderson (1978)

observed that dropouts tend to have relatively poor grades and

a history of being held back in school. Kowalski and Cangemi

(1974) cite low reading ability, low IQ and low scholastic

aptitude as the primary predictors of dropping out. However,

Poole and Low (1982) find that while white male dropouts have

low academic potential, female dropouts have high academic

potential. Lajoie and Shore (1981) report that 19% of high

school dropouts can be classified as gifted, and that males who drop out are more assertive, independent, self-assured, and competitive than those who stay in school. This is corroborated by Fine (1983) who found that males and females who ultimately drop out, compared to students who remain in school, are significantly more likely to challenge an academic injustice when in school.

2.3 ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The past decade has seen an increase in the number of schools catering to students who do not wish to complete their education in the regular secondary school. This number is in addition to the traditional private schools that have always existed alongside the publicly funded system. Raywid (1984) identifies six characteristics common to most alternative schools. They are:

1. The alternative constitutes a distinct and identifiable administrative unit, with its own personnel and program. Moreover, substantial effort is likely to be addressed to creating a strong sense of affiliation with the unit.

2. Structures and processes generative of school climate are held important and receive considerable attention within the unit.

3. Students as well as staff enter the alternative as a matter of choice rather than assignment.

4. The alternative is designed to respond to particular needs, desires, or interests not otherwise met in local schools, resulting in a program that is distinctly different from that of other schools in the area.

5. The impetus to launching the alternative, as well as its design, comes from one or more of the groups to be most immediately affected by the program: teachers, students, and parents.

6. Alternative schools generally address a broader range of student development than just the cognitive or academic. Typically, the sort of person the learner is becoming is a matter of first concern (p. 71).

2.3.1 Organizational Structure

Schools of choice have a different feel and flavor from conventional schools. They tend to elicit different responses from the people involved in working and learning in them. A number of aspects of the way alternatives are put together and operate daily have been identified as major contributors to their distinctive climates. Analysts have pointed to the importance of choice in this regard (deCharms, 1977; Fantini, 1973; Grant, 1981). This is perceived as giving an initial advantage to the chooser, and also serves to heighten the investment in what has been chosen. Collectively, the choosers constitute a more coherent group than do the students, staff, and parents of a comprehensive high school deliberately planned to bring all preferences and persuasions under a common roof. The importance of likemindedness has been

21

emphasized in the recent effective school research by Rutter
(1979) and Schneider (1982-83).

Raywid (1984) points out that in alternative schools
students retain the final power to opt out if they are
sufficiently dissatisfied. This right alone tends to make for
a community of civility and respectful interaction. It is also
commonly noted by students who have rejected conventional
schools that the alternatives differ most by virtue of their
"caring" teachers. Where teachers are so perceived, and
relationships are marked by trust, formal enfranchisement may
appear less vital to having one's own concerns taken into
account (Raywid, 1984). Erikson (1982) observed that it was
the difference between Gesselshaft and Gemeinschaft - between
a formally constituted group held together by regulations, and
a genuine community bound by common, mutual sentiments and
understandings. Raywid (1984) concludes that these distinctive
elements in the climate of schools of choice seem closely tied
to the remarkable levels of satisfaction of both students and
their parents. Student attitudes toward school are widely
reported to change for the better in alternative schools (Barr
and others, 1977; Doob, 1977; Duke and Muzio, 1978), and the
attitude of parents towards these schools is consistently
reported as unusually positive (Fleming and others, 1982;
Metz, 1981). Graduates of alternative schools continue to see

22

their former school as a place where they received help that proved relevant and adequate to their post-high school pursuits (Nathan, 1981; Phillips, 1977).

Alternative schools have addressed the problems of the most educationally challenging groups. Today there are large numbers of schools in the United States dealing with particular groups and problems, as well as others reflecting a representative cross-section of the student population. Programs targeted for disruptive youngsters, underachievers, dropouts, and other "at risk" youngsters have provided instances of impressive success (Raywid 1984). They appear particularly effective in improving student attitudes towards school and learning (Foley and McConnaughy, 1982; Mann and Gold, 1980), self-concept and self-esteem (Arnove and Stout, 1978), attendance (Foley and McConnaughy, 1982; Wehlage, 1982), and behaviour (Duke and Perry, 1978; Wehlage, 1982). They also lead to greater academic accomplishment on the part of those students variously known as "marginal", "resistant", and simply "at risk" (Arnove and Stout 1978; Foley and McConnaughy, 1982).

Raywid (1984) offers the following highlights from her survey of research on schools of choice:

23

1. For all types of students, from the neediest to the most outstanding, alternatives seem to produce significant growth and achievement: cognitive, social, and affective.

2. Both attendance and student behaviour improve in schools of choice.

3. Alternative schools prove highly attractive to those who are associated with them - staff, students, and parents.

4. The success of alternative schools is variously attributed to the benefits of smallness, choice, climate, and degree of staff autonomy.

5. Alternatives manage to "personalize" the school environment and to make it a genuine community of individuals.

6. The two instructional modes most distinctive of alternative schools are independent study and experiental learning.

7. Alternatives appear to have institutionalized diversity. They exist in varying types and appear to be a well-established feature of the educational map (p. 76).

2.4 STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL

Many educators are concerned over the satisfaction of students with their schools. There has, however, been little systematic investigation in the area of student satisfaction (Duke, 1976; Epstein & McPartland, 1976). Instruments do exist to assess general student attitudes toward school (Arlin & Hills, 1974, Berk, Rose & Stewart, 1970; Coster, 1958; Dunn, 1968; Glick, 1970; Greenberg, Gerver, Chall, & Davidson, 1965; Meier & McDaniel, 1974; Neale, Gill & Tismer, 1970; Neale &

24

Proshek, 1967; Perney, 1975; Roshal, Freize, & Wood, 1971; Zeligs, 1966). Student attitudes have been compared in a number of areas and some consistent findings are reported. In general attitudes become more negative as grade level increases (Arlin & Hills, 1974; Coster, 1958; Dunn 1968; Epstein & McPartland, 1976; Neale & Proshek, 1967). No consistent relationship has been established between student attitude and socio-economic level (Berk et.al., 1970; Coster, 1958; Deitrich & Jackson, 1969; Dunn, 1968; Glick, 1970). Small but statistically significant positive relationships have been established between positive attitude toward school and grade point average as well as performance on standardized achievement tests (Beelick, 1973; Brodie, 1964; DuCette & Wolk, 1972; Epstien & McPartland, 1976; Malpass, 1958; Meier & McDaniel, 1974; Neale et. al., 1970). Other positive correlates of student attitudes reported in the litérature include educational and vocational plans (Beelick, 1973; Epstein & McPartland, 1976), opportunity for class participation and time spent on homework (Epstein & McPartland, 1976), school size (Barker & Gump, 1964), popularity among peers (Glick, 1970), and psychological functioning (Jackson & Getzels, 1959).

Isherwood and Hammah (1981) conducted a study to investigate the impact of selected home-setting and

25

school-setting factors on students' attitudes towards school.
The sample consisted of 2,116 subjects drawn from 33 schools
in Quebec. They found that with the individual as the unit of
analysis, the salient predictor of a student's attitude toward
school was the use of mother, father, and siblings as
referents. In the home setting, the family's socio economic
status was not linked to a student's attitude to school:
students across SES groups had similar reactions to school
life. In this study, more-positive school climates were
reported in lower-SES communities. In schools in which
students tended to refer to their teachers more often, the
students had more-positive attitudes towards school than in
other schools. In contrast, in schools in which students
tended to refer to friends in their classes more often, the
students had more-negative reactions to school, to work, and
to the teacher. They concluded that different student-teacher
relationships could be a function of the openness of the
classroom organization or of other teacher and student
characteristics, teaching styles or philosophies, or school
organizational variables.

Betz (1969), and Homans (1961) found that reinforcers
available in the work environment were related to levels of
satisfaction of employees. Brassard (1979) proposed a theory
of "reinforcement density" to account for findings in the

26

literature on job satisfaction. She proposed that job
satisfaction could be predicted using a measure of
reinforcement density, defined as the product of the perceived
frequency with which certain reinforcers are available and the
value that they hold for the individual. Brassard concluded
that the availability of reinforcement alone accounted for
more of the variance in job satisfaction than previous
measures. Social learning theory has demonstrated that
individuals do not necessarily have to receive reinforcement
themselves in order for an outcome to change their behaviour
(Bandura & Walters, 1963). If an individual observes others
being rewarded for their behaviour, this will often
generalize, and the person's own behaviour will change as a
result.

Colton and White (1985) applied Brassard's (1979) theory
of reinforcement density to the area of school satisfaction.
It was hypothesized that student satisfaction could be
explained as a function of the perceived availability and
importance of reinforcing events in the school environment.
The more satisfying or rewarding resources that are present in
or correlated with a situation, the higher the level of
satisfaction an individual should report. Conversely,
dissatisfaction would result from a lack of reinforcing events

and/or the presence of punishing ones. The school environment
provides a variety of opportunities for students, including
academic and extracurricular activities and interactions
between other students and the staff. Colton and White (1985)
proposed that all these areas were possible sources of
reinforcement for students, and satisfaction would be
influenced by a combination of positively or negatively valued
resources in these areas.

Colton and White (1985) noted that the perceived
availability of positively valued resources explained 45% of
student satisfaction with the high school environment.
Suburban females reported slightly lower levels of perceived
availability of resources and satisfaction with school.
However, differences between male and female students were
more qualitative than quantitative and were mostly in academic
areas and interactions with the administration and faculty.
City students reported higher levels of satisfaction than
suburban students. Colton and White (1985) concluded that
student satisfaction may be explained as a function of the
perceived availability of positively valued resources in the
school environment. If schools can increase the availability
of those aspects of school life that students find important
to have, then it is likely that the students will be more

satisfied and engage in more school-related behaviours.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

As a teacher in a PSBGM Outreach school, the author had a personal interest in the issues addressed in this study. Having participated in the planning, creation, and development of a school for dropouts it was apparent that such schools responded to a need, and served an important function for certain youngsters who could not continue in the regular system. Each year the Outreach schools easily attracted students, most of whom were admitted entirely on their own initiative, rather than being sent to the schools. Once in school most progressed better than they had done in the past, and seemed generally happier. The obvious success of the PSBGM Outreach schools nevertheless posed some important questions with regards to the students who returned and their experiences in the alternative system.

Although some dropouts do return to school, many are not sufficiently motivated. It was beyond the scope of the present study, but it would be interesting to examine the differences between those who decide to return, and those who do not. It would be instructive to understand why the latter are not sufficiently motivated to return, and to find out what would

motivate them.

This study concentrates on those adolescents who are motivated to seek places in alternative school programs. It asks what motivates them to return to school, and then it examines their levels of satisfaction with their new school experience. In order to do this, an instrument was developed to elicit responses to pertinent questions on motivation for return, and satisfaction with school. A pilot study was first undertaken to aid in the development of the test questionnaire. The pilot study did three things. First, it tested the feasibility of collecting data in Outreach schools. Second, it tested the proposed instrument, and third, it helped refine the questions to be asked. This is dealt with in more detail in the subsequent sections.

This chapter describes in detail the experimental design, instrument development, sampling techniques, and procedures followed in the study.

3.2 PILOT STUDY

As noted above, one important function of the pilot study was to examine the feasibility of testing in the Outreach schools. It was first necessary to develop an appropriate

31

instrument, and to test it in the school setting. This was done by taking an existing questionnaire which addressed the question of satisfaction among high school students, and having it completed in one regular high school and one Outreach school in Montreal. In this way it was possible to assess it applicability to the general Quebec context by comparing results obtained with the original findings.

Colton and White (1985) developed an instrument to evaluate satisfaction among 411 high school students in five New York schools. Their Students and their Schools (SATS) questionnaire was designed to assess the perceived availability, value and satisfaction with various aspects of high school. A description of this amended instrument is given in the section on instrument design.

During the month of February 1986 a pilot study was conducted in two schools using a modified version of the Colton and White (1985) questionnaire. The instrument was found to perform well in both situations. Students found it generally clear and completed it in twenty to thirty minutes.

The pilot study enabled a limited comparison between the samples for the two schools. Mean totals on Value and Availability (two subscales of the instrument) were very

similar in both schools. Value totals were close to those found in the New York study, and Availability scores were slightly higher. However, the mean totals for Satisfaction were significantly higher in the Outreach school (P <.01), and were higher than those found in the New York high schools. The Outreach students also rated their school significantly higher than students in the regular school. (Means 8.6 and 4.6 on a 0-9 scale; P <.01).

3.3 PROCEDURE

3.3.1 Population

As explained in the introduction there are a variety of approaches in Quebec to the problem of reintroducing dropouts to the school system. Several school boards have isolated programs, but only the PSBGM in the Montreal area has a network of schools dedicated to the education of former dropouts. In this particular board there are Outreach places for students as young as thirteen, and as old as twenty. There are programs for academically weak students as well as the very capable. There are two schools with furniture refinishing and woodworking programs that will accept teenagers who are virtually illiterate. There is one program that operates in French, and addresses the specific needs of recent Haitian

33

immigrants to Montreal who have severe problems integrating into the existing French schools. Other schools cover compulsory and elective courses leading to secondary V certification by the Ministry of Education. It was within this network of small, autonomous schools that enquiry was concentrated.

3.3.2 Permission to Test

Written permission to test in the Outreach schools was sought from the Director of Student Services of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal under whose jurisdiction the schools fall. Each school also has a Principal, although in only one case does this administrator occupy the same physical location as the school. Verbal permission was also sought from the principals concerned. Once permission was granted the cooperation of the head teachers of targeted schools was solicited. In addition, a certificate of ethical acceptability for research involving human subjects was granted by the Ethical Review Committee of the Faculty of Education of McGill University.

3.3.3 Instrument Design

Prior to data collection the instrument used in the pilot study was amended and refined. A section dealing with motivation was added, sections dealing with Value and Availability of reinforcers of Satisfaction in the school environment were eliminated, and some satisfaction variables were removed to shorten the final instrument. Precise details are given later.

3.3.4 Data Collection

The month of November was chosen for testing as the students were sufficiently close to the beginning of the year to have a clear recollection of what had motivated their application to the school they were attending, and yet had spent sufficient time in the program to be able to evaluate their level of satisfaction with its various components.

All data collection was carried out in the schools concerned during school hours. The nature and purposes of the inquiry was explained prior to completion of the questionnaires, and the cooperation of the students sought. In this way informed consent was assured. During the testing period participants were discouraged from seeking

interpretation of questions and were not permitted to discuss their responses with anyone. The questionnaire took approximately fifteen minutes to complete.

3.4 SAMPLING

As outlined earlier, the PSBGM Outreach system catering specifically to the needs of high school dropouts comprises eight separate units. For the purposes of the present study three of the eight were excluded. The first two left out were those in which the students spent a large part of their day in work simulation (workshop) activities. It was felt that this differentiated these schools markedly from the others. The French school was also excluded because of the difficulties inherent in collecting data in French, and because the school served the needs of one specific group of recent immigrants to Montreal, which formed a separate and distinct group within the larger community.

Data were, therefore, collected from the remaining five Outreach schools under the jurisdiction of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal. The response rate was 67.2% of the total student enrollment for the five schools surveyed. Data collection was done by questionnaire. Consideration was given to randomly selecting respondents from the target

population and mailing the questionnaire. This procedure was rejected, though, because of the likelihood of a very high non-response rate. Two reasons for this were thought to be that addresses are sometimes out of date, and secondly, that high school students are unlikely to be motivated to complete and return a questionnaire mailed to their homes. For these reasons it was decided to have the questionnaires completed in the schools by all students present at the time the testing was done. In the case of three schools responses from absent students were returned later. Table 1 shows the Questionnaire Response Rate. There are several reasons for the wide variations in rate of response. Students tested were those in the school at the particular time chosen to test. Several schools have a certain number of their students in the community doing volunteer work for part of each day. Such students may not have been in school during the testing period. Total enrollment figures refer to the number of students actually enrolled on September 30th. Subsequent departures would lower the number present in school as well as the normal incidence of daily absentees. School 4 has only half its yearly enrollment during the first half of the year, so the response rate is high when considered as a fraction of the number of students actually under instruction at the time of testing. Two schools returned a total of six questionnaires completed by students absent on the testing day.

37

Table 1

Questionnaire Response Rate

Institution	Total Enrollment	Questionnaires Returned	
		N	%
School 1	36	33	92
School 2	50	29	58
School 3	45	16	36
School 4	25	18	40
School 5	45	39	87

N = Number of respondents (Total = 135)

Generalization to a wider population must be done carefully in a study such as this. Many dropouts are not sufficiently motivated to return to school, and therefore, cannot be considered part of the same population. Programs aimed at dropouts take so many forms that it would be unwise to assume that findings in the present study could be generalized to other alternative schools catering to dropouts. The present findings, then, may be said to be reflective of the conditions existing in the five schools of the PSBGM Outreach system in which investigation was done.

3.5 INSTRUMENT

3.5.1 Motivation

The study was to explore the reasons which motivated dropouts to return to school. It was necessary to develop questions relating specifically to this area of concern. In order to determine which factors should be included to determine motivation, teachers with experience in interviewing students for acceptance in Outreach schools were asked to suggest reasons cited by prospective applicants. This list was further examined by former Outreach students, and their suggestions were evaluated prior to the final selection. The

resulting ten factors were believed to include those most commonly cited as reasons for returning to school by students seeking places in Outreach schools. Subjects were asked to rate the factors on a six point scale in response to the question "To what extent were the following factors important in your decision to return to school?" Five of the questions selected addressed educational concerns and aspirations (e.g. To complete my high school education). The remaining five questions dealt with factors in the subjects background (e.g. "My friends encouraged me", and "I could not get a job"). A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix 1.

3.5.2 Satisfaction

Colton and White (1985) developed an instrument to evaluate satisfaction among 411 high school students in five New York schools. Their Students and their Schools, (SATS) questionnaire was designed to assess the perceived availability, value and satisfaction with various aspects of high school. It contained a list c thirty five items on which students were asked to rate the extent to which they were satisfied with that aspect of school, how important it was to have or not to have (its value), and how often it was true for their school (its availability). Responses of the students on each item were scored from a low of 1 (extremely dissatisfied,

40

extremely important not to have, almost never true) to a high
of 6 on the satisfaction and value scales (extremely
satisfied, extremely important to have) or a 5 on the
availability scale (almost always true). Total scores for
availability, ranging from 35 to 175, and value and
satisfaction, ranging from 35 to 210, were obtained by summing
the individual scores on all items in that section.
Reinforcement density, as defined by Brassard (1979), was
computed by summing the product of the value times
availability ratings for each of the 35 items.

In addition, several general satisfaction questions were
included on Colton and White's (1985) instrument as a measure
of the reliability of general and composite (total) measures
of satisfaction. Students were also asked for some background
information.

The development of Colton and White's (1985) SATS
questionnaire involved collecting items from several sources.
Students in a suburban high school were asked about the
various aspects of their school that they liked or disliked.
Their responses were combined with factors from the literature
and items that appear on popular instruments measuring student
attitudes. In addition, guidance counselors from schools in
the sample were asked what they perceived as being the most

41

important areas in determining student satisfaction with school. Many of the items included were found in more than one source, so SATS was believed to be a comprehensive coverage of those areas of high school that are positively valued by students.

The satisfaction component of the questionnaire used in the pilot study was found to be an adequate basis for the present study. As the purpose of the present study was to investigate motivation and satisfaction among Outreach students, the sections dealing with Value and Availability in the Colton and White (1985) study were eliminated. With respect to the reliability of their choice of questions Colton and White (1985) state," The total composite satisfaction score...was correlated with various questions about general levels of satisfaction. Correlation coefficients ranged from r = 0.31 to r = 0.56, with a mean of r = 0.49 for the total population" (p. 238). They interpreted the wide variability to indicate that the use of a single item to measure satisfaction was probably less reliable than a composite measure assessing many specific components of satisfaction. Test - retest of the SATS instrument two weeks apart yielded mean reliability coefficients of r = 0.76 for the total satisfaction score. The readability of SATS was estimated to be on a ninth-grade level (Fry, 1968). The findings for this study are reported

42

for both the composite score on satisfaction and the item by item analysis.

An examination of the original Colton and White (1985) study showed that a number of questions were concerned with factors not applicable to Outreach schools. These were such areas as relationships with school administration, and extra curricular sports activities. These questions were eliminated for the purposes of the present study. One question was added. This dealt with the application of school rules. The way school rules are applied in regular schools is often cited as a source of dissatisfaction by Outreach students. In consequence, a question dealing with the way rules and regulations are applied in Outreach schools was included.

3.5.3 Background Characteristics

In order to discern differences in responses between various respondents, subjects were asked to supply background information in six areas. The were asked for their age in years, their sex, and the name of the school they were currently attending. They were also asked to give information on three factors concerned with their academic achievement. They were asked to indicate the level of scholarity they had achieved in their previous school, the number of years they

43

estimated it would take to complete their high school
education, and the time they had spent out of school.

3.5.4 Final Instrument

In order to answer the research questions for the present
study a 38 item questionnaire was developed. This is included
as Appendix 1. The first section asked respondents to rank ten
factors of motivation on a six point scale in answer to the
question, "To what extent were the following factors important
in your decision to return to school?" They were scored from a
high of 6 (very much) to a low of 1 (none). This was followed
by 22 questions dealing with satisfaction with school.
Respondents were asked to reply to the question, "How
satisfied are you with these aspects of your school?"
Responses were scored on a six point scale where a high of 6
represented "extremely satisfied", and a low of one
represented "extremely dissatisfied". The similarity of the
two scales contributed to a desired overall simplicity in the
instrument design. The questionnaire concluded with six
questions concerning the personal background of the subject.
In order to ensure confidentiality respondents were asked not
to place their names on the questionnaires.

3.6 ANALYSIS

Quantitative information was sought in this study. The questions were coded and analyzed by computer. Frequency distributions were obtained for all variables. Descriptive statistics were sought for all ordinal variables.

T-tests were computed for all paired comparisons, but were reported only when overall group differences were statistically significant.

Analysis of variance was performed across intervening variables of age, last grade successfully completed in previous school, time out of school, and school attended.

Pearson product-moment correlations were used to measure the association between variables of motivation for return to school, and satisfaction with school.

A factor analysis was also performed on the satisfaction items. However, results are not reported as they are beyond the scope of the study.

3.7 LIMITATIONS

3.7.1 The findings in the study are restricted to dropouts who are sufficiently motivated to return to alternative schools.

3.7.2 It is not possible to determine on the basis of the results of this study the exact population represented by students in PSBGM Outreach schools. It may not, therefore, be possible to generalize findings to students in other Outreach type schools in other school boards.

3.7.3 The experimental design was ex-post facto. That is, data were collected only from subjects participating in Outreach programs.

3.7.4 Two items on the satisfaction scale caused confusion in some respondents. They were questions concerning negative factors; favouritism in school, and the extent to which teachers were interested only in good students. Several subjects indicated they were not sure whether low incidence on these factors should be scored low or high. It is, therefore, possible that data on these variables are not valid.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and discusses the findings of the study. The chapter is organized according to the various research questions, and data are displayed in tables as appropriate. Several analyses yielded few significant results. In these cases tables of results are not included. Where such data are mentioned a full explanation of the values and tests of statistical significance are given in the text.

4.2 PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF OUTREACH STUDENTS

Research Question #1: What are the characteristics of Montreal Outreach students with respect to age, sex, time out of school, previous educational level, and time required to graduate?

Table 2 shows the age and sex characteristics of respondents. It indicates that the majority of students attending the Outreach programs are sixteen years of age or older (81.4%). As this is the age at which compulsory schooling ends in Quebec it is to be expected that the dropout rate would rise at this point. It should also be noted,

47

Table 2

<u>Age and Sex Characteristics of Students</u>
<u>Enrolled in Outreach Schools</u>

Characteristic	N	%
Age		
13 Years	1	0.7
14 Years	6	4.4
15 Years	18	13.3
16 Years	27	27.4
17 Years	40	29.6
18 Years	25	18.5
Over 18 Years	8	5.9
Total	135	100.0
Sex		
Male	72	53.3
Female	63	46.7
Total	135	100.0

N = Number of respondents

however, that most of the participating schools actively seek students at the secondary IV and secondary V level. Lost schooling and poor academic performance normally results in Outreach students being at least one full academic year behind their chronological peers. This is reflected in the high number (54%) of respondents who are seventeen years or older. Most of these students would normally have graduated.

Table 2 also shows the composition of respondents by sex. The ratio of 53.3% males to 46.7% females is consistent with the findings of Cervantes (1965) for dropouts (53% males; 47% females).

Table 3 displays sample characteristics concerning academic background. With respect to the last grade successfully completed in respondents' previous school, it can be seen that many have had some success in regular high school. Sixty-six percent (66%) have completed grade nine or better. These are students working at a grade 10 or 11 level in their Outreach school. There is a slight discrepancy in that seventy three percent (73%) report that they have no more than two more years of high school left (including the present one). The difference is possibly explained by those students who are received by an Outreach school with very poor prior academic reports. Because of age such students are sometimes

49

Table 3

Last Grade Successfully Completed, Time to Complete,
and Time Out of School Among Students
Enrolled in Outreach Programs

Characteristic	N	%
Last grade successfully completed in previous school		
Less than 8th	28	20.7
8th	18	13.3
9th	39	28.9
10th	50	37.0
Total	135	100.0
Years to complete high school		
In last year	59	43.7
One year remaining	39	28.9
Two years remaining	16	11.9
Three years remaining	15	11.1
More than three years remaining	6	4.4
Total	135	100.0
Time out of school		
Never dropped out	73	54.1
One to three months	23	17.0
Four to six months	10	7.4
Six months to one year	18	13.3
More than one year	11	8.1
Total	135	100.0

N = Number of respondents

50

rapidly advanced to grade 10 work where they are found to perform adequately. These respondents would correctly recognize that they have two years of schooling left, although they have not successfully passed grade nine.

The schools of the Outreach system are designed specifically to address the concerns of dropouts. It is perhaps surprising that such a large proportion of respondents (54.1%) answered that they "had never really dropped out" of school. None of the schools in the study has a requirement that candidates be out of school for any fixed period of time before being admitted. It appears that many students use this fact to find a place in an alternative school before they completely sever their connections with their old school. To this number must be added students who are encouraged or required to leave by administrators and who move directly to an Outreach school upon the recommendation of a school official. They, too, probably feel they have not dropped out, but have been required to find an alternative school.

4.3 FACTORS INFLUENCING STUDENT DECISIONS TO RETURN TO SCHOOL

Research question #2: What reasons do Montreal Outreach students state as primary motivators for returning to school?

Ten factors were listed as possible reasons for returning to school. Respondents were asked to rank the importance of each on a six point scale ranging from 1 (none) to 6 (very much). Table 4 displays means, standard deviations, and overall rankings in importance of each motivator. Results indicate that factors such as the desire to complete high school, to continue education at the C.E.G.E.P. level, and the improvement of basic academic skills (including French, which is important for anglophones in Quebec) are more important motivating factors than those concerning students' personal lives. Outreach students do not appear to be driven to their alternative schools by negative factors in their personal environments. Rather, they are drawn to school by traditional academic factors including the desire to acquire cognitive skills.

These findings support the conclusions of Fine and Rosenberg (1983) that dropouts are keenly aware of the contradictions between their academic learning and lived experiences. Outreach students are above all, looking for the

Table 4

Motivation Factors Influencing Decisions
to Attend Outreach Programs

Factor	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank
1. TO COMPLETE EDUCATION	5.68	0.77	1
2. TO IMPROVE MATH & ENGLISH SKILLS	4.31	1.45	3
3. TO IMPROVE FRENCH SKILLS	3.99	1.60	4
4. TO LEARN JOB SKILLS	3.68	1.72	5
5. TO ENTER CEGEP	4.65	1.81	2
6. ENCOURAGED BY FRIENDS	2.74	1.73	6
7. TO AVOID OLD FRIENDS	2.69	1.87	7
8. BORED AT HOME	2.33	1.64	8
9. UNABLE TO GET A JOB	1.75	1.39	9
10. TO QUALIFY FOR WELFARE	1.48	1.15	10

Notes:

$\bar{X}$ = Mean (135 Cases)
SD = Standard Deviation (135 Cases)

Items calculated for means based on
the following scale

1 = none	2 = very little
3 = little	4 = moderate
5 = much	6 = very much

academic success that eluded them in the regular high school.
It is heartening to note that many such adolescents have their
sights set on post secondary education. Seventy four
respondents (54.8%) replied that they were very much
influenced by the desire to enter C.E.G.E.P. in their decision
to return to school. When being interviewed for admission to
Outreach schools, students often comment that they wish to
avoid returning to their old schools because they want to
avoid old friends who were a bad influence. They also commonly
cite boredom at home or poor experiences in the world of work
as contributing factors. Nevertheless, the findings of this
study show that these reasons do not rate highly in their
decision to return. Only 17 (12.6%) rated boredom at home as
important or very important, while 9 (6.7%) responded in a
similar way with respect to their inability to obtain a job.
Fine and Rosenberg (1983) note that dropouts reject the hidden
curriculum of the traditional school; are "unwilling to
accommodate to the social relationships and definitions of
knowledge that schools legitimate ... In rejecting this hidden
curriculum, dropouts are in fact resisting the dominant
ideology of school and work. But their critique of schools has
been unrecognized - delegitimated by the prevailing view that
dropouts are deviant, lazy, or inadequate" (p. 259). The
present study indicated that returnees to school were highly
motivated by the desire to excel in the traditional way. That

54

is, they wanted to improve their basic academic skills in the traditional subjects such as math and English, and they wanted to graduate. In this respect they did not seem to be rejecting the "definitions of knowledge that schools legitimate", but they do appear to want the knowledge imparted in a different educational setting with a different organizational structure. This group of dropouts which has decided to continue its education in alternative schools may well be rejecting the hidden curriculum of the regular system, and attempting to obtain an equivalent education in a different arena.

4.4 DIFFERENCES IN MOTIVATION BETWEEN SUB-GROUPS

Research Question #3: Do differences in motivation exist between sub-groups which differ in background characteristics?

4.4.1 Age.

Table 5 shows differences in motivational factors according to age of respondents. Those aged under 15 (n = 7) and over 18 (n = 8) were too few for satisfactory analysis, and so were excluded. Factor #1, (To complete my high school education), was the highest ranking factor overall, and was most important at each age analyzed. In fact means increased

Table 5

Difference In Return Motivators According to Age

	Age in Years								
	15 (N=18)		16 (N=37)		17 (N=40)		18 (N=25)		
Factor	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	F-Value
1. TO COMPLETE EDUCATION	5.06	1.16	5.73	0.66	5.80	0.73	5.92	0.28	5.82**
2. TO IMPROVE MATH & ENGLISH SKILLS	4.33	1.03	4.19	1.47	4.35	1.66	4.56	1.36	0.32
3. TO IMPROVE FRENCH SKILLS	3.78	1.59	3.67	1.78	3.90	1.66	4.56	1.26	1.62
4. TO LEARN JOB SKILLS	4.67	1.41	3.27	1.68	3.35	1.88	4.16	1.43	4.07**
5. TO ENTER CEGEP	3.22	2.36	4.67	1.58	4.90	1.69	5.40	1.19	6.21**
6. ENCOURAGED BY FRIENDS	3.22	1.80	2.46	1.68	2.93	1.78	2.76	1.90	0.86
7. TO AVOID OLD FRIENDS	2.72	2.05	2.81	2.03	2.45	1.92	3.08	1.63	0.58
8. BORED AT HOME	2.78	1.56	2.11	1.63	2.53	1.59	2.12	1.81	0.99
9. UNABLE TO GET A JOB	3.00	2.00	1.27	0.65	1.70	1.27	1.60	1.32	7.68**
10. TO QUALIFY FOR WELFARE	2.33	1.65	1.08	0.36	1.55	1.34	1.28	0.84	5.66**

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05
** = significant at p = 0.01

N = number of cases   X̄ = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on a scale of
1 = none   2 = very little
3 = little   4 = moderate
5 = much   6 = very much

56

with age, indicating perhaps, that the goal of attaining a high school leaving certificate becomes more important as teenagers see themselves passing the normal graduation age.

Younger students (age = 15) were significantly more motivated by the desire to acquire job skills (#4) than their older confreres. All groups were similarly motivated towards the improvement of basic skills (#2, #3), but the younger respondents, seeing graduation and C.E.G.E.P. several years away, were more inclined to be looking for job skills when they sought a place in an alternative school. This was reinforced by the finding that students were more motivated by the desire to enter C.E.G.E.P. (#5) as they grew older.

Although there were several significant differences in responses to variables #9 and #10 (inability to obtain a job, and acquisition of Social Security benefits), the variations were not considered to be very important. Table 5 shows that means for these variables ranged between 1.08 and 1.70 on a scale of importance where one indicated "none". The factors themselves were clearly of little importance to respondents generally.

4.4.2 Sex.

Motivation factors were very similar for boys and girls. For this reason no table of results is included. Only factor #8 (I was bored at home) showed a significant difference. Girls ranked this higher than boys. (Mean for boys = 2.00; Mean for girls = 2.70. p = 0.013). This suggests that adolescent boys and girls are similarly motivated with respect to return to school despite the very obvious differences in habits and interests during these years.

4.4.3 Last Grade Successfully Completed in Previous School.

Table 6 shows results for motivation factors according to the students' last grade successfully completed in their previous high schools. Not surprisingly those who had successfully completed grade ten were most motivated by factor #1 (To complete my high school education). The highest mean (4.29) for variable #4 (To learn job skills) was reported by those students with less than grade eight successfully completed. This was consistent with responses to variable #5 (To enter C.E.G.E.P.) where those without grade eight were found to be significantly less motivated than all other groups when T-Tests between group means were performed (p = < 0.01). These findings indicate that students return to school for

Table 6

<u>Differences in Return Motivators According to
Last Grade Successfully Completed
in Previous School</u>

Factor	Less than 8th (N=28)		8th (N=18)		9th (N=39)		10th (N=50)		F-Value
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
1. TO COMPLETE EDUCATION	5.25	1.14	5.61	0.98	5.72	0.69	5.92	0.27	4.90**
2. TO IMPROVE MATH & ENGLISH SKILLS	4.25	1.18	4.78	1.35	4.38	1.44	4.12	1.64	0.95
3. TO IMPROVE FRENCH SKILLS	3.68	1.68	4.17	1.89	3.80	1.53	4.24	1.52	1.02
4. TO LEARN JOB SKILLS	4.29	1.49	4.17	2.12	3.60	1.66	3.42	1.68	2.53*
5. TO ENTER CEGEP	2.93	2.07	4.94	1.43	4.80	1.54	5.40	1.34	15.05**
6. ENCOURAGED BY FRIENDS	2.54	1.45	3.61	2.09	2.74	1.65	2.54	1.78	1.88
7. TO AVOID OLD FRIENDS	2.43	1.79	2.72	1.84	2.62	1.84	2.88	1.97	0.37
8. BORED AT HOME	2.50	1.77	2.67	1.57	2.33	1.69	2.10	1.57	0.67
9. UNABLE TO GET A JOB	2.00	1.67	1.89	1.57	2.00	1.47	1.36	0.99	2.14
10. TO QUALIFY FOR WELFARE	1.89	1.40	1.61	1.46	1.46	1.21	1.20	0.73	2.31

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05
** = significant at p = 0.01

N = Number of cases $\bar{X}$ = Mean SD = Standard Deviation

Note: Items calculated for means based on a scale of
1 = none   2 = very little
3 = little   4 = moderate
5 = much   6 = very much

different reasons depending more upon their past educational experience than their chronological age. Those who have had some past academic success are more likely to be concerned with high school graduation and post secondary studies, while those with fewer academic credits are more likely to be motivated by the acquisition of job skills.

4.4.4 Time Out of School Before Returning.

No significant differences were found when motivation factors were analysed in relation to the time students had spent out of school prior to their decision to return. It appears that Outreach students see their decision to leave the regular school system as an interruption in the attainment of their educational goals. When they decide to return, they are motivated by whatever factors were previously important to them. For example, students who were attending regular school in order to gain access to C.E.G.E.P. upon graduation are not likely to lose this as a factor of motivation as a result of being out of school for a longer or shorter period of time.

4.4.5 School Attended.

The schools of the PSBGM Outreach system are not homogeneous. Each has been encouraged to grow independently and to cater to a clientele of its own choosing. This means that prospective students will match their own needs with a particular Outreach school. For this reason it would be expected that there would be differences in factors of motivation between the participating schools. This is indeed so. Table 7 displays differences in return motivation according to school attended. Significant differences were found on factors #1 and #5 which relate to academic success. School 2 caters to academically capable pupils who can function at the grade ten or grade eleven level. This school has the highest scores for variables #1 and #5. Students in this environment are most likely to be clearly motivated by the desire to complete high school and to enter C.E.G.E.P. School 1 caters to the needs of younger students, and according to Quebec Ministry of Education norms has all its students designated as requiring special education. This school had the lowest scores for factors one and five.

In general the results for motivation, when separated by school attended, show that the students are guided in their choices by the particular nature of the school program. Those

Table 7

Differences in Return Motivators According to School

Factor	School 1 (N=33)		School 2 (N=29)		School 3 (N=16)		School 4 (N=18)		School 5 (N=39)		F-Value
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
1. TO COMPLETE EDUCATION	5.09	1.20	5.97	0.19	5.88	0.34	5.78	0.73	5.85	0.43	7.76**
2. TO IMPROVE MATH & ENGLISH SKILLS	4.33	1.16	4.55	1.33	4.31	1.54	4.83	1.65	3.87	1.59	1.69
3. TO IMPROVE FRENCH SKILLS	3.54	1.64	4.28	1.51	4.06	1.77	4.44	1.65	3.90	1.54	1.27
4. TO LEARN JOB SKILLS	4.24	1.46	3.59	1.68	3.50	2.03	3.33	1.85	3.36	1.69	2.18
5. TO ENTER CEGEP	3.24	2.09	5.79	0.62	4.94	1.39	4.61	1.82	4.90	1.62	10.36**
6. ENCOURAGED BY FRIENDS	2.91	1.65	2.52	1.73	2.50	1.93	2.50	1.76	2.97	1.78	0.53
7. TO AVOID OLD FRIENDS	2.76	1.97	2.69	1.95	2.31	1.74	3.00	2.09	2.64	1.76	0.30
8. BORED AT HOME	2.67	1.73	2.20	1.47	1.94	1.65	2.00	1.41	2.44	1.79	0.83
9. UNABLE TO GET A JOB	2.12	1.73	1.35	0.94	1.75	1.57	1.50	1.04	1.85	1.39	1.41
10. TO QUALIFY FOR WELFARE	1.88	1.34	1.28	1.06	1.38	1.26	1.33	1.19	1.39	0.96	1.39

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05
** = significant at p = 0.01

N = Number of cases $\bar{X}$ = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on a scale of
1 = none   2 = very little
3 = little   4 = moderate
5 = much   6 = very much

who are in a more highly academic setting recognize this in their replies, while those in programs offering instruction in basic skills requiring a subsequent transfer to another school are, in turn, less motivated with respect to high school graduation and C.E.G.E.P. entrance. This supports the view that dropouts are motivated and actively concerned with their futures as suggested by Fine and Rosenberg (1983). There are, of course, many dropouts who never return to school, and nothing may be said of them from the findings of this study, but the students surveyed appear to have found places in alternative schools according to their particular needs. All the participating schools interview prospective candidates in order to ensure a match between the student and the program. It is also done so that students may be given a straightforward and realistic appraisal of their needs and what a particular program is able to offer them. It is not uncommon for a student to be interviewed at several schools before being accepted by one. Outreach teachers frequently phone each other before deciding on student placements.

Choice has been noted by several researchers (deCharms, 1977; Fantini, 1973; Grant, 1981) as giving an initial advantage to the chooser. Rutter (1979) also cited likemindedness as instrumental in the creation of effective schools. In all PSBGM Outreach schools choice is an essential

63

ingredient for staff and student alike. It is hoped that students will know why they are being offered a place in an Outreach school, and will accept the place for the right reasons. There is evidence in this study that the procedures in place are successful in that the students are aware of the character of the program in which they are enrolled. Those in schools with a lower emphasis on high school completion are less likely to be motivated by graduation and post secondary education.

4.5 SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL

The second area of enquiry was the satisfaction with their alternative school expressed by Outreach students. Following the methodology of Colton and White (1985) a composite score for satisfaction was developed and analysed. Further, item by item analysis was performed on the individual factors of satisfaction included in the questionnaire. The following results are discussed both in terms of the composite (aggregate) score, and of responses to individual items on the instrument.

4.6 OVERALL SCHOOL SATISFACTION

Research question #4: To what extent are Montreal Outreach students satisfied with their present school experience?

Twenty two factors associated with satisfaction with school were presented to participating students who were asked to rank each on a six point scale where a low of one represented "extremely dissatisfied", and a high of six represented "extremely satisfied". Means, standard deviations, and overall rankings for these factors are presented in Table 8. The aggregate score represents the mean of the twenty-one

65

Table 8

Satisfaction Factors Associated with Attendance at an
Outreach School Ranked in Order of Importance

Factor	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank
11. TO SOCIALIZE WITH FRIENDS	4.45	1.53	16=
12. STRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS	4.46	1.40	15
13. ENJOYABLE LUNCH PERIOD	4.47	1.52	14
14. AMOUNT OF HOMEWORK	4.55	1.30	13
15. TEACHERS PRAISE STUDENTS	5.00	1.00	6
16. COMFORTABLE SEEKING HELP	5.18	1.20	3
17. STUDENTS FRIENDLY IN SCHOOL	4.72	1.25	12
18. HAVING DEDICATED TEACHERS	5.25	1.05	2
19. RECEIVING HIGH TEST MARKS	4.85	1.08	10
20. HAVING RELEVANT CLASSES	4.38	1.32	18
21. CONTACT WITH TEACHERS	4.77	1.21	11
22. PRESSURE TO DO WELL	4.45	1.30	16=
23. FAVOURITISM IN SCHOOL	4.18	1.51	19
24. GETTING A GOOD REPORT	5.33	0.90	1
25. INTERESTING TEACHING	5.14	1.00	4
26. CHOOSE OWN ACTIVITIES	4.07	1.49	20
27. WORK AT OWN PACE	4.88	1.30	9
28. GOOD STUDENTS FAVOURED	3.69	1.80	21
29. WORK IN SMALL GROUPS	4.91	1.08	7
30. ADULT TREATMENT OF STUDENTS	4.89	1.27	8
31. TEACHERS INTERESTED IN JOBS	5.11	0.97	5
32. GENERAL SATISFACTION a	5.28	0.95	-
AGGREGATE SCORE a	4.74	0.60	-

Notes:
a Factors not ranked.

$\bar{X}$ = Mean (135 cases)   SD = Standard Deviation (135 cases)

Items calculated for means based on a scale of
1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfie

individual factors. Variable #32 (General satisfaction) was not included for the purposes of calculating the aggregate mean. Results indicate that factor #24 (Getting a good report card) received the highest score (Mean = 5.33). Students in Outreach schools are certain to have had problems in their previous schools. In most cases these problems would have resulted in poor marks or poor attendance patterns which, in turn, would have been reflected in unsatisfactory report cards. Testing was done during the latter part of the month of November 1986. Respondents would have recently received a mid-term report card. The high satisfaction rating for this factor no doubt resulted from an overall marked improvement in report card results and comments. It was interesting to observe that this most tangible measure of performance is the one causing the most satisfaction in Outreach schools. The study showed that students were most motivated to return to school by factors concerned with academic achievement. It is perhaps not surprising that such students would look for evidence of success in their report cards which specifically measure these aspects of school life, and would express high levels of satisfaction if the reports were better than previous ones.

Raywid (1984) noted that students in alternative schools commonly state that the alternatives differ most by virtue of

their caring teachers. Ranked in positions two to six are factors #18, #16, #25, #31, and #15 respectively with means of 5.00 or better, indicating that students were satisfied or extremely satisfied in each case. All these factors are concerned specifically with teachers and teaching techniques. Regular high school students frequently complain that teachers are not interested in them, or that classes are so large that they do not receive any individual attention. Many dropouts cite these among their reasons for leaving school. The findings support Raywid (1984) in that the subjects in this study, who had formerly had little satisfaction in school, found the most satisfactory aspects of their alternative schools to be associated with their teachers.

It was beyond the scope of the present study to investigate teacher performance in Outreach schools so conclusions may not be drawn as to the reasons for the high level of satisfaction with this area expressed by the respondents, except that they are in conformity with other research on alternative schools. It may be that the teachers do in fact perform better in the Outreach schools, or the organizational structures may be better suited to the students' needs. However, from the point of view of the students concerned, it is clear that the teachers in the Outreach schools do make a difference.

In seventh place overall is factor #29 (Having the opportunity to work with others in small groups) with a mean of 4.91. The small group instruction that is much a part of all the participating schools may also be a contributing factor in the overall satisfactory performance of the teachers.

Overall means for individual satisfaction factors ranged from a high of 5.33 to a low of 3.69. This shows that the participating students are generally well satisfied with the aspects of their schools which were examined. Means are influenced by extreme scores, so information was sought with respect to the most typical or commonly occurring responses of respondents to the satisfaction factors. An examination of the modes of responses on each item showed the following. Ten factors were found to have a mode of 6, with a further ten factors receiving a mode of 5. This means that 20 of the 22 factors included in the survey were most commonly rated as satisfactory or extremely satisfactory by respondents. These high levels of satisfaction correspond with the findings of Raywid (1984) that schools of choice have remarkable levels of satisfaction of both students and their parents. This is particularly interesting in view of the fact that the population surveyed were students who had previously been so

dissatisfied with school that they had dropped out, and moved to an alternative school in frustration. These are not the students who are usually associated with schools of choice, nor are they typically the children of middle class parents actively seeking a better education for their youngsters. According to Cervantes (1965) they are more likely to be slum dwellers than suburbanites, and to have parents who did not graduate from high school. In addition dropping out is most common among children who come from large families or broken homes. Nevertheless, the findings indicate that the alternative schools examined were performing well for the population served.

4.7 DIFFERENCES IN OVERALL SATISFACTION ACCORDING TO BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS.

Research question #5 : To what extent is satisfaction different according to background characteristics?

In order to answer this question the aggregate satisfaction score, as well as individual item responses were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance.

An aggregate satisfaction score was obtained by summing the individual responses to the 21 questions on the instrument

dealing with various aspects of satisfaction and dividing by 21. The overall aggregate mean was found to be 4.74 (see Table 8, p.66).

In order to further examine the satisfaction of Outreach students with their schools an item by item analysis of all twenty one satisfaction factors was performed. Each variable was examined for differences according to the background characteristics of respondents. In certain instances few significant differences were found. In these cases no table of results is presented, and results are included in the text.

4.7.1 Age

No significant differences in overall satisfaction were found according to the age of the respondent. When individual satisfaction items were examined only one significant difference was found. On variable #13 (Having an enjoyable lunch period), the youngest group analysed (those aged 15 years) were the least satisfied (F-Value = 5.78; $p < 0.01$). No table of results is presented.

71

4.7.2 Sex

No significant differences in overall satisfaction were found according to the sex of the respondent. T-tests were performed in order to discover differences in student satisfaction on each individual factor according to the sex of the respondent. Girls were found to be more satisfied than boys with the amount of homework they were assigned. Boys were found to have a mean score of 4.35, with girls reporting a mean score of 4.75 (p < 0.05).

Colton and White (1985) found no significant differences between males and females in their study conducted in five New York high schools. Poole and Low (1982), however, found that white male dropouts have low academic potential whereas female dropouts have high academic potential. This study did not measure academic potential, nor is it possible to project year end academic success from the results, so it is not known whether girls are more successful than boys in Outreach schools. However, if there existed a significant difference in academic potential among the students surveyed, it might be expected to influence the levels of satisfaction expressed. The ratio of males to females in the sample was similar to the 53% male, 47% female ratio for dropouts found by Cervantes (1965), so neither sex is over-represented in the sample.

Nevertheless, in the present study males and females had
almost identical responses. There was no evidence of
differences, academic or otherwise, in the sample. Students in
Outreach schools are, of course, motivated to return, and may
not be reflective of the general dropout population. This may
explain why there are few differences by sex of respondent.
Males with low academic potential are not found in the present
sample because they are not sufficiently motivated to seek a
place in an Outreach school. No table of results is included
as there was only the one significant difference indicated
above.

4.7.3 Last Grade Successfully Completed in Previous School.

Table 9 displays results for satisfaction factors
according to "Last grade successfully completed in previous
school". It was found that the two groups with the lowest
scores were those with less than grade 8 and those who had
completed grade 10. There were significant differences on a
F-test comparison among those who had completed grade 10 (Mean
= 4.60) and those who had completed grade 8 (Mean = 5.00) and
those who had completed grade 9 (Mean = 4.86); (p = < 0.05).
It was somewhat surprising to find that those students who
were nearest to successful completion of high school were the
least satisfied with their experience. This was particularly

73

Table 9

Differences in Satisfaction (Aggregate Score)
According to Last Grade Successfully
Completed in Previous School

Less than Grade 8 (N=28)		Grade 8 (N=18)		Grade 9 (N=39)		Grade 10 (N=50)		F-Value
$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD	
4.67	0.68	5.00	0.55	4.86	0.55	4.60	0.62	2.78*

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05

N = Number of cases $\overline{X}$ = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on the following scale
1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfied

so in view of the fact that the subjects were adolescents who had returned to school after dropping out, or who had actively sought out a place in an Outreach school in order to complete their high school education. One might suppose that those who were the closest to attaining their goal would be the most satisfied. However, an analysis of the differences on individual items (see below) revealed that this group had different experiences with respect to interactions with teachers, and pressure to do well in school. It could be that the added pressure of being in the last year at school creates its own degree of dissatisfaction.

Table 10 shows differences between satisfaction factors according to last grade successfully completed in previous school. Those respondents with less than grade eight successfully completed showed less satisfaction with the extent to which rules and regulations were strictly enforced (#12). The same group also produced a low score on factor #15 (The extent to which teachers praise students for doing well).

A consistent pattern of differences which holds for each significant mean was found with respect to students who had completed grade 10, and who were, therefore, presumably working in their last year of high school. Students in this

75

Table 10

Differences in Satisfaction Factors According to
Last Grade Successfully Completed
in Previous School

Factor	Less than Gr 8 (N = 28)		Gr 8 (N = 18)		Gr 9 (N = 39)		Gr 10 (N = 50)		F-Value
	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	
11. TO SOCIALIZE WITH FRIENDS	4.36	0.91	4.67	1.19	4.54	1.12	4.36	1.30	0.44
12. STRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS	3.71	1.63	4.78	1.21	4.67	1.38	4.60	1.25	3.56*
13. ENJOYABLE LUNCH PERIOD	4.30	1.40	4.33	1.91	4.62	1.48	4.40	1.53	0.18
14. AMOUNT OF HOMEWORK	4.36	1.52	4.33	1.68	4.74	1.07	4.58	1.23	0.65
15. TEACHERS PRAISE STUDENTS	4.89	1.34	5.56	0.62	5.31	0.80	4.64	0.96	5.60**
16. COMFORTABLE SEEKING HELP	5.14	1.26	5.56	0.61	5.39	0.94	4.90	1.46	1.89
17. STUDENTS FRIENDLY IN SCHOOL	4.64	1.22	4.94	1.35	4.72	1.23	4.68	1.29	0.24
18. HAVING DEDICATED TEACHERS	5.10	1.44	5.56	0.85	5.43	0.72	5.08	1.05	1.55
19. RECEIVING HIGH TEST MARKS	4.64	1.31	5.00	0.69	5.13	1.06	4.70	1.06	1.66
20. HAVING RELEVANT CLASSES	4.71	1.18	4.50	1.04	4.21	1.40	4.26	1.43	0.94
21. CONTACT WITH TEACHERS	4.57	1.37	5.05	1.21	5.10	1.02	4.52	1.22	2.33
22. PRESSURE TO DO WELL	4.54	1.21	4.78	1.06	4.69	1.30	4.10	1.36	2.13
23. FAVOURITISM IN SCHOOL	3.96	1.71	5.00	1.18	4.36	1.35	3.86	1.54	2.99*
24. GETTING A GOOD REPORT	5.36	0.78	5.17	0.99	5.46	0.94	5.28	0.93	0.52
25. INTERESTING TEACHING	5.25	0.93	5.61	0.78	5.15	1.11	4.90	0.99	2.44*
26. CHOOSE OWN ACTIVITIES	4.14	1.62	4.78	1.26	4.00	1.57	3.82	1.38	1.90
27. WORK AT OWN PACE	5.14	1.27	5.44	0.92	5.00	1.19	4.44	1.43	3.69*
28. GOOD STUDENTS FAVOURED	3.57	1.89	3.72	2.08	3.69	1.79	3.74	1.72	0.05
29. WORK IN SMALL GROUPS	5.21	0.78	5.28	0.89	4.89	1.09	4.62	1.21	2.73*
30. ADULT TREATMENT OF STUDENTS	4.57	1.37	4.83	0.98	5.05	1.31	4.96	1.27	0.85
31. TEACHERS INTERESTED IN JOBS	5.04	1.26	5.22	0.87	5.26	0.85	5.00	0.96	0.61
32. GENERAL SATISFACTION	5.00	1.25	5.38	0.78	5.59	0.59	5.16	0.99	2.62*

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05
** = significant at p = 0.01

N = Number of cases.   X̄ = Mean.   SD = Standard Deviation.

Items calculated for means based on the following scale
1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfied

category scored lowest on variables #15, #25, #27, and #29. This reinforces and refines the findings for overall satisfaction discussed earlier. These questions reveal the areas of dissatisfaction to be personal interactions with teachers (#15, and #25), and work habits (#27, and #29). The pressure to pass final examinations and gain credits obviously intensifies during the final year at school. As a result it seems that some of the satisfaction found by others in the alternative school system is lost by this particular group.

4.7.4 Years to Complete High School.

A similar pattern emerged when the findings for the question, "How many years will it take you to complete your high school education?" were compared with those for "Last grade successfully completed in previous school". Findings are displayed in Table 11. The lowest means were for those with more than three years of high school left (Mean = 4.60), followed by those in their last year (Mean = 4.62). The curvilinear results are closely related to those for last grade successfully completed. The similarity is probably largely explained by the overlapping nature of the questions. For example, those who have completed grade 10 will, for the most part, be the same respondents who report that they are in their last year of school. The frequency distributions shown

Table 11

Differences in Satisfaction (Aggregate Score) According to
Years Required to Complete High School

Final Year (N=59)		1 More Year (N=39)		2 More Years (N=16)		3 More Years (N=15)		More than 3 Years (N=6)		
$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD	$\overline{X}$	SD	F-Value
4.62	0.62	4.89	0.61	5.01	0.57	4.63	0.49	4.60	0.45	2.37*

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05

N = Number of cases $\overline{X}$ = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on the following scale

1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfied

in Table 3 (p. 50) for the variables in question bear this out (50 reported they had completed grade 10; 59 stated that they were in their last year).

There is, then, the same interesting feature of these findings wherein students express less satisfaction with school when they are close to, or very far away from graduation. Data showed that age was not a significant factor in assessing overall satisfaction, so the reasons for this curvilinear pattern are to be found in the academic level, and time remaining to complete high school.

4.7.5 Time Out of School Before Returning.

Table 12 shows differences in aggregate satisfaction scores for subjects according to "Time out of school". The lack of statistical significance may be a result of the small sample size for those who spent time out of school. A more balanced sample might produce a different result. Although there are no overall significant differences in the scores, the patterns of means conforms with the experience of educators working with returned dropouts. Teachers in this area often observe that those who have been "on the street" for a while have a more mature attitude when they return, and are more determined to succeed than their counterparts who

Table 12

Differences in Satisfaction (Aggregate Score)
According to Time Out of School

Never Dropped Out (N=73)		1-3 Months (N=23)		4-6 Months (N=10)		6 Mths - 1 Yr (N=18)		More Than 1 Yr (N=11)		F-Value
X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	
4.76	0.61	4.48	0.54	4.82	0.67	4.86	0.61	4.91	0.53	1.56

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05

N = Number of cases   X̄ = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on the following scale
1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfied

move directly from a regular school to an Outreach school.

Teachers in some programs are so convinced of this that they

have requirements that a student must be out of school for a

certain length of time before an application will be

entertained. Results of the present study do not confirm the

wisdom of this in terms of expressed satisfaction with school

upon return, but do suggest a trend towards more satisfaction

among students who have been out of school longer. A study

directed more specifically towards this area of research might

find significant differences.

Table 13 shows differences in individual satisfaction

factors according to time spent out of school. There were no

significant differences on the aggregate score, and the item

by item analysis also shows few differences between means.

Only two factors showed significance; Item #16 (Feeling

comfortable asking teachers for help), and item #27 (Being

able to work at your own pace). In each case the least

satisfied students were those who had been out of school for a

short period of time. Other variables displayed a similar

pattern of responses, though without significant differences.

A more precise study is indicated to examine the importance of

time out of school in relation to subsequent satisfaction upon

return.

Table 13

Differences in Satisfaction Factors According
to Time Out of School

Factor	Never Out (N=73) X	SD	1-3 Mths (N=23) X	SD	4-6 Mths (N=10) X	SD	6 Mths-1 Yr (N=18) X	SD	1Yr + (N=11) X	SD	F-VALUE
11. TO SOCIALIZE WITH FRIENDS	4.48	1.19	4.39	0.84	4.80	1.55	4.22	1.31	4.45	0.93	0.42
12. STRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS	4.46	1.30	4.39	1.40	4.90	1.45	4.44	1.65	4.18	1.79	0.35
13. ENJOYABLE LUNCH PERIOD	4.43	1.53	4.39	1.37	4.50	1.71	4.61	1.68	4.63	1.63	0.92
14. AMOUNT OF HOMEWORK	4.57	1.26	4.00	1.41	4.60	1.58	4.61	1.19	5.36	1.03	2.15
15. TEACHERS PRAISE STUDENTS	4.90	1.02	4.82	1.19	5.20	0.79	5.28	0.82	5.45	1.04	1.30
16. COMFORTABLE SEEKING HELP	5.16	1.28	4.56	1.37	5.60	0.51	5.56	0.85	5.54	0.82	2.60*
17. STUDENTS FRIENDLY IN SCHOOL	4.67	1.36	4.47	1.01	5.30	0.82	4.44	1.50	4.91	0.83	0.84
18. HAVING DEDICATED TEACHERS	5.33	0.93	4.83	1.47	5.50	0.71	5.39	0.91	5.18	1.69	1.29
19. RECEIVING HIGH TEST MARKS	4.82	1.17	4.61	1.16	5.30	1.48	4.89	1.02	5.09	0.70	0.87
20. HAVING RELEVANT CLASSES	4.32	1.41	4.13	1.33	4.50	1.35	4.56	1.04	4.73	1.01	0.49
21. CONTACT WITH TEACHERS	4.84	1.14	4.22	1.31	5.00	0.94	4.78	1.21	5.27	1.49	1.85
22. PRESSURE TO DO WELL	4.49	1.28	4.17	1.34	4.30	1.33	4.67	1.28	4.54	1.50	0.44
23. FAVOURITISM IN SCHOOL	4.19	1.51	3.87	1.51	4.30	1.16	4.38	1.68	4.27	1.68	0.35
24. GETTING A GOOD REPORT	5.36	0.91	5.26	1.17	4.90	0.87	5.56	0.51	5.36	0.67	0.89
25. INTERESTING TEACHING	5.14	1.05	5.26	0.75	4.70	1.34	5.28	0.96	5.09	1.04	0.64
26. CHOOSE OWN ACTIVITIES	4.08	1.51	3.52	1.44	3.70	1.57	4.56	1.29	4.64	1.50	1.85
27. WORK AT OWN PACE	4.99	1.29	4.17	1.37	4.90	1.37	5.33	0.90	4.91	1.51	2.43*
28. GOOD STUDENTS FAVOURED	3.56	1.81	3.82	1.67	3.60	1.64	4.22	1.83	3.45	2.25	0.56
29. WORK IN SMALL GROUPS	4.90	1.04	5.04	0.64	5.00	1.16	4.77	1.35	4.81	1.60	0.19
30. ADULT TREATMENT OF STUDENTS	4.95	1.37	4.52	1.28	5.10	0.74	5.06	1.06	4.82	1.33	0.66
31. TEACHERS INTERESTED IN JOBS	5.11	0.94	4.91	1.20	5.20	0.92	5.22	1.11	5.27	0.78	0.37
32. GENERAL SATISFACTION	5.41	0.77	4.96	1.66	5.20	0.78	5.11	1.45	5.45	1.82	1.27

Notes:
* = significant at p < 0.05

N = Number of cases   X = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on the following scale
1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfied

4.8 DIFFERENCES IN SATISFACTION ACCORDING TO SCHOOL ATTENDED

Research Question #6: Are there differences in student satisfaction between various Montreal Outreach schools?

Table 14 displays the differences in aggregate satisfaction scores according to school attended. No significant differences were found among the schools surveyed, and none of the schools was found to be unsatisfactory by its students. The study did not measure student satisfaction in the regular school system so comparisons may not be made. The significance of these results, though, is that the population surveyed is composed exclusively of students who found sufficiently little satisfaction in regular schools that they left them. The fact that they were generally satisfied with their new alternative schools speaks highly of these organizations. Outreach students display many of the characteristics of typical dropouts as observed by Jones (1977). That is, they often display feelings of alienation (rootlessness, hopelessness, and estrangement) from their schools, homes, neighbourhoods, and/or society in general. In addition they frequently have added feelings of not belonging due to failing courses at school, and the consequent separation from peers. This, too, was noted by Jones (1977). Those who elect to return to an Outreach school to continue

Table 14

<u>Differences in Satisfaction (Aggregate Score)</u>
<u>According to School Attended</u>

School 1 (N=33)		School 2 (N=29)		School 3 (N=16)		School 4 (N=16)		School 5 (N=39)		F-Value
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	
4.62	0.69	4.63	0.65	4.89	0.51	5.06	0.53	4.72	0.61	2.17

Notes:
* = significant at p = 0.05

N = Number of cases $\bar{X}$ = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on the following scale
1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfied

their secondary education form a distinct group within the total group of high school dropouts. There are naturally many youngsters who leave school early never to return. The findings of the present study, though, show hope for those who do return in as much as they present a possibility for disaffected students to once again become involved in a satisfactory educational experience.

Table 15 shows the 22 individual satisfaction variables isolated by school. Ten of the factors showed significant differences among the schcols surveyed. There was, however, no consistent pattern of low scores. No school appeared to be consistently weaker than the others. This conforms to the results for the aggregate satisfaction score where no significant differences were found despite the fact that the schools themselves are very different, and cater to the needs of different categories of students.

Factors which ranked highly overall generally ranked highly in each school. For example, factor #24 (Getting a good report card) was ranked highly in each school, and was ranked first cverall. It appeared that this visible expression of performance was found to be satisfactory to students in all Outreach schools regardless of their ability or academic standing. It would be interesting to study the nature of

Table 15

Differences in Satisfaction Factors
According to School Attended

Factor	SCHOOL 1 (N=33)		SCHOOL 2 (N=29)		SCHOOL 3 (N=16)		SCHOOL 4 (N=18)		SCHOOL 5 (N=39)		F-Value
	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	
11. TO SOCIALIZE WITH FRIENDS	4.63	0.93	4.17	1.34	4.69	0.95	4.61	1.04	4.56	1.31	0.81
12. STRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS	3.88	1.45	4.97	1.55	4.38	1.26	4.78	1.40	4.46	1.19	2.72*
13. ENJOYABLE LUNCH PERIOD	3.88	1.67	4.35	1.68	4.00	1.83	4.94	0.99	5.05	1.09	3.79**
14. AMOUNT OF HOMEWORK	3.97	1.61	4.41	1.24	5.13	1.09	4.56	1.34	4.89	0.97	3.54*
15. TEACHERS PRAISE STUDENTS	4.97	1.07	4.76	1.27	5.19	0.75	5.72	0.46	4.82	0.94	3.28*
16. COMFORTABLE SEEKING HELP	5.07	1.25	4.96	1.45	5.63	0.62	5.72	0.46	5.00	1.32	2.03
17. STUDENTS FRIENDLY IN SCHOOL	4.61	1.22	4.72	1.28	5.25	0.86	4.11	1.78	4.87	1.03	2.04
18. HAVING DEDICATED TEACHERS	5.09	1.37	5.35	0.94	5.31	0.87	5.67	0.49	5.10	1.05	1.1
19. RECEIVING HIGH TEST MARKS	4.69	1.24	4.72	1.06	5.44	0.71	4.78	1.26	4.87	0.95	1.49
20. HAVING RELEVANT CLASSES	4.48	1.14	4.48	1.45	4.25	1.53	4.50	0.98	4.21	1.45	0.33
21. CONTACT WITH TEACHERS	4.64	1.25	4.58	1.21	5.00	0.96	4.94	1.62	4.84	1.09	0.53
22. PRESSURE TO DO WELL	4.60	1.08	4.86	1.33	4.18	1.68	4.00	1.72	4.33	0.98	1.65
23. FAVOURITISM IN SCHOOL	3.90	1.57	3.76	1.76	4.68	0.79	5.28	1.23	4.00	1.38	4.12**
24. GETTING A GOOD REPORT	5.21	0.93	5.52	0.68	5.38	0.61	5.39	1.20	5.26	0.99	0.53
25. INTERESTING TEACHING	5.24	0.87	5.24	0.79	5.31	0.79	5.56	1.19	4.72	1.14	2.90*
26. CHOOSE OWN ACTIVITIES	4.15	1.64	3.55	1.45	4.81	0.91	4.78	1.16	3.74	1.52	3.63**
27. WORK AT OWN PACE	5.33	0.85	3.48	1.64	5.38	0.62	5.67	0.68	4.97	1.01	16.93**
28. GOOD STUDENTS FAVOURED	3.12	1.85	3.72	1.83	3.31	1.82	5.22	1.31	3.59	1.63	4.72**
29. WORK IN SMALL GROUPS	5.00	1.00	4.83	1.34	4.81	0.98	5.33	0.77	4.74	1.09	1.05
30. ADULT TREATMENT OF STUDENTS	4.39	1.41	4.79	1.35	5.06	0.92	4.94	1.31	5.28	1.09	2.39*
31. TEACHERS INTERESTED IN JOBS	5.04	1.08	5.35	0.77	5.12	0.89	5.33	1.08	4.90	1.05	1.15
32. GENERAL SATISFACTION	5.09	0.84	5.17	1.22	5.44	0.63	5.50	1.25	5.36	0.74	0.83

Notes:
 * = significant at p = 0.05
** = significant at p = 0.01

N = Number of Cases   X̄ = Mean   SD = Standard Deviation

Items calculated for means based on the following scale
1 = extremely dissatisfied   2 = dissatisfied
3 = fairly dissatisfied   4 = fairly satisfied
5 = satisfied   6 = extremely satisfied

reporting in the Outreach schools to determine whether the
expressed satisfaction was related simply to improved student
performance, or whether there are factors inherent in the schools'
reporting practices which create greater student satisfaction. For
example, none of the Outreach schools uses the School Board
computerized reporting system. This means that Outreach reports are
typically hand written, and in some cases address affective
concerns. There exists the possibility that such reports themselve
are more satisfactory to students than those produced by computer.

Other variables which were highly ranked in each school had to
do mainly with teachers and teaching methods. There were no
differences between scores for variables #16, #18 and #31; all of
which are directly concerned with teachers and teaching methods.
This indicates that Outreach students in all schools have similar
positive experiences in these important areas of school life.
Raywid (1984) noted that "caring teachers" were a key factor in the
success of alternative schools. This study confirms that overall
satisfaction with school is linked closely to satisfaction with
teachers. It also shows that students who have found little success
at school can also find better educational experiences when they
are satisfied with their teachers and teaching methods. Cynical
observers of Outreach schools with their non-traditional methods of

87

operation and structure might be tempted to believe that students are satisfied with their schools because not much is expected of them, and they have a good time there. The results of this study, however, do not bear out this assertion. Table 8 (p. 66) shows that factors relating to student satisfaction with socializing with friends (#11; mean = 4.45), enjoyable lunch period (#13; mean = 4.47), and students friendly in school (#17; mean = 4.72) ranked 16th, 14th, and 12th respectively. While none was found to be unsatisfactory, these factors were all below the overall satisfaction mean of 5.28 (#32). This together with the high importance of such motivators for return to school as the desire to achieve graduation, and to improve performance in academic subjects indicates that Outreach students are serious about their education and satisfied most with those aspects of their schools which address those very concerns.

4.9 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATION AND
SUBSEQUENT SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL

Research Question #7: What is the relationship between satisfaction with school and factors motivating return?

Outreach schools fall into the general category of schools of choice. That is, the students decide to apply, and remain

only as long as they wish to do so, or as long at the staff wish them to be there. The study, therefore looked at factors important in decisions to return to school, and in subsequent satisfaction with the experience leading to continued attendance in the Outreach program. Also of interest was the relationship between a particular motivating factor of return, and subsequent satisfaction. That is, whether some motivations for return to school more closely associated with satisfaction with school than others.

To answer this question correlations were performed between the 10 motivation factors, and the items of satisfaction including the aggregate satisfaction score. Table 16 displays results for the correlations between the aggregate satisfaction score and the 10 motivators. Levels of significance better than $p < .05$ were found on three items, but none of the relationships was very strong. Item #5 (To enable me to enter C.E.G.E.P.) showed the strongest correlation with overall satisfaction (r = 0.25; p = 0.004).

Table 17 shows the correlations between the 22 individual satisfaction items, and 10 motivators. These results were similar to those found for the comparisons using the aggregate score. None of the motivators showed a significant relationship with more than seven individual items, and none

89

Table 16

Correlations Between Aggregate
Satisfaction Scores and
Motivation Factors

Factor	Correlation Coefficient
1. TO COMPLETE EDUCATION	0.07
2. TO IMPROVE MATH & ENGLISH SKILLS	0.15
3. TO IMPROVE FRENCH SKILLS	0.18*
4. TO LEARN JOB SKILLS	0.17*
5. TO ENTER CEGEP	0.25**
6. ENCOURAGED BY FRIENDS	0.08
7. TO AVOID OLD FRIENDS	0.10
8. BORED AT HOME	-0.03
9. UNABLE TO GET A JOB	-0.03
10. TO QUALIFY FOR WELFARE	-0.02

Notes:
* Significant at $P = 0.05$
** Significant at $P = 0.01$

Table 17

Correlations Between Individual Satisfaction Item Scores and Motivation Factors

Satisfaction Factors	Motivation Factors									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11. TO SOCIALIZE WITH FRIENDS	0.01	-0.02	0.16	-0.10	0.12	0.05	0.06	-0.05	-0.04	-0.04
12. STRICT RULES AND REGULATIONS	0.22*	0.14	0.15	0.02	0.22**	0.03	0.12	-0.10	-0.16	-0.03
13. ENJOYABLE LUNCH PERIOD	0.01	0.02	-0.10	-0.15	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.06	-0.10	-0.07
14. AMOUNT OF HOMEWORK	0.84	0.09	0.14	0.03	0.15	-0.07	0.11	-0.11	-0.10	0.00
15. TEACHERS PRAISE STUDENTS	-0.02	0.15	0.15	0.04	0.03	0.11	0.19	0.06	0.01	0.04
16. COMFORTABLE SEEKING HELP	0.04	0.12	0.11	0.03	0.16	0.04	-0.02	-0.17	-0.03	0.01
17. STUDENTS FRIENDLY IN SCHOOL	-0.09	-0.22	-0.10	-0.08	0.09	0.03	-0.09	0.04	0.08	0.01
18. HAVING DEDICATED TEACHERS	0.04	0.11	0.15	0.14	0.16	-0.04	0.12	-0.14	-0.13	-0.01
19. RECEIVING HIGH TEST MARKS	0.12	0.00	-0.05	0.06	0.27**	0.03	-0.06	-0.03	0.01	-0.15
20. HAVING RELEVANT CLASSES	0.03	0.26**	0.23**	0.36**	0.02	0.05	0.09	0.10	0.05	0.20*
21. CONTACT WITH TEACHERS	0.11	0.08	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.05	0.03
22. PRESSURE TO DO WELL	0.03	0.15	0.02	0.21	0.20*	0.20*	0.05	-0.06	0.03	0.13
23. FAVOURITISM IN SCHOOL	-0.02	0.16	0.06	-0.01	0.26**	-0.03	-0.11	-0.11	0.03	-0.10
24. GETTING A GOOD REPORT	0.04	0.14	0.10	0.14	0.30**	0.05	0.10	0.02	-0.13	0.16
25. INTERESTING TEACHING	-0.14	0.11	0.14	0.27**	0.07	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.03
26. CHOOSE OWN ACTIVITIES	-0.03	0.01	0.13	0.21**	0.13	0.01	-0.18	0.01	-0.16	-0.15
27. WORK AT OWN PACE	-0.17	-0.13	-0.01	0.01	-0.15	0.04	-0.05	0.02	0.04	-0.03
28. GOOD STUDENTS FAVOURED	0.16	0.13	0.20*	0.02	0.14	-0.17	-0.07	-0.17	-0.01	-0.16
29. WORK IN SMALL GROUPS	-0.19	0.18	0.18*	0.18*	0.06	0.26**	0.23**	0.15	0.05	0.15
30. ADULT TREATMENT OF STUDENTS	0.15	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.21**	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.01
31. TEACHERS INTERESTED IN JOBS	0.20	0.15	0.22**	0.20*	0.19*	0.01	0.11	-0.11	0.05	0.12
32. GENERAL SATISFACTION	0.16	0.14	0.16	0.13	0.23**	0.04	0.10	-0.05	-0.01	-0.06

Notes:

 * = significant at p = 0.05
** = significant at p = 0.01

Motivation Factors as follows:

  1. To complete my high school education.
  2. To improve my basic english and math skills.
  3. To become proficient in French.
  4. To learn job skills.
  5. To enable me to enter C.E.G.E.P.
  6. My friends encouraged me.
  7. To get away from old friends who were a bad influence.
  8. I was bored at home.
  9. I could not get a job.
 10. I wanted to qualify for Social Security benefits.

of the correlations was very strong. Item #5 (to enable me to enter C.E.G.E.P.), and item #4 (To learn job skills) demonstrated the largest number of significant correlations. To the extent that conclusions may be drawn from the data, it is possible to say that some students who decide to return to school with specific goals such as the acquisition of job skills or entry to C.E.G.E.P. may be expected to have a more satisfactory school experience than others, but in general, satisfaction with school cannot be predicted by the factors influencing a decision to return.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the major conclusions of the study and makes suggestions for further study.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

Research Question #1: What are the characteristics of Montreal Outreach students with respect to age, sex, time out of school, previous educational level, and time required to graduate?

1. A majority of Outreach students (81%) are sixteen years of age or older. Four of the five schools surveyed sought students who were at least sixteen. The fifth enrolled younger students. The age composition of the sample was, therefore, a reflection of the admitting policies of the schools concerned.

2. The sample was composed of 53% males, and 46% females. This indicates that Outreach schools have a male to female ratio in accordance with the ratio of males to females found by Cervantes (1965) for the dropout population.

3. Sixty six percent (66%) of the respondents had completed at
   least grade 9. The participating schools were mostly concerned
   with teaching academic subjects, and with giving their
   students an opportunity to gain high school leaving credits.
   Not surprisingly, the adolescents who decide to return to
   these schools tend to be those who have had at least some
   previous high school success.

4. Many Outreach students (54%) claim not to have dropped out of
   school at all. It seems clear that many youngsters who are
   unhappy in the regular high schools are aware of the
   alternative system, and gain access to it before they actually
   drop out of school.

   Research Question #2: What do Montreal Outreach students
   state as primary motivators for returning to school?

5. The major motivating factors affecting the decision to return
   to school among Outreach students are the desire to complete
   their high school education, the desire to improve basic
   academic skills, and the desire to obtain the qualifications
   that will enable them to gain access to C.E.G.E.P.

6. Many Outreach students intend to continue their education
   beyond high school.

Research Question #3: Do differences in motivation exist between sub-groups which differ in background characteristics?

7. Younger Outreach students are more likely to be motivated by the desire to obtain job skills than are their older counterparts.

8. Those students who are older, or who have completed several high school grades are more likely to be motivated by a desire to complete their high school education.

9. Choice of school is important in a student's decision to return. Those attending more academic programs were more likely to be motivated by academic concerns than were their confreres in the less academic schools.

10. Those students who are motivated to return to school in order to complete their high school education, or to improve basic academic skills are likely to be satisfied with their experience. Those who return in search of job skills or to avoid old friends who were a bad influence are also likely to be satisfied, but the relationship is less pronounced.

Research Question #4: To what extent are Montreal
Outreach students satisfied with their present school
experience?

11. Outreach students are generally satisfied with their current
school experience.

Research Question #5: To what extent is satisfaction
different according to background characteristics?

12. There were few differences found in motivation for return or
in satisfaction with school according to participants' age or
sex.

13. Students who had completed grade ten were less satisfied than
their counterparts with less previous education.

Research Question #6: Are there differences in student
satisfaction between various Montreal Outreach schools?

14. There are few differences in satisfaction between Montreal
Outreach schools. All were rated in the satisfactory range by
their students.

Research Question #7: What is the relationship between satisfaction with school and factors motivating return?

16. There is very little correlation between factors motivating return and subsequent satisfaction. A slight association exists with respect to those students who return to school with specific goals such as the acquisition of job skills , or the desire to enter C.E.G.E.P.

5.3 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The present study examined the motivation for return to school, and subsequent satisfaction among students enrolled in Montreal area Outreach schools. It would be of interest to know whether the levels of satisfaction found are different from those of students in the regular high schools of Quebec, and from students in other alternative schools. A comparative study of satisfaction including regular high schools, Outreach schools, private schools, and other schools of choice would provide additional valuable information.

The results of this study indicated that students in Outeach schools were well satisfied with the performance of their teachers. The results do not indicate why students who had formerly had very unsatisfactory experiences with high

school teaching and teachers were better pleased in their current school. It may be that teachers do in fact perform better in Outreach schools, but it is also possible that the organizational structure of the units contributes to better teacher performance. This study did not look at such features as size of school, administrative structure, or informality of teacher/student interactions in relation to student satisfaction. Much would be learned from studies which focussed on teacher effectiveness and organizational structure in Outreach schools.

Many teachers in Outreach schools believe that dropouts are more successful if they spend time out of school before they return. The results in this study failed to show differences in student satisfaction according to time out of school. A trend in that direction could be seen in the scores, but an imbalance in group size may have contributed to the lack of significance. A further study of the effects of time out of school on subsequent performance upon return would be of value to Outreach teachers.

The creation of networks of Outreach schools pose many questions for the educational community. School boards, though anxious to support measures to ease the dropout problem, have been reluctant to develop broad policies to cover such schools

as participated in this study. Likewise, teacher unions are supportive of the initiatives while reluctant to develop policies with respect to such areas as staffing and funding. A comprehensive policy study of the implications of Outreach schools would be an important contribution to the development of schools to cater to the needs of dropouts who decide to return to school.

REFERENCES

Arlin, M., & Hills, D. (1974). Comparison of cartoon and verbal methods of school attitude assessment through multitrait-multimethod validation. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 34, 989-995.

Arnove, R., & Stout. T. (1978, September). Alternative schools for disruptive youth. Prepared for the National Institute of Education, Grants. 76-0217 and 77-0254.

Bachman, J., Green, S., & Wirtinen, I. (1972). Dropping out is a symptom. Education Digest, 37, 1-5.

Barker, R.G., & Gump, P.V. (1964). Big school, small school. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

Barr, R., Colson, B., & Parrett, W. (1977, July). The effectiveness of alternative schools: An analysis of six school evaluations. Viewpoint. 1-30.

Beck, L., & Muia, J.A. (1980, November). A portrait of a tragedy: Research findings on the dropout. High School Journal, 64, (2) 65-72.

Beelick, D.B. (1973). Sources of student satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The Journal of Educational Research, 67, 19-28.

Berk, L.E., Rose, M.H., & Stewart, D. (1970). Attitudes of English and American children towards their school experience. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 33-40.

Betz, E.L. (1969). Need reinforcer correspondence as a predictor of job satisfaction. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47, 878-883.

Brassard, M.R. (1979). Reinforcement density: A theoretical application to job satisfaction. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 2417B.

Cervantes, L. (1965). The dropout: Causes and cures. Ann Arbour, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Colton, J.A. & White, M.A. (1985). High school student satisfaction and perceptions of the school environment. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 10, 235-248.

Coster, J.K. (1958). Attitudes toward school of high school pupils from three income levels. Journal of Educational Psychology, 49, 61-66.

Curley, T., et al. (1971). The social system: Contributor or inhibitor to the school dropout. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED-049-334.)

deCharms, R. (1977, March). Pawn or origin? Enhancing motivation in disaffected youth. Educational Leadership, 444-448.

Diedrich, R., & Jackson, P.W. (1969). Satisfied and dissatisfied students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47, 641-649.

Doob, H. (1977). Evaluations of alternative schools. Arlington, Va: Educational Research Service.

Duke, D.L. (1976, May). Challenge to bureaucracy: The contemporary alternative school. Journal of Educational Thought, 34-48.

Duke, D.L., & Perry, C. (1978, Fall). Can alternative schools succeed where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew, and B.F. Skinner have failed? Adolescence, 375-395.

Duke, D.L., & Muzio, I. (1978, February). How effective are alternative schools? A review of recent evaluations and reports. Teachers College Record, 461-483.

Dunn, J.A. (1968). The approach-avoidance paradigm as a model for the analysis of school anxiety. Journal of Educational Psychology, 59, 388-394.

Epstein, J.L., & McPartland, J.M. (1976). The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15-30.

Erickson, D. (1982). The British Columbia story: Antecedents and consequences of aid to private schools. Los Angeles: Institute for the study of Private Schools.

Fantini, M. (1973). Public schools of choice.
New York: Simon and Shuster.

Fine, M. (1983). Perspectives on inequity: Voices from urban schools. In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology annual, IV. Beverley Hills: Gage.

Fine, M., & Rosenberg, P. (1983, Summer). Dropping out of high school: The ideology of school and work. Journal of Education, 165(3), 257-272.

Fleming, P., Blank, R., et al. (1982, September). Survey of magnet schools: Interim report. Washington: James H. Lowry & Associates.

Foley, E.M., & McConnaughy, S. (1982). Towards school improvement: lessons from alternative high schools. New York: Public Education Association.

Fry, E. (1968). A readability formula that saves time. Journal of Reading, 11, 513-517.

Glick, O. (1970). Sixth graders' attitudes towards school and interpersonal conditions in the classroom. Journal of Experimental Education, 38, 17-22.

Grant, G. (1981, Summer). The character of education and the education of character. Daedalus, 135-149.

Grant, W. (1975, Summer). Estimates of school dropouts. American Education, 11: back cover.

Greenberg, J.W., Gerver, J.M., Chall, J., & Davidson, H.H. (1965). Attitudes of children from a deprived environment towards achievement-related concepts. Journal of Educational Research, 59, 57-61.

Hicks, J.B. (1969). All's calm in the crow's nest. American Education, 5, 9-10.

Homans, G.C. (1961). Social behavior: its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Howard, M., & Anderson, R. (1978). Early identification of potential school dropouts: A literature review. Child Welfare, 57(4), 221-230.

Isherwood, G.B., & Hammah, C. K. (1981). Home and school factors and the quality of school life in Canadian High schools. In J. L. Epstien (Ed.), The Quality of School Life (pp. 137-151). Boston: D.C. Heath

Jackson , P.W., & Getzels, J.W. (1959). Psychological health and classroom functioning: a study of dissatisfaction with school among adolescents. Journal of Educational Psychology, 50, 295-300.

Jones, W.M. (1977). The impact on society of youths who drop out or are uneducated. Educational Leadership, 34, 411-416.

Kowalski, C.J., & Cangemi, J.P. (1974). High school dropouts - A lost resource. College Student Journal, 8, 71-74.

Lajoie, S., & Shore, B. (1981). Three myths? The over-representation of the gifted among dropouts, delinquents and suicides. Gifted Child Quaterly, 25(3) 138-143.

Mahan, G. (1983, April). Portrait of a dropout: Dealing with academic social and emotional problems. NASSP Bulletin, 67, (462), 80-83.

Malpass, J.F. (1958). Some relationships between students' perceptions of school and their achievement. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 44, 475-482.

Mann, D., & Gold, M. (1980, December). Alternative schools for disruptive secondary students: Testing a theory of school processes, students' responses, and outcome behaviors. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Meier, R., & McDaniel, E. (1974). A measure of attitude towards school. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 34, 991-998.

Metz, M.H. (1981). Magnet schools in their organizational and political context. Paper presented to the American Sociological Association, Toronto, August 23-28.

Millard, T.L. (1965). Dropouts and the school. Educational Leadership, 22, 247.

Nathan, J. (1981). Attitudes towards high school education held by graduates of a traditional and an alternative public school in St. Paul Minnesota. Unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Neale, D.C., & Proshek, J.M. (1967). School related attitudes of culturally disadvantaged elementary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 58, 238-244.

Neale, D.C., Gill, N., & Tismer, W. (1970). Relationship between attitudes towards school subjects and school achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 63, 223-237.

Perney, J. (1975). The development and validation of the student opinion inventory factor scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 35, 983-986.

Phillips, G. (1977). Descriptive study of the impact of a high school alternative learning environment on post high school lives by a group of resistent learners. Unpublished dissertation, Ball State University.

Phillips, J.D. (1984). The school leaver and the world outside. Education Canada, 24(3), 26-31.

Poole, M., & Lowe, B. (1982). Who stays? Who leaves? An examination of sex differences on staying and leaving. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11(1), 49-61.

Raywid, M.A. (1984, April). Synthesis of research on schools of choice. Educational Leadership, 41, 70-78.

Roshal, S.M., Frieze, I., & Wood, J.T. (1971). A multitrait-multimethod validation of measures of student attitude towards school, towards learning, towards technology in sixth grade children. Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement, 31, 999-1006.

Rutter, M., and others. (1979). Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schneider, J. (1982-83, Winter). Stop the bandwagon, we want to get off. R & D Report, 7-11.

Schreiber, D., ed. (1962, May). School Dropouts. National Education Association Journal, 51, 50-59.

Wehlage, G., and others. (1982). Effective programs for the marginal high school student. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Zeligs, R. (1966). Children's favourable attitudes towards home and school. Journal of Educational Research, 60, 13-21.

APPENDIX 1   - INSTRUMENT

SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to discover what persuaded you to enrol in your present school, and how satisfied you are with your experience. Your cooperation in providing this important information will lead to a better understanding of the outreach system, and how it may be improved. Questions 1 through 10 are concerned with your reasons for enrolling in your present school.

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS

****

USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE FOR YOUR RESPONSES.
Please circle the most appropriate response.

6 = very much	3 = little
5 = much	2 = very little
4 = moderate	1 = none

****

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE THE FOLLOWING FACTORS IMPORTANT IN YOUR DECISION TO RETURN TO SCHOOL?

1. To complete my high school education.   6   5   4   3   2   1

2. To improve my basic english and math skills.   6   5   4   3   2   1

3. To become proficient in French.   6   5   4   3   2   1

4. To learn job skills.   6   5   4   3   2   1

5. To enable me to enter C.E.G.E.P.   6   5   4   3   2   1

6. My friends encouraged me.   6   5   4   3   2   1

7. To get away from old friends who were a bad influence.   6   5   4   3   2   1

8. I was bored at home.   6   5   4   3   2   1

9. I could not get a job.   6   5   4   3   2   1

10. I wanted to qualify for Social Security benefits.   6   5   4   3   2   1

Questions 11 through 32 deal with your satisfaction with your present
school.

****

USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE FOR YOUR RESPONSES.
Please circle the most appropriate response.

6 = extremely satisfied   3 = fairly dissatisfied
5 = satisfied   2 = dissatisfied
4 = fairly satisfied   1 = extremely dissatisfied

****

HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THESE ASPECTS OF YOUR SCHOOL?

11. Having an opportunity to socialize with your friends.	6	5	4	3	2	1
12. The extent to which there are strictly enforced rules and regulations.	6	5	4	3	2	1
13. Having an enjoyable lunch period.	6	5	4	3	2	1
14. The amount of home-work you have.	6	5	4	3	2	1
15. The extent to which teachers praise students for doing well.	6	5	4	3	2	1
16. Feeling comfortable asking your teachers for help.	6	5	4	3	2	1
17. The extent to which students in your school are friendly.	6	5	4	3	2	1
18. Having dedicated teachers.	6	5	4	3	2	1
19. The frequency with which you receive high marks on tests.	6	5	4	3	2	1

2

continued...

20. Having classes that   6   5   4   3
    are relevant to you
    future career interests.

21. The extent to which   6   5   4   3   2   1
    you have personal
    contact with teachers.

22. Feeling pressure to   6   5   4   2   1
    do well in school.

23. The amount of favoritism 6   5   4   3   2   1
    in your school.

24. Getting a good report card. 6   4   2   1

25. Having teachers with   6   5   4   3   2   1
    interesting ways
    of teaching.

26. Having a chance to   6   5   4   2   1
    choose your own
    activities in class.

27. Being able to work   6   5   4   3   2   1
    at your own pace.

28. The extent to which   6   5   4   2   1
    teachers seem interested
    only in good students.

29. Having the opportunity 6   5   4   3   2   1
    to work with others
    in small groups.

30. The extent to which   6   5   4   3   2   1
    teachers treat students
    like adults.

31. The extent to which   6   5   4   3   1
    teachers seem really
    interested in what
    they are doing.

32. In general, how satisfied 6   5   4   2   1
    are you with your school?

3

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS
BACKGROUND INFORMATION.

Put a check (✓) in the appropriate space.

33. AGE: 13 Years ___ ___ 14 __ __ 15 __ __ 16 ___ ___ 17 __ __ 18 __ __ OTHER. ___ __

34. SEX: (1) MALE __ __ (2) FEMALE __ __ __

35. LAST GRADE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED IN YOUR PREVIOUS SCHOOL:-

    (1) less than 8th grade __ (2) 8th __ (3) 9th __ __ (4) 10th __ __

36. HOW MANY YEARS WILL IT TAKE YOU TO COMPLETE
    YOUR HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION?

    1) This is my last year. __ __

    2) I have one more year to go. __ __

    3) I have two more years to go.

    4) I have three more years to go. __ __

    5) I have more than three more years to go. __ __ __

37. HOW LONG WERE YOU OUT OF SCHOOL BEFORE YOU RETURNED?

    1) I never really dropped out. __ __

    2) One to three months. _____

    3) Four to six months. _____

    4) Six months to one year. _____

    5) More than one year. _____

38. WHICH SCHOOL DO YOU ATTEND? ____ _____ _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

4