Dissertations

1993

A case study of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science : differential program preference ratings by group constituency, race, and gender

Kay Tokunaga
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A CASE STUDY OF THE STEINMETZ ACADEMIC CENTRE

FOR WELLNESS AND SPORTS SCIENCE:

DIFFERENTIAL PROGRAM PREFERENCE RATINGS BY

GROUP CONSTITUENCY, RACE, AND GENDER

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

KAY TOKUNAGA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JANUARY 1993

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people generously gave assistance at various stages of this research. The author wishes to express her appreciation to her mentors and supporters.

Dr. Max Bailey, director of the dissertation committee provided the leadership, guidance, and support necessary for the completion of this study. His consistent encouragement and display of genuine concern throughout the project are greatly appreciated. Invaluable consultation, support, and advice were provided by Dr. Arthur Safer and Dr. Diane Schiller, members of the committee. The professional nurturing atmosphere provided by this team is a reflection of the culture of Loyola University. The faculty of the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and the staff of the Graduate School office at Lewis Towers are also acknowledged for their support and assistance.

Thanks are also due to Dr. Constantine Kiamos, Principal of Steinmetz Academic Centre, for his ongoing support and mentoring. Technical assistance provided by Dr. Cynthia Felton, Carolyn Funai, Jim Kennedy, Dr. George Knox, Catherine Pope, and Dr. Shoba Srinivasan are sincerely appreciated.

DEDICATION

To my husband, Chito, for his total support in all my endeavors; especially in the completion of this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the mandate to desegregate public schools, which troubled the United States and all its major population centers during the past three decades, had an intense impact on the City of Chicago. To address the needs of Chicago's population and to provide adequate policy responses to this problem several strategies were employed. One such strategy involved the establishment of special programs called "options programs" and student placement in attendance centers called "magnet schools." The hope was that white students in some parts of the city would be attracted to schools in other parts of Chicago and would therefore provide the desired cultural diversity of learners in otherwise all black or Hispanic school bodies.

One school selected for this type of program was Steinmetz High School, a school which reflected community growth since the 1920s. As the community expanded, a high school was needed to serve the local secondary school population. Before the stock market crash in 1929, plans were made for the building of a high school to relieve the overcrowding at Austin High School, Schurz High School, Foreman High School, and Kelvyn Park High School, all of which

served the northwest quadrant of the city. The foundations for Steinmetz were laid in 1930, but the work progressed slowly. Completion of the building in 1934 was possible only after federal aid was provided. Building costs totalled $3.5 million.

The school opened as a four year general high school in September 1934 with 2,207 students and forty teachers. Second day enrollment rose to 2,919, which was 419 students above the planned capacity of 2,500 for the building. By November 1934, enrollment reached 3,373. Enrollment continued to grow and peaked in 1938 with a student population of 4,225 students chiefly of German, Italian, Polish, Irish and Greek ancestry. In order to relieve overcrowding at Steinmetz High School, a branch was opened at Sayre Elementary School in 1935.

Since 1938, the school experienced a high but steadily decreasing population. Three parochial schools were erected which attracted some of the Steinmetz student population: (1) Luther High School, (2) St. Patrick High School, and (3) Notre Dame High School. Further, the demand for workers during the war years of the 1940s and the attractive pay that this work represented had considerable effect on decreasing the Steinmetz student population. High school age students left the school to seek employment in the various factories and business communities. The result of the drop in student population was the closing of the Sayre branch of Steinmetz. However, with the baby boom in the late fifties and early

sixties the increased student population reached a point at which it was necessary not only to reopen the branch at Sayre, but also to open branches at Mary Lyon, Thorp, and Bridge Elementary Schools. In June 1967, all branches were closed with the initiation of a voluntary busing program which had the result of sending students to Steinmetz from the south end of District Four. District Four of the Chicago Public School System was bounded by North Avenue (1600 N.) to the south, Lawrence Avenue (4800 N.) to the north, Harlem Avenue (7200 W.) to the west, and Mayfield Avenue (5800 W.) to the east.

The busing program provided the opportunity for students in the overcrowded South Austin area schools to enroll in District Four schools located in the far northwest area of the city. Empty classrooms in the District, due to the decreasing population of school age children and the growing number of families selecting their choice of parochial schools or private education, allowed the enrollment of students from South Austin schools to surge upward at Steinmetz. The "elementary feeder" school option already in place allowed all students graduating from Steinmetz "feeder" schools to automatically enroll as freshmen at Steinmetz, regardless of their residency.

As a result of this social change, the Steinmetz High School population began to convert from an all-white school to an integrated school. The "white flight" situation described by Coleman (1975) in a study conducted during the period 1968-

1973 was affecting Steinmetz:

> First of all, there is a continuous loss of white students from central-city schools. The loss is greater as 1) the size of the city is greater; 2) the central-city school district has a higher proportion of black students; and 3) the racial disparity between city and suburbs is great, with a big segregation between blacks in the central-city district and whites in the suburban ones. Thus the loss of white children from the central-city school system has been especially great in large cities which have a large black population and are surrounded by predominantly white suburbs.[1]

The years between 1972 and 1982 presented many incidents of racial violence, strife, and discrimination in and around the Steinmetz High School community. Most often these disturbances affected the community and the media portrayed them as major disruptions. Little help came from the central administration of the school system, with its "hands off" policy. The school population was in an era of intense social change. The community was not willing to see their neighborhood school used by "outsiders." Reports of student unrest, protest, confrontations, and arrests were numerous during these integration years and continued until 1987.

Compelling evidence of this openly hostile community which perceived Steinmetz and its heterogeneous population as the cause for increased crime, vandalism, and graffiti was the effort by the Northwest Neighborhood Federation to seek the dismissal of the principal and to institute a "closed campus"

---

[1] James S. Coleman, "Racial Segregation in the Schools: New Research with New Policy Implications," Phi Delta Kappan 73 (October 1975): 76.

policy for the school. This group began by sending a letter to the principal on 15 May 1986 inviting him to attend a meeting to discuss problems in the neighborhood which this organization perceived to be the direct result of Steinmetz students.[2] The Northwest Neighborhood Federation accused the school and its students of negatively impacting on the property values, crime, and quality of life of the neighborhood and its residents. Residents had two demands at the June 5 meeting; increased police surveillance and a closed campus at Steinmetz. The new 25th District Police Commander, Matthias Casey, gained instant popularity when he assured the residents that increased patrols will be available the next morning.[3] The principal, on the other hand, made many residents unhappy when he declared that his first responsibility was to the students and he would not commit to a closed campus on the spot at the meeting. In an article in the Chicago Sun-Times, he further explained that it would be unfair to lock every student in during lunch because of a few students who may behave badly. "If the best interest of the student is a closed campus, then that will be the direction we will go."[4] Instead he proposed that the Northwest

_____

[2]Northwest Neighborhood Federation, Chicago, to Constantine Kiamos, Chicago, 15 May 1986, Steinmetz Closed Campus File, Steinmetz Archives, Room 220, Chicago.

[3]"Discuss Steinmetz Problems," Belmont Central Leader, Chicago, 11 June 1986.

[4]Michael Gillis, "N. W. Siders Blast Gang Activity Near Steinmetz," Chicago Sun-Times, 6 June 1986.

Neighborhood Federation meet with Steinmetz officials to discuss probable solutions to their concerns.

On 17 July 1986 a petition with forty-eight names and no addresses was sent to the principal demanding that a positive response to close the campus and remove graffiti on a daily basis be forthcoming within two weeks. The petitioners threatened to take whatever steps necessary to close the school.[5]

Further, the organization sent a letter of ultimatum to the Chicago Public School Superintendent, Dr. Manford Byrd, demanding that the campus be closed, or the principal removed from the school. Byrd declined on both counts, and so the neighborhood organization instituted another aggressive media campaign, restating their demands for a closed campus and their complaints with the school.[6]

In the fall of 1986, a church bulletin accused the principal of refusing to close the school campus because he felt that the complaints from residents were "exaggerated."[7] The Northwest Neighborhood News in an article "400 Blast Steinmetz," printed erroneous and unsubstantiated accounts of

[5]Northwest Neighborhood Federation, Chicago, to Dr. Kiamos, Chicago, 17 July 1986, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

[6]Northwest Neighborhood Federation, Chicago, to Dr. Manford Byrd, Chicago, 13 August 1986, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

[7]"Northwest Neighborhood Federation," St. Ferdinand Church Bulletin, 21 September 1986, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

crime-related incidents associated with the school and attributing them to the students of Steinmetz. The article stated:

> Irate residents have taken action to demand an end to the abuses their neighborhood has endured for years stemming from Steinmetz High School. The surrounding area has suffered severely from the aggressive, anti-social behavior of Steinmetz students. One non-Steinmetz youth, riding on a CTA bus, had his radio stolen by Steinmetz students. When he tried to retrieve it, he was beaten up with seven teeth knocked out, and tossed off a moving bus. A storeowner was threatened with a knife and other fearful businessmen lock their doors during school hours. Sources report at least two knifings this year at Steinmetz, with one girl requiring over 100 stitches. Bystanders witnessed a gang battle at Belmont and Narragansett, with a gun going off and students beating one another with chains and bats.[8]

In January 1987, the same neighborhood organization filed petitions for an advisory referendum for a "closed campus" at Steinmetz High School in the 7 April 1987 elections. A popular home equity program was also tied to this referendum.[9] The home equity plan was expected to create a fund to guarantee sustained home values in areas exploited by "block busters" and "panic peddlers" in the Steinmetz neighborhood. While the referendum passed overwhelmingly, the principal declared that he would only treat it as the advisory, for

---

[8]"400 Blast Steinmetz," Northwest Neighborhood News, Chicago, September 1988.

[9]Manuel Galvan, "Referendum Sought on Guaranteed Home Equity Program," Chicago Tribune, 20 January 1987.

which it was.[10]

On 9 February 1988 the school was informed that a resolution commemorating the 7 April 1987 referendum was introduced in the Chicago City Council by Aldermen Banks and Cullerton. The resolution said:

> WHEREAS, Charles P. Steinmetz High School currently maintains an "open campus" environment for its students; and
>
> WHEREAS, The surrounding community has experienced an extensive amount of vandalism, and damage to property both real and personal; and
>
> WHEREAS, The incidence of vandalism and property damage has occurred, based upon police records, during the time that the school term encompasses; and
>
> WHEREAS, A direct correlation can then be drawn that such "open campus" status has contributed to the instability and unrest in the community.
>
> NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that we, the members of the City Council, of the City of Chicago, do hereby memorialize the Board of Education, Manford Byrd, and principal Constantine Kiamos to authorize a "closed campus" environment at Charles P. Steinmetz High School located at 3030 N. Mobile, Chicago, Illinois.[11]

No action was taken by the principal or superintendent. At the regularly scheduled meeting of the Chicago Board of Education on 13 May 1987, sixteen representatives of the Northwest Neighborhood Federation signed the roster for the

---

[10]Joe Babbo, Chicago, to Belmont-Austin Concerned Neighbors, Chicago, 25 May 1987, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

[11]Chicago City Council, "Resolution Memorializing Board of Education, Manford Byrd, and Constantine Kiamos to Create a Closed Campus at Charles P. Steinmetz High School," 9 February 1987, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

public presentation component of the meeting. Only one spokesperson addressed the Board and Superintendent Byrd. The request was to close the Steinmetz campus.[12]

On 12 June 1987 the Northwest Neighborhood Federation sent a letter to the late Mayor Harold Washington asking for his help to close the campus at Steinmetz.[13] This letter was referred to Superintendent Byrd. The response from Dr. Byrd as before was to encourage the Northwest Neighborhood Federation to work with the PTA/LSIC and the principal to help improve the school but the Northwest Neighborhood Federation refused to work with the local school.[14]

The Northwest Neighborhood Federation failed in its attempt to broaden its political base by using the Steinmetz closed campus issue as a focal point of their campaign. The General Superintendent of Schools sent a clear message in support of the principal and students of Steinmetz. Outside agitators who did not have the best interest of students in mind would have an opportunity to be heard, but they would not be allowed to disrupt the business of schooling. A year of wasted agitation by the Northwest Neighborhood Federation could have been avoided had the Northwest Neighborhood

[12]Lucyna Kanasyc, "Excerpts of Speech to Chicago Board of Education," 13 May 1987, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

[13]Joe Babbo, Chicago, to Mayor Harold Washington, Chicago, 12 June 1987, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

[14] Manford Byrd, Jr., Chicago, to Joe Babbo, Chicago, 23 September 1987, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

Federation taken the words of a deputy superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools seriously. After listening to the flagrantly biased statements of resident after resident the deputy superintendent calmly said that in spite of what they were saying or thinking, "Steinmetz is a nice place to be."[15]

In 1980, the Chicago Board of Education entered into a Consent Decree with the United States Department of Justice. This Consent Decree established two basic objectives:

1). Establishment of the greatest practicable number of stably desegregated schools, considering all the circumstances of Chicago.

2). Provision of educational and related programs for any black or Hispanic school population remaining racially isolated.[16]

By applying the Chicago Board of Education definition of desegregation, along with the two above objectives, it was determined that Steinmetz was a stably desegregated general high school, with the potential of slipping into a segregated state. Then between 1982 and 1985, the minority population grew to approximately 70% of the total student body. By Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Program guidelines, Steinmetz was now on a course towards racial isolation. The school administration, cognizant of the potential for racial change, developed a proposal for a new

---

[15]Notes of 5 June 1986 Meeting Held at Good Shepherd Bible Church, Chicago, Steinmetz Closed Campus File.

[16]Board of Education, City of Chicago, Comprehensive Student Assignment Plan (Chicago: Board of Education, 1982), 40-41.

options program to meet the need for a tri-ethnically balanced school population of black, white, and Hispanic students. This proposal became the rationale behind what would later be called Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science (SACWSS). A detailed description of this Centre follows in Chapter III.

Purpose of the Study

This case study examined program preferences surrounding the development of the options program at Steinmetz High School to determine the degree of consensus or differentiation among students, parents, staff and Local School Council members. Sex and race were also examined. To guide the study, three major questions and three hypotheses were used.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The major questions to be explored in this case study are as follows:

1) What are the program preferences of students, their parents, the school staff, and the members of the Local School Council?

2) What differences exist in program preferences among students, their parents, the school staff, and members of the Local School Council? Alternatively, how much consensus exists between these four major groups in terms of program preferences?

3)   Do these program preferences vary significantly by
gender or race?

The major hypotheses to be tested in this case study
therefore consist of the following, stated first in their null
form (A) and then in their research form (B):

1) A.   Null hypothesis: There is no difference
between the program preferences among
students, parents, teachers, and Local School
Council members.

1) B.   Research hypothesis: Program preferences will
vary significantly among students, parents,
teachers, and of the Local School Council
members.

2) A.   Null hypothesis: There is no difference
between program preferences by gender.

2) B.   Research hypothesis: Program preferences will
vary significantly by both gender.

3) A.   Null hypothesis: These is no difference
between program preferences by race.

3) B.   Program preferences will vary significantly by
race.

Justification of the Study

Warren (1978) indicated that the popularity of magnet
schools in the 1960s was due to the search for appropriate
educational options to meet individual needs for students. It
also reflected the desire for increased parental participation

in the educational process as well as the search for voluntary desegregation measures.[17]

Rossell noted the lack of systematic comparative analysis of school program components that are attractive to parents and students and their overall desegregation effectiveness.[18] The lack of adequate research on the parameters employed by parents and students to make realistic school choices is a limiting influence in the successful marketing of new and different options. There is a need to know how families will react to the availability or non-availability of such program preferences as computer laboratories, science laboratories, or swimming pools. School safety, the racial composition of the school community, the school philosophy and its interaction with other learning institutions all seem to influence the decision to accept or not to accept the school's program.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations for this study have been identified:

1. This investigation was limited to a single high school in Chicago, Illinois.

---

[17]Constancia Warren, "The Magnet School Boom: Implications for Desegregation," Equal Opportunity Review, (Spring 1978): 2.

[18]Christine H. Rossell, "What is Attractive About Magnet Schools?" Urban Education 20 (April 1985): 7-22.

2. This marketing of "options" programs in "magnet" schools is for the most part common only to school districts attempting to create and/or maintain racial diversity in the student population.

3. Replication or application of the research findings may be inhibited by the lack of either similar populations, or parallel circumstances under which to conduct research.

Conceptual Definitions

The following definitions are utilized for the purposes of this case study.

1. "Options programs" – special programs designated by an attendance center for the purpose of providing alternatives to the regular general school program.

2. "Magnet schools" – schools designated by a district solely for the purpose of desegregation. The curriculum is intended to attract students of different racial backgrounds.

3. "Elementary feeder" – schools surrounding a high school which automatically send their graduates to the home high school.

4. "White flight" – majority students fleeing their neighborhood schools to study at parochial, private, or suburban schools.

5. "Outsiders" - minority students attracted to a magnet school are often viewed as outsiders by community members surrounding the school and its predominantly white composition.

6. "Closed campus" - the disallowing of students to leave the school building during a scheduled lunch period.

7. "Block busters" - reference made to real estate agents who promote the sale of homes in a white community to minorities.

8. "Panic peddlers" - reference made to real estate agents who encourage residents to sell their homes before the homes depreciate due to racial integration.

9. "Consent Decree" - the agreement between the U.S. Department of Justice and the Chicago Board of Education, to develop and implement a system-wide student desegregation plan.

10. "Stably desegregated school" - a school that has significant numbers of majority and minority children by voluntary student assignment techniques.

11. "Integrated school" - differs from a desegregated school in that the diversity of enrollment is due to the natural residential attendance pattern.

12. "Segregated school" - less than 30% majority or minority students in the school.

13. "Lottery" - bias free system of options acceptance.

14. "Scholar athlete" - athlete who is also academically talented.

15. "Wellness" - total well-being.

16. "Sports science" - designated area of study which includes courses such as: athletic training, psychology of sport, body mechanics, exercise science, sports law, aerobic training, treatment of athletic injuries, fitness for life, etc.

17. "Choice" - the empowerment of parents to select a school for their child within legitimate restrictions dictated by community goals such as racial balance, class size, cost-effective use of facilities, etc.

Research Definitions

Described below are the definition of terms specifically related to the research questionnaire used in this case study:

1. Special courses in sports-related areas - a course offered in the school program focusing specifically on sports.

2. Attractiveness of the school building - the physical appearance of the high school building itself.

3. <u>Safety in the school neighborhood</u> - the sense of personal safety a person has on the way to or from school in the community area surrounding the high school.

4. <u>Safety in the school building</u> - the sense of personal safety a person has within the high school building itself.

5. <u>Distance from home to school</u> - the geographical distance between the location of a persons home residence and the actual location of the high school.

6. <u>A racially integrated student body</u> - the relatively equal representation of white, black, and Hispanic students within the high school student population.

7. <u>A racially integrated teaching staff</u> - the culturally and racially diverse nature represented among the teachers, clerks, aides, and custodians of the high school.

8. <u>Size of the student body</u> - the total number of students enrolled at the high school.

9. <u>Quality of school staff</u> - the character and competency of the staff employed at the high school.

10. <u>Relationship with cultural institutions</u> - the existence of ties between the high school and dominant cultural institutions in the community.

11. <u>Relationship with colleges</u> - the existence of ties between the high school and institutions of higher learning (colleges and universities).

12. <u>Opportunity for parental involvement</u> - the existence of mechanisms for allowing parents a greater role to play in the high school, to provide input and feedback on its operation and their concerns.

13. <u>Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school</u> - the sense of disappointment with a school located in the area where a person actually resides; which may give rise to their interest in attending another high school such as that under study.

14. <u>3X class offerings</u> - the existence of classes that meet three times per week.

15. <u>"No study hall" programming choice</u> - the existence of a program component that allows the student to elect to have no study hall and therefore a more intensive course of education.

16. <u>Extracurricular activities</u> - the existence of clubs, special activities, varsity sports, and structured opportunities for student participation at the high school.

17. <u>Emphasis on college prep courses</u> - the intentional effort to prepare high school students for matriculating into higher education.

18. School philosophy of "sound mind/body" - the Steinmetz emphasis on the "whole student" to develop both their physical and intellectual abilities.

19. Recruiting brochure - the type of marketing device consisting of a short written description of the high school designed to attract new students.

20. Reputation of school - the favorable or unfavorable reputation of the high school in its public perception.

21. My friends attend the school - the preference for a given high school because a person has friends who are also represented there.

22. 5th major requirement - the necessity to successfully complete twenty major units of credit instead of the Chicago Public School requirements of sixteen major units of credit for graduation.

23. Race - the self reporting of whether a person is white, black, American Indian, Hispanic, or Asian.

24. Gender - the self reporting of whether a person is male or female.

25. Program factors - aspects of a magnet or options school program intentionally designed to attract students (e.g., quality education, integrated education, attractive teaching styles, etc).

26.   <u>Non-program factors</u> - aspects of a magnet or options school which are not intentionally designed to attract students, or over which any school has little control (e.g., safety, quality of school staff, relationship with cultural institutions, relationship with colleges, parental involvement, and so on).

<u>Organization of the Dissertation</u>

This study provides five additional chapters. Chapter II provides a discussion of and summarizes the relevant literature. Chapter III describes the Centre at its inception and traces its growth to the time this study was undertaken. Chapter IV describes the research methodology employed in this study. Chapter V provides the findings from this study. Finally, Chapter VI contains the summary conclusions and recommendations based on this research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature is divided into three sections. The first section reviews the history of magnet schools. Section two describes the perceptions of various sectors of the consumer public with regard to magnet school programs. Section three delineates the additional materials utilized in the investigation.

History of Magnet Schools

Magnet schools emerged primarily as a device to promote desegregation in city schools. To their credit, magnet schools not only achieved their primary goal but have accomplished much more than that. Magnet schools have been credited with:

1) Providing high quality education in urban school systems

2) Helping to renew the interest and motivation of teachers

3) Improving a school system's image in the community

4) Encouraging the practice of a wide variety of educational philosophies and methods

5) Providing a means for research and development to add

to our knowledge of effective school programs.[1]

While the accomplishments cited above clearly indicate the success of magnet schools and programs, this desegregation tool "provided public school parents something they have never had before - the ability to choose the kind and quality of education they want for their children."[2]

In the past two years, the much maligned term "choice" has gained a new respectability. An assortment of bipartisan groups such as the National Governors' Association, the Carnegie Task Force, The Committee for Economic Development, and the United States Education Department have expressed recognition of the vast potential "choice" provides for the revitalization of public schools. Former United States Secretary of Education William J. Bennett said, "When I started to talk about choice a couple of years ago, it was still heretical. Now it seems to be conventional wisdom."[3] Lauro Cavazos, successor to Bennett, underscores the same sentiment by stating that choice "empowers people by bringing them into the decision-making process."[4] The present

---

[1]Evans Clinchy, "Let Magnet Schools Guide the Way to Education Reform - and Diversity," American School Board Journal (May 1985) 172: 5.

[2]Ibid., 43.

[3]William Snider, "The Call for Choice: Competition in the Educational Marketplace," Education Week 20 (June 1987): 2.

[4]_____ "Cavazos Couples Parental Choice, Site Management," Education Week 25 (October 1989): 21.

education chief, Lamar Alexander, was an education governor who did more than talk about education. His programs clearly aimed for excellence rather than adequacy and also employed the need for choice. President Bush, yearning to be the "education president," declared the need for public school choice to be a national necessity.[5] Finally both the 22nd and 23rd Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes reported that the public favors choice by a 2:1 margin.[6]

Shortly after the military victory in the Persian Gulf, only 41% of the public considered building a strong military force to be very important. However, 89% said developing the best educational system in the world fundamental to national well-being and that an educated citizenry is important to world superiority. In this quest for educational superiority, public school choice appears to be gaining strong support and momentum from the public. Every major population segment of the country has indicated that this aspect of school must be supported if our nation's schools are to improve and students are best served.[7] All men and women regardless of race voted 61-62% in favor of choice. Whites voted 60% in favor of choice while non-whites voted 69% in favor of choice.

---

[5]Evans Clinchy, "Public School Choice: Absolutely Necessary But Not Wholly Sufficient," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (December 1989): 289.

[6]Stanley Elam, "The 23rd Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward the Public School," Phi Delta Kappan 73 (September 1991): 40.

[7]Ibid., 42.

However, these same respondents were clearly opposed to private school choice at public expense. More than two-thirds (68%) of the public voted against private school choice at public expense.[8]

Although the Gallup Poll has been measuring parental choice since 1979, only now has it become an important issue because President Bush and his new education secretary Lamar Alexander have endorsed the concept in the "America 2000" plan. It is the goal of "America 2000" to introduce more accountability and competition into the public school monopoly that now exists.[9]

According to Warren (1978), the popularity of magnet schools in the 1960s and 1970s drew much strength from three converging trends in education. These three trends were:

1) The search for appropriate educational options to meet individual needs of students.

2) The desire for increased parental participation in the educational process.

3. The search for voluntary desegregation measures.[10]

Today, magnet schools are popular because of their perceived effectiveness, and their ability to provide attractive educational alternatives for students. The most

---

[8]Ibid., 47.

[9]Ibid., 48.

[10]Constancia Warren, "The Magnet School Boom: Implications for Desegregation," Equal Opportunity Review (Spring 1978): 1-4.

comprehensive research done by the United States Department of Education examined twelve hundred (N = 1200) magnet schools in the 1981-1982 school year. The study concluded that magnet schools or schools of choice can and do provide high quality education in urban school districts. Magnet schools have consistently reported better attendance rates, fewer discipline problems, lower dropout rates, and higher student achievement.[11]

Raywid (1987) estimated that about half of the current schools of choice were created as a result of desegregation measures. The others were developed as alternative schools to serve a range of special needs. Four factors that play a role in the popularity and success of magnet schools have been identified. These factors are:

1) Differentiation. Magnet schools aim to maximize student motivation by offering a special curricular emphasis, instructional method, or school climate.

2) Cohesiveness. The sense of shared purpose has been shown to have a positive impact on learning.

3) Autonomy. Principals and teachers generally enjoy more freedom from central control.

4) Size. Most magnet schools are smaller than traditional schools. This factor builds

---

[11]Snider, "The Call for Choice:," 3.

collegiality among students and staff, which in turn boosts morale and potential for learning.[12]

The legal framework of the magnet school evolved from the non-static positions of the courts in regard to school integration. According to Weinberg (1977) court decisions historically have created "racially discriminatory public school systems."[13] Courts were largely unsuccessful in their attempts to mediate school segregation issues because of widespread racist attitudes in the 1800s. Constitutional protection first appeared in the United States Supreme Court ruling in Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) in which separation of races in railroad coaches in Louisiana was enunciated. This "separate but equal" doctrine carried over to the school system until 1954 when its applicability to public schools was challenged.[14]

In the landmark case of Brown v. Board of Education (1954) Chief Justice Warren said: "We conclude that in the field of public education, the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." With that, the United States Supreme Court issues its order for schools to desegregate "with all deliberate

---

[12]Ibid., 3.

[13]Meyer Weinberg, "Minority Students: A Research Appraisal," Report prepared by the U.S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, (March 1977): 17.

[14]Ibid., 17.

speed."[15]   The responsibility to carry out this order was placed in the hands of school boards.   Interpretation of "with all deliberate speed" was the key to the little effort that many school districts put into desegregating and integrating their schools.   Most school boards that introduced school desegregation plans to comply with the Court's order have done so because they were either sued for non-compliance, or threatened by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW, which later became the U.S. Department of Education) by the withholding of federal funds.

In Chicago the 1980 Consent Decree resulted in the escalation of the implementation of desegregation and integration measures.   Prior to the federal government's intervention, the scope of magnet schools was limited.   After this intervention an abundance of magnet schools and options programs surfaced as alternatives to mandatory measures such as arbitrary redistricting and school pairings.   Magnet schools became the vehicle to satisfy federal guidelines for desegregation, an alternative to court-ordered busing, and a deterrent to "white flight."

---

[15]Ibid., 22.

Perceptions Regarding Magnet Schools

The concept of magnet schools and options programs was not new. Fullington (1977) said that the creation of differentiated programs within existing high schools, as well as in separately established ones, evolved from disillusionment with the old Boston Latin Grammar School's narrow and elitist curriculum. Fullington stated "It was this differentiation that established the precedent for today's magnet schools."[16] Fantini (1977) saw magnet schools as an outgrowth of the alternative schools of the 1960s and 1970s.[17]

Studies about magnet schools are abundant. Single studies of magnet schools and programs have been related to achievement (Blasie 1984), school climate (Matz 1982; Lawrence 1983; Short 1985), dropout rates (Johnson 1971; Dobransky 1975; Felice and Richardson 1977; Beverly 1980), organizational and political context (Metz 1981), interracial behavior (Larkins and Oldham 1976; Nelson and Uhl 1976; Crain 1977; Schofield and Sagar 1977; Genova and Walberg 1979), models for family choices (Raywid 1984), participation and ownership (Weintraub 1984), and school size (Clinchy 1986). A study of a Texas magnet school program by Abadzi (1983)

---

[16]Gail G. Fullington, "Magnet Schools: What Are They? Where Are They Going?" OSSC Bulletin 21 (March 1978): 3.

[17]Mario Fantini, "History and Philosophy of Alternative Schools." in Magnet Schools: Legal and Practical Implications eds. Nolan Estes and Donald R. Waldrip (Piscataway, N.J.: New Century Education Corporation, 1978).

evaluated admissions criteria, school racial composition changes, participant characteristics, student achievement, program curricula, and the attitudes of the constituency (parents, teachers, and students) towards the program. Findings indicated that student achievement score gains were minimal but rising; that the quality of students admitted improved; and that racial balance shifted from predominantly black to racial ratios more closely paralleling that of the district population.[18]

Other studies of magnet schools have been done in relation to self-concept, school environment, social and personal adjustment and achievement (Lardo 1980); academic achievement and self-concept (Soileau 1981); parent perception and pupil characteristics (Comerford 1981); social class and family environment (Roskowski 1980); and critical factors such as curriculum and recruitment, selection and training of teachers and administrators (Till 1981).

Parent perceptions of magnet schools and programs have been scrutinized for about twenty years. As early as 1968 in an interview with the superintendent of schools at Berkeley, California, Terkel cited the main fears of white parents. Terkel concluded that white parents were most concerned about

---

[18]Helen Abadzi, "A Texas Magnet Program: 1981-1983 Evaluation Materials Results," Resource in Education 1: 233099 (December 1983).

student safety, and a diminishing quality of education.[19] In

Minneapolis, Johnson (1975) found that parental perceptions

focused on five general areas: 1) parental involvement; 2)

flexibility in the curriculum, schedule and instructional

methods; 3) team teaching; 4) a learning environment that

encourages pupil movement and talk in an orderly work setting;

and 5) direct supervision of learning by the teacher for part

of the day.[20]

Wegman (1977) found that parents were concerned about

critical factors such as school quality, student safety, and

the social status of the magnet school.[21] McMillan (1977)

found five non-program and four program factors which parents

perceived to be important in their choice of schools in

Boston. These non-program factors were: 1) safety; 2)

talented and aggressive faculty and administration; 3)

relationship with universities and businesses; 4) good

facilities; and 5) parental involvement. The program

factors were: 1) quality education; 2) integrated education;

---

[19]Studs Terkel, "Two Superintendents Discuss
Integration: Interview." in Integrated Education ed. Meyer
Weinberg (Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press, 1968).

[20]Larry Johnson, "Parents' Preferences for Educational
Alternatives," Elementary School Journal 76 (December 1975):
161-169.

[21]Robert G. Wegman, "The White-flight Controversy and its
Implications for Big-City Schools," in The Future of Big-City
Schools, eds. Daniel U. Levine and Robert J. Havighurst
(Berkeley: McCutchan Co., 1977), 13.

3) attractive learning themes; and 4) attractive teaching style themes.[22]

In 1977, Levine and Campbell studied magnet programs in Dallas, Cincinnati, and Houston. The non-program concerns were the assurance of safe and reliable transportation, and school security. Program concerns included a balanced curriculum, program stability, and a program that entailed a genuinely different educational concept and approach than that of the neighborhood school. Levine and Campbell also found that successful recruitment depended a great deal first on good advertising, and secondly on a range of strategically located program choices.[23]

Royster (1978) studied eighteen school districts around the U.S. and visited three magnet schools in each district. He found that parental choice was affected to a large degree by non-program factors such as school location, physical plant, transportation, and safety in the school.[24]

Loveridge (1978) surveyed parents of magnet school students in St. Louis and found that there was no statistically significant difference in perception between

---

[22]Charles B. McMillan, "Magnet Education in Boston," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (1977): 158-163.

[23]Daniel U. Levine and Connie C. Moore, "Magnet Schools in a Big-City Desegregation Plan," Phi Delta Kappan 57 (April 1976): 507-509.

[24]Eugene C. Royster, Catherine D. Baltzell, & Karen Ferb, "Study of the Emergency School Aid Act Magnet School Program: Interim Report," A report prepared by Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass., 1978.

black or white parents in the areas of quality of education, reduction of racial isolation, and instructional implementation.[25] Our own data in Chapter IV will allow for a direct test of this previous finding and that previously reported by Terkel.

Stanley and Rosser (1978) conducted a national study of one hundred seven school districts utilizing magnet schools for voluntary desegregation purposes. Thirty-eight school districts were shown to use magnet schools with special emphasis areas. In rank order, from most frequently reported to least reported, these areas of emphasis included: 1) fine arts, 2) career/vocational/technical education, 3) academic, 4) basic skills, 5) administrative/structural alternative, 6) gifted and talented, 7) early childhood education, 8) bilingual/bicultural, and 9) handicapped.[26]

It is interesting to note that no magnet school or magnet program, to the knowledge of the author, has emphasized the concept of "wellness and fitness."

While most of the studies have focused on parent perceptions of magnet schools and programs, a few studies have

[25]Robert L. Loveridge, Joseph G. Whittling, & Thomas E. Brooks, "Parent Perceptions of Magnet Schools as a Method of Desegregation," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 27-31 March 1978.

[26]Cheryl F. Stanley & Stephan R. Rosser, "A National Survey of Magnet Schools Utilized for Voluntary Integration," Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

focused on student perceptions of the school. Bobbitt (1972) studied the different perceptions that black and white students bring to the school.[27] Schafft (1976) described the fear held by white students in a predominantly black elementary school and their subsequent avoidance of out-of-school activities.[28] Nelsen and Uhl (1976) studied minority students in predominantly white schools. Black student perceptions indicated that the white schools are better cared for, there are more clubs and extra curricular activities, and more interracial friendships and dating. The minority students, however, also felt that they were excluded from extra curricular activities and programs in the schools.[29]

In Chicago, Ogletree and Starkman (1980) surveyed 1,000 majority and minority students to determine their attitudes and perceptions of integrated schools and programs. While the majority of students surveyed favored the magnet programs, only one-third of the students believed that student achievement would be enhanced. Over 50% of the sample,

---

[27]Leslie Bobbitt, "Discipline in Desegregated Schools." Proceedings of the Conference on Development in School Desegregation and the Law. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1972, Dialog, ERIC, Ed 074 157.

[28]Gretchen Schafft, "Together Yet Separate: Territoriality Among White Children in Predominantly Black Classrooms," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, 1975.

[29]Edward A. Nelsen and Norman P. Uhl, "The Influence of Racial Composition of Desegregated Secondary Schools Upon Black Students' Perceptions of the School Climates," Research in Education 1976, Dialog, ERIC, ED 123 316.

however, believed that magnet schools would help students understand other races.[30]

Raivetz, et. al. (1980) studied student attitudes and perceptions of a magnet high school for the creative and performing arts. A fifteen item questionnaire explored racial attitudes, course content, homework, facilities, performances, and materials with respect to the students' perception of the program. Students were overwhelmingly positive. In fact, about 88% of the respondents indicated that if they had to make the choice over again, they would choose the same school.[31]

Additional Materials Relevant to This Research

Of all these studies, the one investigation most similar to the work of the present case study of Steinmetz High School is Comerford's "Parent Perceptions and Pupil Characteristics of a Senior High Magnet School." Comerford studied the first magnet high school for the creative and performing arts (CAPA) in Philadelphia. He wanted to determine what type of students are attracted to the magnet school and what qualities attracted the parents of the students who attended CAPA. Five characteristics were analyzed: pupil achievement, race,

---

[30]Earl J. Ogletree and Stanley S. Starkman, "Parents and Students' Attitudes Toward the Chicago Desegregation Plan," Research in Education June 1981, Dialog, ERIC, ED 198 221.

[31]Mark L. Raivetz, et al. "High School for Creative and Performing Arts: Student Attitudes and Perceptions," A report prepared by the Office of Research and Evaluation, Philadelphia School System, (March 1980).

gender, residence, and socioeconomic environment. The results indicated: 1) CAPA had successfully attracted students who were homogeneous in terms of residential location, number of former schools represented, socioeconomic status, race and gender; 2) more girls attended CAPA than city averages would suggest; 3) CAPA had a better racial balance than the district; 4) some 23 % of the students came from non-public schools, and 5) students were above average in achievement.[32]

In the second part of the study, Comerford examined parent perceptions and how they differed with regard to five variables: race, levels of occupation and education, student grade, and gender. In addition, program and non-programmatic factors which enhanced the educational program were identified. The program factors included: quality of the school staff, uniqueness of the curriculum, integrated student body, integrated faculty, relationship with nearby cultural institutions, and parent involvement. The present research directly replicates all five of these factors. The non-program factors in the Comerford study were: travel from home to school, safety in the neighborhood, safety in the building, size of the student body, dissatisfaction with the school the student would have attended in his/her own neighborhood; and the overall attractiveness of the school building. These

---

[32]James Comerford, "Parent Perceptions and Pupil Characteristics of a Senior High Magnet School," (Ph.D. diss. Rutgers University, 1981): 127-130.

variables are also directly replicated in the present case study of Steinmetz.

The main findings from Comerford indicated: 1) the more important items to parents were the uniqueness of the curriculum, the safety in the building, safety in the school neighborhood, and the quality of the school staff. 2) There was a direct and significant relationship between the parent's educational level and the importance they attributed to the attractiveness of the school building, and safety in the school neighborhood. 3) There were significant differences by race, occupation, and educational level for the item "opportunity for parental involvement." The higher the socioeconomic status of the parent, the less concern there was about parental involvement. 4) A desegregated educational environment was more important to non-white parents than to white parents.[33]   Comerford stated that if the balance tipped toward a majority of non-white students, it would be more difficult to attract white students and only a segment of the black student population.[34]   This very situation was in fact occurring at Steinmetz High School.

At present, over 80% of the Chicago high schools are designated magnet high schools, or contain magnet programs. As a result, the competition to attract academically talented students and an exemplary staff is intense. Recruitment of

---

[33]Ibid., 132-134.

[34]Ibid., 141.

qualified students and staff is a priority that cannot be overlooked, as the pool from which selections are made diminishes year after year. The competition is further bolstered by a strong and growing parochial and private school population which impacts negatively on recruitment efforts.

Our knowledge about the effectiveness of magnet schools and programs is limited. Rossell says: "There are few systematic, comparative analyses of the school characteristics that are attractive to parents and students, or their overall desegregation effectiveness, and even fewer systematic analyses of the educational effectiveness of the magnet curriculum, presumably one of the factors that motivates parents to enroll their children."[35]

The limited data on student, parents of students, and staff perceptions of program and non-program attractiveness make conclusions about the relative importance of various descriptors or indicators tentative at best. Unlike Comerford's study, which investigated parent perceptions of a magnet program, the present investigation focused on students, parents, staff, and members of the Local School Council (LSC) regarding their perceptions of descriptors relating to the marketing of the options available in the magnet school programs. It also measured their relative importance. The results of this investigation may play a crucial role in the

---

[35]Christine H. Rossell, "What is Attractive About Magnet Schools?" Urban Education 20 (April 1985): 7.

development of programs, and the evaluation of these programs at Steinmetz and many other high schools.

Summary

Choice appears to be the "buzz" word for our "educational president" and the general public. Empirical support has indicated three fundamental premises underlying the concept of choice. These are:

1) There is no one best school for everyone,

2) It is necessary to provide diversity in school structure and programs in order to accommodate all students and to enable them to succeed, and

3) Students will perform better and accomplish more in learning environments they have freely chosen than in those to which they are simply assigned.[36]

Magnet schools and alternative schools are two major types of schools of choice. The magnet school is usually patterned after federal guidelines to achieve desegregation by offering a quality educational program around a special theme. This curriculum must be distinctive and provide equal opportunities for all youth "with all deliberate speed."

While studies of magnet schools are plentiful and there is a wide array of topics, no magnet school or program has addressed the concept of wellness and sports science. Limited

---

[36]Mary Anne Raywid, "The Case for Public Schools of Choice," PDK Fastback 283 (1989): 7.

data as to what attracts students, parents, and staff to a magnet program is the thrust behind this case study project.

CHAPTER III

THE EMERGENCE AND GROWTH OF THE STEINMETZ ACADEMIC CENTRE

Introduction

This chapter will trace the early beginnings of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science to the time this study was undertaken. The first part of the chapter focuses on the historical background of the Centre (October 1985 - June 1987). The second part describes the implementation of the proposal (September 1987 - June 1990).

Historical Background of the Centre

October 1985 - June 1987

In the fall of 1985, an informal study of Steinmetz was undertaken by a member of the school's administrative team. A needs assessment was conducted at the grass roots level and staff input was solicited. A year later, a proposal was created from the results of this needs assessment and the recommendations made by the 1983 North Central Evaluation Team. The proposal stressed the need to stabilize the school population by a complete restructuring of the general school curriculum. The vehicle to accomplish this restructuring was called the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science. Since no college preparatory curriculum was in

place, the principal was eager to address this need. A site-based management plan was included by this visionary principal. The quality circles managerial format was stressed. The Steinmetz principal secured the support of the District Superintendent, the Field Superintendent, and an Assistant Superintendent from the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs. In December 1986 a meeting was called by the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs to discuss the proposal. This was the first step towards gaining Board approval.

The actual process of securing Board approval took six months. In mid-May 1987, the Chicago Board of Education formally approved the proposal to create an intensive four year college preparatory options program, in order to meet two basic needs:

1. Stabilization of the school population to reflect a racial balance.

2. Introduction of a high powered college preparatory curriculum.

To operationalize these needs, the principal and a representative of the Chicago Board of Education met to establish ground rules for the creation of a new options program at Steinmetz High School that would meet federal guidelines and yet would offer another choice to parents of students in the Chicago Public Schools. There were three significant guidelines to be followed:

1).   Equal access to the magnet (options) program.
      Equal access to the program requires that a non-
      discriminatory selection process be employed to
      determine eligibility and acceptance. To
      accomplish this, a lottery system of selection was
      to be prescribed. The lottery was to be conducted
      in January of each year preceding the year for
      which students were being selected. Random
      selection was expected to ensure equity in
      determining successful and unsuccessful lottery
      participants.

2).   Tri-ethnic balance among the student population.
      The Chicago Board of Education and the Federal
      Government recognized three dominant student
      populations. That is, there were: white, black,
      and Hispanic students. The goal of the magnet
      program was to stabilize the school population by
      decreasing the black student population and
      increasing the white and Hispanic populations
      accordingly until there was an approximate balance
      of numbers between the groups.

3).   Staff selection based on affirmative action policy.
      Staff selection was to be guided by policies
      mandated by the Chicago Board of Education. This
      policy, simply stated, required that no school have
      more than seventy percent (70%) of the staff be
      black.[1]

With these stipulations, the principal of Steinmetz High

School employed his own initiatives to develop and staff a

school that incorporated the best of the old school policies

with a pioneering new spirit for improvement. Through the use

of state-of-the-art technology and the support of an

invigorated staff, the principal embarked on a bold experiment

to ensure that Steinmetz would be among the best in the

nation.

---

[1]Board of Education, City of Chicago, Comprehensive
Assignment Plan, (Chicago: Board of Education, 1982):58.

Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science was thus designed to meet the challenge of the competitive job marketplace by establishing an accredited four year college preparatory curriculum in Wellness and Sports Science. The newly developed course of study offered an exciting opportunity for students to explore career opportunities in areas of personal interest, with the end goal of finding a more secure and personally rewarding future.

The escalating interest within American society in health and fitness has made everyone health conscious. Americans want to live longer and healthier. In recent years, the emphasis on well being, healthy lifestyles, disease prevention, and the importance of being an informed health consumer have all grown in interest within what some have called the "fitness revolution."

While the effects of this revolution may not be readily obvious, a new generation of twenty-first century Americans will reap its benefits. A few examples of career opportunities in health care, aside from the traditional medical practice, may be found in: nutrition, activity therapy, biomedical engineering, and medical illustration. Students in the Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science would be directed toward these new areas of employment.

Sports have always played a major role in our society. Emphasis on developing the "scholar athlete" is one of the

goals of the elite performer focus. Sports science studies focus on physical training, teamwork, physiological therapy, performance skills, promotional advertising, and endorsements. These areas encompass the cultural impact of sports on our society and the financial gains to be made by individuals and teams.

The above observations led in part to the establishment of a "Wellness and Sports Science" specialty as an "Options Program" to be offered at Steinmetz. These factors also influenced the basic philosophy of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science which was to educate the whole child by furthering the harmonious development of mind and body. The school hoped to help the student realize potential through self discipline, courage, self esteem, perseverance, and physical fitness, and to draw upon these qualities to achieve academic and life long success. In the belief that these dimensions of learning would serve as the building blocks of personal achievement and fulfillment, the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science staff accepted the contemporary challenge of education to work in harmony with parents, students, and the community to help students achieve these goals.

The Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science became a part of the growing number of "options programs" in the Chicago Public School system to address the

dual school system situation that existed long after the Brown decision. Beck (1987) said:

> Desegregation was essential to rid the nation of shameful dual school systems - those unconscionable separate, but rarely equal, schools intended to keep black children out of facilities set up for whites. The often painful personal adjustments the process necessitated had to be made to correct what was legally and morally an intolerable situation.[2]

This "school within a school" intended to draw resources from business and community organizations to augment the funding provided by the Chicago Board of Education and Federal Government. These resources would be used to design and implement innovative programs with equally distinctive curricula, taught by dedicated teachers to a racially diverse population.

In order to present a clearer picture of the development of the Academic Centre, the various components which impact on the centre will be described. These components include the curriculum, staff recruitment, student recruitment, facilities improvement, and collaborative relationships with business, community, and other institutions.

The Centre Curriculum

The National Commission on Excellence in Education in the 1983 report, A Nation at Risk, expressed strong concern for the marked deterioration of academic study in American high schools. Especially alarming to the committee were findings

---

[2]Joan Beck, "High-Risk Pupils Increase Even as Desegregation Fades", Chicago Tribune (1 October 1987):23.

that documented fragmented and incoherent curricula. High
school curricula have been in the eyes of the general public
but more especially in the eyes of educators who are assigned
the task of effective implementation of the curricula. The
National Commission said:

> Secondary school curricula have been homogenized,
> diluted, and diffused to the point that they no longer
> have a central purpose. In effect, we have cafeteria
> style curriculum in which the appetizers and desserts can
> easily be mistaken for the main course.[3]

The Commission criticized the courses and credits earned
by students in the "general high school" track which account
for at least 25% of graduation credits. These include
physical education and health, work experience outside the
school, remedial math, remedial English, and "personal service
and development" courses.[4] While the Commission agreed that
these courses have their place, they question their expansion
at the expense of core academic classes. The Commission
recommendation focuses on the strengthening of course
requirements in basic academic subjects. Their report
suggested that students should not graduate from high school
unless specific requirements are completed within prescribed
time frames.

---

[3]National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A
Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform"
(Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), 5.

[4]Ibid p. 10

These requirements are:

English	4 years
Social Students	3 years
Math	3 years
Science	3 years[5]

The Academic Centre goals have expanded the minimal requirements set by the National Commission on Excellence. For example, in order to graduate from the Steinmetz Academic Centre a student must successfully complete the following requirements:

English	4 years
Social studies	4 years
Math	4 years
Science	4 years
Language	3 years

These requirements were, in part, incorporated from a core curriculum entitled James Madison High School, A Curriculum for American Students.[6] Written with the advice of principals and teachers at a number of American schools, this represents Bennett's idea of a sound secondary core curriculum. Bennett stresses that "James Madison H.S., while reflecting the quality and character of a number of real-world models, is meant as a goal and an ideal, not as a monolithic program to

---

[5]Ibid., 11.

[6]United States Department of Education, James Madison High School, A Curriculum for American Students, (Washington, D.C.:GPO, December 1987), 3.

be uniformly imposed or slavishly followed."[7] Other electives added to the required major credits make it necessary for a student to earn a minimum of twenty-four credits instead of the present Chicago Public Schools requirement of twenty credits to graduate.

The Academic Centre curriculum is designed to address the concerns of experts in curriculum development by basing its development on Tyler's four fundamental questions. These are:

1.   What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?

2.   What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?

3.   How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?

4.   How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?[8]

While the curriculum emphasizes the study of the classics, the traditional delivery system is fused with a cooperative learning philosophy. Courses reflect a blending of the old with the new. The Centre curriculum has four focus areas. These are:

1.   COMMUNICATIONS

This focus incorporates the following disciplines:

1. English
2. Speech/Drama
3. Foreign Languages
4. Journalism

---

[7]Ibid., 1.

[8]Ralph W. Tyler, <u>Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction</u> (University of Chicago, 1969), 4.

2. MATH/SCIENCE

This focus incorporates laboratory and non-laboratory courses in science, math and computer technology.

3. HUMANITIES

This focus incorporates the following disciplines:

1) Social Studies (History, Law, Geography, Sociology, Psychology)
2) Art
3) Music

4. PHYSICAL EDUCATION/SPORTS SCIENCE

This focus incorporates three distinctive strands of choice. These strands include:

1) Teaching and Coaching,
2) Sports Marketing and Management,
3) Elite Performance.

The distinctive curriculum of the Academic Centre has two basic components. They are:

1. An interdisciplinary team teaching approach to learning. Eg., in the Humanities focus, students will survey the history of man from the Renaissance to the present with an emphasis on the development of Western Civilization. Historical analyses and interpretation will be emphasized as students encounter the major forces that shaped the modern world; the Renaissance, the Age of Discovery, the Protestant Reformation, the Enlightment, the Industrial Revolution, the rise of Democracy, Nationalism, Totalitarianism and Total War in the 19th and 20th Centuries. The art, music, and architecture that accompanied these explosive historical movements will be correlated.

2. A concentration on the overall concept of wellness. Eg., in the Physical Education focus, an array of courses in the area of fitness and sports science are included.

The uniqueness of these courses warrant brief descriptions.

Sports Psychology

This course will examine the principles of general psychology; emphasis on positive self-concept development, stress management, mind control, and other psychological facets of academic and sports competition.

Nutrition

This course will examine the principles of exercise and nutrition as they apply to fitness and weight control. Special emphasis is directed towards the management of these variables influencing body composition, lean body weight, growth, and physical performance. A special unit on cholesterol control and management is included.

Introduction to Sport Law

This course will examine all legal aspects of individuals involved in sport participation such as: liability insurance, responsibility of schools toward athletes, special insurance, agents, contract limitations, breach of contracts, tax shelters, advertising, endorsements, chemical abuse, etc.

Computers in Sports

This course will examine the extensive use of computers in sports, the employment opportunities, and the diversity of jobs available to fit many levels of ability and interest. Students will learn about computer support staff positions that are essential to any modern sports facility, including professional and semi-professional sports, college and high school sports, health clubs and corporate fitness programs. Students will have hands-on experience with sports-related computer activities.

Body Mechanics, Kinesiology and Exercise Physiology

A survey course that shows the relationship between the physical sciences (physics), biological sciences and physical education. The latest methods of aerobic, anaerobic, and sports medicine

will be covered. Students will also receive
instruction in wrapping and taping for the
prevention of injuries and to treat injuries
incurred, methods to treat injuries to aid the
athlete in recovery, massage exercise, and the use
of weights in treating injured athletes. Practical
application of these systems of training will also
be an integral part of course activities.

Fitness for Life

This course is designed for the student who wants
to maintain or improve his physical condition. It
will discuss the importance of rest, diet, and
cardio-vascular fitness as a way to manage stress
in our ever changing society. It will meet one day
a week for class room instruction and four days a
week for lab instruction.

Lifetime Sports

This course will develop skills and interests
related to lifetime sport activities. Students
will be exposed to individual sports skills and
strategies. This course will meet 9th period to
take advantage of community facilities. Activities
included: golf, tennis, badminton, racquetball,
roller skating, cross-country skiing, bowling,
orienteering, handball, ice skating, and scuba
diving.

Sports Management

A study of the management of sports and
recreational activities at both the scholastic and
adult level. This course will include both theory
and application of organizational and implemental
skills. Upon completion, student will be able to
assist in areas such as: 1) Organizing and
implementing intramural programs, including
scheduling, standings, and awards. 2) Entering,
seeding and organizing interscholastic track or
swim meets. 3) Keeping records of participants,
eligibility, inventory, or schedules for a varsity
high school team.

Sport Theory and Practicum

This course should be taken only by those students
who enjoy a variety of sports. It will discuss
seasonal sports from a spectator, participant, and
coach's point of view. Students will be required

to attend, participate, and work with coaches for a better understanding and appreciation of the game. It will meet one day a week for classroom instruction, and four days a week for lab instruction.

Team Sports Officiating

Students will receive instruction in sports rules, officiating techniques, and tournament organization. A practical officiating experience will also be provided. Sports to be covered are basketball, volleyball, softball, and flag football.

In concert with the philosophy of a "sound mind and a sound body" students are encouraged to participate in an expanded field of individual and group extracurricular activities which emphasize the Olympic ideal. Traditional sports such as football, basketball, wrestling, baseball, volleyball, track and field, swimming, golf, tennis, hockey, gymnastics, and soccer are augmented by judo, tae kwon do, aerobics, karate, team handball, and ping pong. Also available are special interest activities such as gospel singing, jazz band, academic competitions, peer counseling, peer tutoring, and ethnic clubs.

Staff Recruitment

All potential staff members are interviewed based on an initial screening of their credentials and credibility. The recruitment and selection process at the Centre follows the guidelines set by the Department of Teacher Personnel. Identifying, recruiting, and hiring appropriate personnel is viewed as crucial to the success of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sport Science program. This unique

program requires potential staff to possess unique qualifications which are based on the course offerings of the Centre. Health educators, athletic trainers, weight-training specialists, sports medicine experts, and nutritionists, are among the staff who are being recruited. These professionals were selected for their expertise in specialized areas and were required to have advanced degrees in their individual fields.

It is hoped that the Steinmetz Academic Centre staff will be comprised of professionals who are personally committed to this concept of learning and self-fulfillment; that they will be exemplary role models who will motivate students to achieve their highest potential; that they will participate in on-going workshops, meetings, staff development and in-service programs; that they will be part of a community of learners whereby all participants (teachers, other staff, administration, parents and students) will be engaged in learning and teaching; that they will focus on learning, re-learning, discovering, re-discovering, thinking critically, problem-solving, analyzing, and working together cooperatively.

Student Recruitment

During the Summer of 1987 the student recruitment plan and timetable was developed for fall implementation. The program director with the assistance of six counselors visited neighboring "feeder schools" to introduce the new program.

This group of professionals comprised the first recruitment team. Recruitment brochures were developed for fall distribution to all public, private, and parochial elementary schools in Chicago. A "High School Evening Open House" was scheduled for November 1987 and a "Feeder School Principal/Counselor Breakfast" was scheduled for December, 1987. Both functions were well attended and encouraging to the recruitment team.

Students who are highly motivated and committed to learning are expected to find this rigorous program challenging and fulfilling. The goal was to recruit a minimum of 125 Freshman students for the first year of the Academic Centre. As the program grew and facilities were expanded, each entry level Freshman class was expected to increase in number based on available space. Anticipated transition of the general high school program into the Academic Centre was projected for approximately eight to ten years.

Facilities Improvement

The success of the Academic Centre program requires the commitment of staff with innovative ideas who are also "movers" and "shakers" in the realm of educational change for improvement. However, the motivation and morale of dedicated staff is continually challenged and tested by the scope and magnitude of the tasks involved to meet this challenge. While the staff is eager to be at the forefront of change, the program is being nurtured in a system that has major fiscal

problems and is faced with professional accountability. Keeping afloat in a time of austerity emphasizes the reality of funding projects which call for additional spending. While funds have been allocated for improving the physical plant of the Centre, the work is progressing slowly. Initial allocation of nearly one million dollars for electrical work, lighting, and window replacement has been completed. New Board commitments amounting to $4.2 million for other improvements are targeted towards new locker room facilities, science laboratories, a communications laboratory, and renovation of the remaining two gymnasiums.

While the "wish list" is long, a few examples of teacher and staff generated requests include: an exercise science center, human performance laboratory, state-of-the-art fitness center, two Olympic size pools, indoor track, outdoor cinder track, auditorium/theater for the performing arts, and a new lunchroom. Although the facilities are not as important as the curriculum, most teachers have informally indicated that they would like to see some changes in the facilities.

Although the Centre's cost project plan is nearly twenty times the allocations to date, the administration and staff are satisfied with the Board's initial commitment. However, it is clear that Board commitment alone will not make the Academic Centre program a reality. Commitment from the larger tax-paying community must be obtained.

Collaborative Relationships

Several colleges and universities have been contacted and informed of the developing Academic Centre program. The institutions of higher learning were asked to assist with curriculum development, evaluation, scholarships, internships, and on-site consulting.

Business and industry have been targeted for on-the-job site experiences, summer incentive programs, adopt-a-room scheme, donations of supplies and equipment, and professional assistance in promoting sports science and wellness.

An advisory board comprised of business, industry, professional athletes, educators, and prominent supporters of the program is being established to assist in fund raising for the Centre.

Growth of the Academic Centre: 1987 - 1990

What follows now is an account of the growth of the Academic Centre from September 1987 through the school year 1989-1990. The development of the Centre with regard to curriculum, staff, teacher recruitment, student recruitment, facility improvement and collaborations will be described within the context of its social history.

School Year I (1987-1988)

The _Curriculum_ of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science centers around a humanities-based team teaching model as the basis of the core curriculum.

Teachers in various disciplines volunteered to be on the curriculum revision and writing committee. Each group was headed by a department chair. Coordinating this committee was Dr. Evelyn Carlson, former Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum for the Chicago Board of Education. First year course offerings were reviewed, restructured, and rewritten. Academic Centre teachers piloted the courses and working in tandem with the committee, fine-tuned the content and syllabus.

The curriculum revisions and additions for the first year included:

1). Humanities-based interdisciplinary team-teaching model incorporating Ancient World History, Art, and Music.

2). Conceptual Physics, a course not offered in any other Chicago Public High School.

The Staff of the newly developed Steinmetz Academic Centre consisted of a program director and secretary. This school year served as a planning and development period for the program. Much of the program director's time was spent on the development of recruitment materials, establishing linkages with universities/businesses, proposal writing for additional funding, conducting informational meetings with in-house staff and feeder schools, curriculum development, and recruitment of students for the first year group entering in September 1988. Teacher recruitment began in January 1988.

Teaching positions were advertised in the General Superintendent's Bulletin of the Chicago Public Schools. Advertised positions included English, Conceptual Physics, History, Math, Physical Education and Latin. Interviews were scheduled for the months of May and June. The interview teams were comprised of the principal, program director, central office bureau director, a coordinator from the Department of Teacher Personnel, and the President of the Local School Improvement Council. As a result of the interview process twenty-six teachers were selected for the Academic Centre opening for 1988-1989. The proposed teaching areas and number of positions staffed into the Academic Centre for September 1988 included:

Art	1	Math	5
Biology	1	PE	4
Computer	1	Physics	1
English	4	Music	1
Latin	1	Social Studies	7

The total teaching staff hired for 1988-1989 totaled twenty-six.

Student recruitment commenced in November 1988 with locally generated brochures. Central office printed brochures were promised to the director by 1 October 1987 but as it turned out, the brochures arrived 8 April 1988, three months after the close of the Options Programs enrollment period.

All elementary schools in the North and Northwest quadrant of the city were targeted. While Steinmetz was classified as a stably mixed school, changing residential patterns indicated a potential for racial change in the student body. Brochures were mailed to individual schools and presentations were made at district principals' meetings in three of the six targeted districts. Two district superintendents did not allow the program director to do any face to face recruitment in their districts. This "home made policy" changed the following year because of numerous complaints from parents who learned of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science program through friends. In spite of the limited recruiting effort there were over 500 student applications for the 125 openings at the Steinmetz Academic Centre. Student selection was based on a lottery system. This technique offers a student equal access to any program of choice. There were no minimum requirements for teacher issued grades, standardized test scores, or attendance rates. This bias-free process allowed students from all parts of the city to select a high school of their choice.

Flexible programming options were made available to the students at Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science based on the student's ability to succeed. Parental involvement, support, and commitment were actively encouraged and emphasized.

Successful students in the lottery process were interviewed for the appropriate strands. Parents and students were reminded of the Academic Centre's requirement of a strong commitment to learning because of the challenging and demanding nature of the class work for this college preparatory program. During the interview, students had the opportunity to select courses and areas of concentration. An individual educational plan was developed for each student. Each plan required a minimum of three years to a maximum of six years of successful schooling. Each educational plan was developed to address the specific needs of each student.

The Facilities of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for the first year included a physics lab, biology lab, computer lab, resource room, and a weight training center. All classrooms were located on the third floor or top floor of the school, southwest wing. Student lockers were located adjacent to classrooms for easy access and limited hall movement. The pool and libraries were shared by the entire student body. Library access was excellent, since Steinmetz contains two libraries in the building, and the Chicago Public Library has a branch located a half block west of the school adjacent to the bus stop utilized by our students.

Future plans for facilities improvement included a new exercise science lab, windows for the entire building, lockers and locker room facilities, lighting and floors in the main gymnasium, additional computer lab, and a communications lab.

These proposed improvements were to be prioritized and implemented in phases over a period of ten to twelve years. Collaboration is an area of focus that the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science has prioritized. Efforts to establish a network of support is on-going. Some practices employed to garner support included letter writing, telephone calls, person-to-person contacts, proposal writing, and door-to-door solicitation by coordinators from the Chicago Public Schools Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Collaborations for the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science were acquired through letter writing, telephone calls, face-to-face contacts, proposal writing, and the assistance of two physical education coordinators who had donated extensive time and expertise to help ensure the success of the program.

Linkages were made with two local educational institutions: University of Illinois and Northeastern Illinois University. These universities have designed the various strands of the curriculum to include didactic as well as practical training through internship programs.

On 20 June 1987, the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science program was formally introduced to the United States Olympic Academy (USOA) in Indianapolis, Indiana, site of the 1987 United States Olympic Academy conference. Presentation of the Steinmetz proposal brought

favorable comments and well wishes. Help forthcoming from the Educational Council of the United States Olympic Council included educational materials, guest speakers who are former Olympians, and availability of facilities at Olympic House in Colorado.

School Year II (1988-89)

The <u>Curriculum</u> for the first year was being field tested under the close scrutiny of the curriculum director, coordinator, curriculum revision committee, and university consultants. Courses included: Humanities I, Ancient World History, Art, and Music, Physical Education, Conceptual Physics, and Algebra I. Academic Centre teachers communicated with the committee on a timely basis to offer suggestions for revisions, improvements, or maintenance of the course content of the new curriculum. Three X computer classes were added. Student input was also solicited. Each quarter, students were asked to evaluate the content of the course and instructional delivery. This practice served as a barometer to measure the course in the area of student interest, understanding, and enjoyment of learning.

Curriculum writers for summer revisions were funded through the Chicago Board of Education curriculum department. The curriculum for the second year was also in the process of being developed.

The <u>Staff</u> additions this year included a program coordinator, academic counselor/recruiter, and curriculum

coordinator. The newly opened Steinmetz Academic Centre with 128 students required additional staff to provide the quality of service commensurate with a quality classical studies program. The non- teaching staff now totaled five - four professionals and one clerical.

Teacher recruitment was highly successful for the opening of the Steinmetz Academic Centre. Aside from local staff who applied and were accepted into the Centre, teachers came from general high schools, magnet schools, academies, and other specialty schools. The anticipated teaching staff of twenty-six became a reality in October 1988 when the much awaited vocal music teacher arrived.

In January 1989, positions were advertised in the Superintendent's Bulletin for journalism, drama, instrumental music, and desk top publishing teachers.

Student recruitment activities were heightened to a faster pace. The scheduled "Open House" in November and "Information Breakfast" in December commenced on time. The recruitment team was now comprised of the Program Coordinator, and a full time recruiter. Over 1400 applications were received for the Academic Centre options program by 15 January 1989. This was an increase of 900 over the previous year. Over 120 schools were contacted by mail. Forty schools were visited by the recruitment team. Student recruitment activities appeared to impact on the number of students applying to Steinmetz.

Facilities improvement plans were being formulated by departments. Staff input was solicited through department meetings. While the needs or wishes of every department required prioritizing, morale began to rise as staff began to experience decision making at the grass roots level. Priorities were given to the following departments: Computer, Counseling, and Physical Education. A brief description of the improvement plans for each follows:

Computer: expansion of labs to house seventy-five additional pieces of hardware.

Counseling: refurbishing of office and expansion to include two additional offices.

Physical Education: new electrical wiring, lighting, floor, backboards in main gym.

Collaboration efforts yielded exciting news from Northeastern Illinois University School of Education. The Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science was adopted by the School of Education under Dean Ahmed Fareed. Northeastern pledged to oversee the writing of the curriculum and follow through on the validating procedures. Departmental chairs from various disciplines were assigned to work with the curriculum writers in an advisory capacity.

In April 1989, a group of concerned business and community leaders established a support group for the Academic Centre. They appropriately called themselves the "Friends of Steinmetz Academic Centre" and established themselves as a

not-for-profit organization. Many notable and illustrious Chicagoland citizens pledged their support. The group was ably led by its president Daniel Shannon.

By the end of the school year, the United States Olympic Academy and other universities pledged their support through summer internships, scholarships, and AIDS education workshops for students and staff. Cholesterol studies were also done through our health classes.

School Year III (1989-1990)

Curriculum revisions, development, evaluations are now in a state of uncertainty as Chicago School Reform has made its impact on the entire school system. As indicated earlier, curriculum revisions and additions were on-going. New courses added during the 1989-1990 school year included: Desk Top Publishing, Computerized Drafting/Architecture, Academy Journalism, Typing/Word Processing, Academy Drama, Sports Management, Lifetime Sports, Aerobics for Fitness, Body Mechanics, and Treatment of Athletic Injuries. In Physical Education, the ability grouping project committee targeted its possible implementation date for September 1992.

Questions relating to the Local School Council's acceptance or rejection of the Academic Centre curriculum were abundant. Staff and teachers were advised to carry on their curriculum projects in a "business as usual" manner.

Staff additions to address the growing number of students and teachers at the Academic Centre included one full-time and

two part-time professionals. The addition of 250 incoming Freshmen to the Academic Centre necessitated these additions to the existing staff. The demand for services made it necessary to hire a counselor and two part-time curriculum writers. The number of non-quota or non-teaching staff reflected five full-time and two part-time positions. Together this staff was responsible for all activities associated with the Academic Centre.

Teacher recruitment resulted in twelve new teachers accepted into the Academic Centre. Although there were almost eighty applicants, only twelve were selected for the special program. Advertised positions in Sports Science, Communications, Journalism, Computers, Math, Physics, Band, Chemistry, and Foreign Languages attracted many applicants.

Student recruitment commenced as scheduled in early October. In November, an Open House for parents of 8th graders was held. Parents and prospective students visited classes in session and became acquainted with the entire Academic Centre facilities. Academic Centre students enrolled at the time served as guides. Communication between visitors, teachers, and Academic Centre students was encouraged. In December, a Principal/Counselor Breakfast was held and a special open house was held for the visitors.

By the end of the recruitment period, the Academic Centre recruitment team visited over sixty elementary schools in the Chicago Public School system. Student recruitment also took

the form of paid advertisement in the local newspapers. The efforts of the Academic Centre recruitment team increased the number of applications by almost 170% from the previous year. Over 2,400 applicants applied to the Steinmetz Academic Centre of which 250 were accepted.

Facilities improvement moved very slowly because of problems associated with bidding contracts for the electrical work to be done. With the completion of the electrical work and lighting, the renovation of the competition gym floor became the focus of this school year. Work began in early December and continued through the Spring semester. At the same time, the work on replacing the windows of the entire building commenced. This $675,000 project gave Steinmetz a "new face." Rehabilitation of the existing structure and new construction within the Academic Centre building was approved by the Board for $4.2 million.

New volleyball standards were installed in the girls' gym but problems with the existing floor prevented the completion of the project. A structural engineer and materials stress engineer were consulted to complete the project for the 1990-1991 school year.

Collaboration played a major role in the pursuit of establishing a wellness and sports science centre at Steinmetz. The new gym floors were paid in part by the Chicago Board of Education and a donation from Floors Incorporated, a private business. State-of-the-art basketball

backboards were installed by Porter Athletic Equipment Company at no cost to the Academic Centre. These important collaborations boosted the morale of the students who used the facility as well as the teachers who worked at the Centre.

The Athletic Congress (TAC) of Illinois sponsored workshops for Steinmetz Academic Centre students and teachers in the area of sports management. The eight week long workshop trained students and teachers in the intricacies of managing and executing a sports event such as a track meet. As part of the culminating activity, students practiced their newly acquired skills in the True Value Stores "Run for Fitness" project held at the Steinmetz Athletic Field in June 1990. Under the sponsorship of JAM Productions, Academic Centre students were able to demonstrate the effectiveness of the workshop training in the areas of judging, timekeeping, marking the fields, organizing runners, etc. In addition, the Prairie State Games awarded two student internships in the sports management area. Steinmetz interns got "hands on" experience at a national sports event.

In April 1990, the State Legislature recognized the Steinmetz Academic Centre by passing a House Resolution citing the uniqueness of the Academic Centre program and its effective contribution to educational excellence. A copy of this resolution is included in the Appendix.

Northeastern Illinois University sponsored two summer internships at the Centre for Exercise Science and Cardiac

Research.   Two Academic Centre students were given the
opportunity to earn college credit prior to entering the
university.

The United States Olympic Academy initiated two Steinmetz
Academic Centre teachers into their Class of 1990.   The Class
of 1990 received their certificates at Emory University in
Atlanta, Georgia.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter has presented a narrative description of the
events surrounding the emergence and development of the
Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science.
This discussion has attempted to provide a social history of
the Steinmetz Academic Centre program from its idea stage to
its implementation.   Although the Academic Centre is in its
infancy, there is strong indication that the Centre is well on
its way to providing Chicago students with a viable option for
quality education.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This case study is an in-depth investigation of a magnet program in a large urban school. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodology used in this study. The research strategy of the case study approach as reflected in the literature is reviewed below. Other aspects of the overall methodology described here include the design of a questionnaire, its pretesting, sampling, and data collection.

The Value of the Case Study Method and Survey Research

Frank T. Paine and William Naumes (1982), in their book Organizational Strategy and Policy, place the matter of strategic management at the heart of using broad concepts and strategy to survive in a changing environment. Most of their book is devoted to actual cases.[1]

Here we find that:

> In the case study method, learning takes place as the students try to discover, refine, and answer critical questions using real-life situations. The end goal of case analysis is suggested management actions based on the analysis.

---

[1]Frank T. Paine and William Naumes, Organizational Strategy and Policy, 3d ed., (New York: CBS College Publishing, 1982).

Thus, case studies are used for a variety of purposes such as exploring values and their effect on decisions and to "demonstrate the methods, inputs, style, and environmental setting of such decisions."[2]

Niehoff (1966) calls it not the case study method, but the case history method. Its benefit is to be able to learn from study of past efforts. The many cases of change and development affecting peasant farmers in the Niehoff book are therefore "case histories" at the project level, not the planning level. Regarding the case history method itself, we are told not so much how to carry it out as to be able to recognize when we saw it. According to Niehoff, the ideal case history method has these attributes: "professional and complete...so the...reader can get a clear picture of what happened,...interestingly presented" material that is not dull, with the "most information presented in the most succinct manner."[3]

As Miles and Huberman claim, the case study research design:

> ....contains rich descriptions and explanations of
>   processes occurring in local contexts
> ....preserves chronological flow
> ....assesses local causality
> ....results in fruitful explanations.[4]

---

[2]Ibid.

[3]Arthur H. Niehoff, ed., A Casebook of Social Change (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966), 7-8.

[4]Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Huberman, Qualitative Data Analysis (Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1984), 166.

A search of the literature on magnet schools, magnet programs, and other schools of choice was conducted to determine whether any programs in wellness and sports science existed. No such previous contributions to the literature on this topical area were located. This study therefore provides another alternative to magnet program offerings to assist in the voluntary desegregation effort.

According to Best and Kahn, all research involves three elements: observation, description, and analysis. All research would be classified under one or a combination of the following types:

1. Historical research which describes _what was_. The process involves investigating, recording, analyzing, and interpreting the events of the past for the purpose of discovering generalizations that are helpful in understanding the past and the present, and to a limited extent in anticipating the future.

2. Descriptive research which describes _what is_. This method describes, records, analyzes, and interprets conditions that exist. It involves some type of comparison or contrast and attempts to discover relationships between existing nonmanipulated variables.

3.	Experimental research which describes
	<u>what will be</u>.	The focus is on the
	relationships of variables when these
	variables are controlled or manipulated.
	As defined, deliberate manipulation is
	always a part of the experimental
	method.[5]

In trying to improve the conditions of the high school under study, many assumptions are made. However, these assumptions are personal interpretations of the administrative staff. The utilization of the survey research improves assumptions by going a step further and providing the administrators and all constituents of Steinmetz timely and accurate information, the validity of which can be ascertained. This survey research was done for not only theoretical but most importantly, practical reasons. Base line information was needed to determine what different constituencies considered important in selecting Steinmetz as a learning center.

Since a descriptive study describes and interprets what is, it is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trends that are developing. While it is primarily concerned with the present, it often

---

[5]John W. Best and James V. Kahn, <u>Research in Education</u>. Prentice-Hall, 1986, 24-25.

considers past events and influences as they relate to current conditions.[6]

Backstrom and Hursh-Cesar, strong advocates of survey research, summarized the important characteristics of survey research in the form of two checklists. The first checklist summarizes important characteristics which claim that survey research is:

1. SYSTEMATIC: it follows a specific set of rules, a formal and orderly logic of operations.

2. IMPARTIAL: it selects units of the population without prejudice or preference.

3. REPRESENTATIVE: it includes units that together are representative of the problem under study and the population affected by it.

4. THEORY-BASED: its operations are guided by relevant principles of human behavior and by mathematical laws or probability (chance).

5. QUANTITATIVE: it assigns numerical values to nonnumerical characteristics of human behavior in ways that permit uniform interpretation of these characteristics.

6. SELF-MONITORING: its procedures can be designated in ways that reveal any unplanned and unwanted distortions (biases) that may occur.

7. CONTEMPORARY: it is current, more than historical, fact finding.

8. REPLICABLE: other people using the same methods in the same ways can get essentially the same results.[7]

_____

[6] Ibid., 79.

[7] Charles H. Backstrom and Gerald Hursh-Cesar, Survey Research Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, 1981, 4.

The second checklist claims that information from the surveys is:

1. ORIGINAL: not already existing in some usable form.

2. PARTIAL: obtained from some (a sample), not all, of the people (the population) it describes.

3. MEDIATED: obtained by interviewers acting as third parties between the researcher and the people in the sample (respondents).

4. SELF-REPORTED: primarily people's testimony about themselves.

5. STANDARDIZED: obtained by uniform procedures for asking and answering questions.

6. TIMELY: collected quickly - surveys are in and out of the field in a rather brief time.[8]

In this case study, the survey research tool will provide a means of obtaining data to answer research questions in collaboration with the people under study-colleagues, students, parents of students, and members of the Local School Council. "The survey method can be an effective say to gather data from a relatively large number of cases at a particular time. While it is not concerned with characteristics of individuals as individuals, it is concerned with the generalized statistics that result when data are abstracted from the individual cases. It is essentially cross-sectional."[9] In this case study of Steinmetz, the intent of the survey questionnaire involved the development and gathering of information about Steinmetz Academic Centre to

---

[8] Ibid., 5.

[9] Best and Kahn, 90.

present group, as opposed to individual perception about characteristics perceived to be important in selecting the Steinmetz options program. The survey differs from other kinds of research in an important way: the survey can generalize about many people by studying only a few of them. The generalizations extracted from this research method are mostly free of personal biases. This is a direct result of procedures used in survey research which allows any researcher the ability to test, retest, affirm, reaffirm or refine the results. This is only one of the major strengths of doing a survey research. In reviewing various other research methods, this researcher found that the survey questionnaire's greatest strength as a research method was its ability to test hypotheses.[10] Other advantages include but are not limited to:

1. Considerable savings in cost in the area of information gathering. (Individual interview versus questionnaire)

2. Time saving.

3. Convenience of survey questionnaire completion and return according to respondent's schedule.

4. Greater assurance of anonymity.

5. Standardized wording.

6. No interviewer bias.

---

[10]Michael J. Austin and Jill Crowell, "Survey Research," in Richard M. Grinnell, Jr. ed. Social Work Research and Evaluation, Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers Incorporated, 1985: 276.

7. Possibility of gathering relevant data
    from personal records or colleagues
    before answering items.[11]

However, some obvious disadvantages include:

1. Lack of flexibility in question format
    which prevents varying the items or
    questions.

2. High potential for low response rate.

3. Use of written responses only; nonverbal
    behavior and other personal
    characteristics cannot be documented.

4. No control over environmental
    distractions.

5. Possibility of unanswered items.

6   Difficulty in determining why respondents
    are not responding to the questionnaire.

7. Complex format cannot be used.

8. No control over date on which respondents
    answer the items.[12]

The inherent limitations associated with survey research are not to be overlooked. Users of the information must temper their reliance on the data that is produced.

Compared to other research approaches, Backstrom believes that surveys are the best means available for describing certain characteristics of large populations. These include personal characteristics that people provide about themselves-how they feel, what they think, what they know, how they act. Until a better substitute method of getting the same

---

[11] Ibid., 276.

[12] Ibid., 278.

information without talking directly to the people themselves is found, the survey is the best means of describing these characteristics.

At present there is no preferred research alternative to surveys for determining with a known degree of confidence and a known level of precision, the characteristics of large populations.[13]

The case study method has been used because the focus of this study is a unique program in a school. All pertinent aspects of the school are incorporated in the study. Isaac and Michael (1981) described the case study as an in-depth investigation of a given social unit resulting in a complete well organized picture of the unit. Therefore, information which might not otherwise be reported would be included so that a clear description of the unit can be provided. The case study research design is used extensively in disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, and organizational behavior, but the case study dissertation is not new to the field of education. Present day advocates Kenny and Grotelueschen (UI-Champaign) feel that the case study approach to educational research and evaluation is a viable and vital approach for educators to utilize.[14]

---

[13]Backstrom and Ceasar, 5.

[14]Robert N. Kenney and Arden D. Grotelueschen, "Making the Case for Case Study," Journal of Curriculum Studies 16 (January/March 1984): 37-51.

In this particular case study the decision to examine Steinmetz Academic Centre was pertinent in that this school provided a multi-ethnically balanced student body which was undergoing change, but at the same time was required to maintain a prescribed minimum percentage of majority group students in order to meet the mandates of a federal court order. To satisfy these requirements the school administration and staff had to market the school throughout the city by using school program and physical plant descriptors designed to appeal to parents and potential students. This target population was comprised of families representing all of the ethnic backgrounds present in the population of a major urban city. It was thus considered pertinent to at some point measure the effectiveness of the various descriptors employed. This case study represents the first known attempt to measure the effectiveness of the descriptors used.

The procedures followed to accomplish this aim included:

1. An investigation into the background and history of Steinmetz Academic Centre was performed.

2. A survey instrument was constructed incorporating the descriptors already in use to market the options programs at the school.

3. The survey instrument was field tested and then distributed to a sample composed of students,

parents, school staff members and Local School
Council members. The survey was administered to four
hundred forty-four individuals representing the
four groups.

4. Statements relating to the descriptions of
characteristics of the school comprised the survey
items and respondents were asked to indicate the
importance of each item.

5. The substantive items were supplemented by group
identification items to aid in the comparative
analysis of responses.

6. The survey was tallied and an analysis performed
using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
(SPSS), the Statistical Analysis System (SAS), and
the System for Statistics (SYSTAT).

7. Results were tabulated and compared, measuring the
differences between the responses of the four groups
(students, parents, staff and council members) and
the responses by race and sex.

8. Conclusions were made relative to the importance of
specific descriptive items used in the marketing of
schools and special options programs.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument developed for use in this study
consisted of a one-page questionnaire. A Likert-style
quantitative survey instrument to measure program and non-

program attractiveness was developed for students, parents, staff, and members of the Local School Council. Likert scaling reflects the element of "intensity" in item format where the respondent provides an ordinal response from a series of response modes along a continuum.[15] In the present survey instrument this continuum measured response ranges from "not important" to "very important" along a seven point scale for twenty-three different program component preferences.

In a review of the literature on magnet schools and programs, two studies in particular utilized questionnaires that measured parent perceptions of schools. One, developed by Loveridge in 1977, was used to measure magnet school satisfaction of parents in St. Louis Public Schools.[16] The second, developed by Comerford in 1981, was used to study parent perceptions and pupil characteristics of a magnet high school in Philadelphia.[17] These survey instruments were used as a guide for the development of a local questionnaire to address the needs of this research project. The object of the instrument was "not to find out that parents want more of

---

[15]Earl Babbie, <u>The Practice of Social Research</u>, 6th ed., (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company), 180.

[16]Robert L. Loveridge, Joseph G. Whittling, and Thomas E. Brooks, "Parent Perceptions of Magnet Schools as a Method of Desegregation." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 27—28 March 1978.

[17]James Comerford, "Parent Perceptions and Pupil Characteristics of a Senior High Magnet School," (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1981).

everything but to learn which school characteristics seem more important to them than others."[18] This philosophy was also extended to include students, staff, and Local School Council members.

Two follow-up questions in the questionnaire also capture the rank ordering of these program preferences: which one program component is considered most important, and which one is considered the least important. Two demographic items are also included at the end of the questionnaire to measure race and gender.

Four separate versions of the questionnaire were used. Each was identical, however, in containing twenty-five questions relating to program and non-program descriptors. Two demographic questions dealt with race and gender.

A complete copy of the survey instrument used for this study is provided in Appendix C.

Each group of respondents was asked to rate the following program and non-program descriptors on a scale of "1" to "7" with "1" indicating the least important and "7" indicating the most important in evaluating their perceptions of the total school program.

A)   Special courses in sports related areas

B)   Attractiveness of the school building

C)   Safety in the school neighborhood

---

[18]Charles L. Glenn, "Putting School Choice in Place," Phi Delta Kappan (December 1989): 298.

D)   Safety in the school building

E)   Distance from home to school

F)   A racially integrated student body

G)   A racially integrated teaching staff

H)   Size of student body

I)   Quality of school staff

J)   Relationship with cultural institutions

K)   Relationship with colleges

L)   Opportunity for parental involvement

M)   Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school

N)   3X class offerings

O)   "NO STUDY HALL" programming choice

P)   Extra curricular activities

Q)   Emphasis on college prep courses

R)   School philosophy of "Sound mind/body"

S)   Recruiting brochure

T)   Reputation of school

U)   My friends attend the school

V)   5th major requirement

W)   Other

In addition to the above items all respondents were asked the following questions:

Which one (of these descriptors) would you consider to be the most important?

Which one (of these descriptors) would you consider to be the least important?

What ethnic or racial group do you represent?

What is your gender?

Field Testing Procedure

To ascertain the clarity and appropriateness of the questions on the instrument each questionnaire was pilot or field tested by samples from each participating group in the study. The samples include:

10 Academic Centre students

10 Parents of Academic Centre students

10 Staff members of the Academic Centre

5 Local School Council Members

Each of the participants was given a questionnaire to answer. The researcher conducted group interviews to further ascertain the perceived clarity and appropriateness of each question. As a result of the pilot survey, adjustments in the format were made and some words were altered or changed to provide uniformity in the four separate instruments. The instruments were reviewed by two Chicagoland educational researchers. In addition, a full review was conducted by the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects at Loyola University of Chicago.

Sampling

No effort was made to produce equivalent sample sizes for the four groups in this study. The reason is that the groups to be sampled vary naturally. The student population universe

represents approximately N = 2400. How much greater or less
the sample universe of their parents is not ascertained. The
staff sample universe at Steinmetz is approximately N = 200.
However, there are only ten members of the Local School
Council.

The sampling strategy was to seek a 10%-20% stratified
random sample of students, parents, and staff. An effort was
made to provide a saturation sampling of the members of the
Local School Council.

Student Survey Procedure

The following procedures were used to survey the student
population:

1) A random selection of students enrolled in the
    Academic Centre was given a questionnaire and a
    manila envelope addressed "TO: Parent of Steinmetz
    Academic Centre Student." Contents in the large
    manila envelope included a cover letter to the
    parents, a parent questionnaire, and a white business
    envelope labelled "Steinmetz Academic Centre Parent
    Questionnaire."

2) Counselors and division teachers trained by this
    researcher administered the survey instrument to the
    students and collected the student questionnaires at
    the end of the extended division period.

3) Students were instructed to deliver the manila
    envelope to their parents or guardians and to return

them on or before Parent Report Card Day.

Parent/Guardian Survey Procedure

The following procedures were used to survey the parent/guardian population:

1) Students in the Academic Centre delivered manila envelopes to parents or guardians.

2) The cover letter in the 8 1/2" x 11" manila envelope explained the purpose of the survey and outlined two options for the return of the completed questionnaire. These options were:

   a) Return by sending it back with the student to the division teacher.

   b) Return in person on Parent Report Card Pick-up Day.

Staff Survey Procedure

The following procedures were used to survey the staff population:

1) All Academic Centre staff (43) were included in the sampling process. The staff were aware that this research was in progress and it was possible to distribute the questionnaires directly to each of them by placing one in each of their mail boxes.

2) The cover letter accompanying the survey instrument explained the purpose of the research.

3) Staff were directed to place the completed questionnaires in a box labelled "Academic Centre Staff Questionnaires" on or before the Parent Report Card Day.

LSC Survey Procedure

The following procedures were used to survey the LSC population:

1) Each member of the LSC was mailed a questionnaire and a cover letter.

2) The letter explained options for returning the questionnaire. These options included:

a) Return by U.S. mail

b) Student

c) Council meeting

d) Report Card Pick Up Day

Data Collection

These procedures generated an overall sample size of N = 444 consisting of the following: (1) N = 246 students, (2) N = 150 parents, (3) N = 39 staff, and (4) N = 9 members of the Local School Council.

Data Processing

The surveys were keyed to a computer disk to create a single master file using the code key in Appendix B. This

code key is also useful for interpreting descriptive statistics discussed in the next chapter. The primary statistical package used for this statistical analysis is SYSTAT, <u>The System for Statistics</u>. In addition, both <u>SPSS</u> and <u>SAS</u> were also used for some parts of the analysis. All data were laboriously cross-checked for validity using the file printout after data entry to ensure no errors of transcription during data reduction. This involved comparing all computer data with their respective original source documents (e.g., surveys).

<u>Summary</u>

This chapter has described the research methodology for this case study of Steinmetz High School. The research technique is that of a survey design using a random sample stratified by grade level. The survey instrument was pretested and has been described here along with its data processing.

CHAPTER V

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the statistical findings from the analysis of the data collected on Steinmetz Academic Centre. Two statistical packages were used in the treatment of the data. The System for Statistics (SYSTAT) which is traditionally used with survey data to examine hypotheses through Chi-square tests, and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), which uses analysis of variance tests (ANOVA) to address smaller populations, serve as the statistical foundation for the study. The chapter begins with a description of the entire sample (N = 444) involving all four groups together. Each hypothesis is then tested through the findings of SYSTAT. The data is then examined through ANOVA tests. A further analysis is done with the subgroups parents and students by gender, by race, and by gender by race. A comparison of the results of the 1991 Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes towards school characteristics which influence choice and the results of this case study are then presented.

A Description of the Entire Sample (N=444)

This section describes the demographic composition and overall program descriptor preferences of four groups (students, parents, staff, and school council members) who represent the constituency of Steinmetz Academic Centre which was surveyed in this research. This was done to examine the marketing of an options program such as exists at Steinmetz. While most of this description is by means of a narrative format, tables are included which summarize the data.

The total number sampled was 444. The student group totaled 246 or 55.4% of the entire sample (n=246, 55.4%). Since there are 347 students enrolled in the Academic Centre, 246 respondents represents 70.8% of the student enrollment. The discrepancy between number of questionnaires returned and the total number of students enrolled can be explained by the fact that on any given day, fifteen to twenty percent of the students are absent or tardy to school. Further, any number of students may have elected not to participate in the survey. No effort was made on the part of the researcher to survey those students who were absent from or tardy to school on the survey day. Parents represented the next single largest group and constituted a third of the entire sample (N=150, 33.8%). As those students who were in attendance on the day the questionnaire was distributed were given exactly one survey form to take home to their parents, the highest possible number of parents in receipt of the survey could be or may

have exceeded 246. Only one survey questionnaire was sent to each family because the researcher did not want to convolute the results given that the mother and father of the same student would likely have similar values and responses. Since the voluntary behavior of each student cannot be controlled, at best, the researcher can conclude that 246 or perhaps slightly more than 246 parents received the survey questionnaire. The 150 parent respondents would therefore represent 150 out of 246 or 60.97% of the parents. Staff (N=39, 8.8%) had the highest return. Of the forty-three staff members in the Academic Centre, thirty-nine or 90.7% of the staff returned their survey instruments. The Local School Council members also had a high return percentage with nine or 90% of the members returning their questionnaire. Of the entire sample population, the nine Local School Council members represented 2% of the sample population. The staff and members of the Local School Council together represent about 10% of the entire sample.

Race was significantly different for the four groups. Table 1 shows the crosstabulation of the groups by race; note that ten students, three staff members, and two parents did not indicate their race. While Hispanics accounted for well over a third of the parent and student groups, there were no Hispanic staff and only two LSC respondents. Whites were significantly represented in both Staff (79.5%) and LSC

(55.6%) groups. Blacks were evenly represented in each group
(22-24%) except in the Staff group (10%).

TABLE 1

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE GROUP BY RACE

	Type of Constituency Group in the Survey			
	Student	Parent	Staff	LSC Member
	*******	******	*****	**********
RACE GROUP:				
White	66(26.8)	44(29.3)	31(79.5)	5(55.6)
Black	51(23.6)	36(24.0)	4(10.3)	2(22.2)
American-Indian	1(00.4)	1(00.7)	0	0
Hispanic	90(36.6)	56(38.9)	0	2(22.2)
Asian	31(13.0)	12(08.0)	1(02.6)	0

However, within the entire sample, racial diversity was
certainly evident, with roughly three equivalent groups:
whites (34%), blacks (23.23%), and Hispanics (34.7%). Asians
accounted for 10.4% and American Indians less then 1% (.2%).

Similarly, gender was significantly different for the
four groups in the survey sample. Table 2 shows that a
substantial majority of students and parents were female.
However, in the LSC group, males outnumbered females by 2:1
ratio. Note that two students, two parents, and three staff
members did not respond to the gender question.

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE GROUP BY GENDER

	Type of Sub-Sample Group in the Survey			
	Student	Parent	Staff	LSC Member
	*******	******	*****	**********
GENDER:				
Male	96(39.0)	40(26.7)	18(46.2)	6(66.7)
Female	148(60.0)	108(72.0)	18(46.2)	3(33.3)

The analyses that follow will focus on the three hypotheses that guide this research study.

Program Descriptor Preferences by Group

Hypothesis #1: Program preferences will vary significantly between students, parents, staff, and Local School Council members.

Hypothesis number one stated significant differences would emerge by group (students, parents, staff, and LSC members) in the preference ratings given for the various program components at Steinmetz Academic Centre. Here we test this hypothesis and describe the findings.

The small size of the Local School Council subsample in the present data environment meant that for purposes of analysis it was not realistic to treat it as a separate group for contingency table analysis. However, when the LSC members were combined with the school staff to create a composite group that can be designated as "school officials" this problem was eliminated. Thus, in the analysis that follows, the three groups analyzed consist of: students, parents, and "school officials" (staff and LSC members).

Table 3 summarizes the results of twenty-two different contingency table analyses made which examined whether this group factor significantly differentiated preference ratings. Ten such factors were shown to be significantly differentiated in their ratings by whether the respondent was a student,

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF PREFERENCES
BY <u>CONSTITUENCY GROUPS</u>
(Students, Parents, School Officials)

<u>Groups Vary Significantly On These Preferences</u>

Distance from home to school

Quality of school staff

Relationship with colleges

Opportunity for parental involvement

Dissatisfaction with the neighborhood school

3X class offerings

Attractiveness of the school building

Emphasis on college prep courses

Safety in the school neighborhood

My friends attend the school

<u>No Significant Difference On These Preferences</u>

Extra curricular activities

Special courses in sports areas

Safety in the school building

Racially integrated student body

Racially integrated teaching staff

Size of student body

Relationship with cultural institutions

School philosophy of "sound mind/body"

Recruiting brochure

Reputation of school

5th major requirement

"No study hall" choice

parent, or "school officials" (e.g., staff or LSC member) by the Chi-square test (p < .05). Twelve of these factors were not significant (P > .05) in relationship to the type of high school constituency group. A discussion of each factor follows.

The issue of <u>distance from home to school</u> reveals that this factor is more important to staff and parents than it is to students or members of the Local School Council. Two thirds (66%) of the staff rated this factor at a level of five or higher. Among the parents, 54.7% rated this factor at a level of five or higher. However, only 42.3% of the students and 44.4% of the Local School Council members rated this factor at a level of five or higher in terms of its importance. <u>Type of group constituency</u> in this instance significantly differentiated the importance attached to the issue of <u>distance from home to school</u>. The significant difference in preference ratings for the factor <u>distance from home to school</u> is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF <u>DISTANCE FROM HOME TO SCHOOL</u> AMONG
STUDENTS, PARENTS, & SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Ratings 1 thru 4	140(56.9)	68(45.3)	18(37.5)
Ratings 5 thru 7(highest)	103(42.3)	82(54.7)	30(62.5)

The issue of the <u>quality of the school staff</u> showed that this factor was less important to Local School Council members

parents and students than it was to the staff. All of the Local School Council members and 94.8% of the staff rated this factor at a level of five or higher. However, 78.1% of the students and 82.5% of the parents rated this factor at a level of five or higher. Type of constituency group in this instance significantly differentiated the importance attached to quality of school staff. Using the three group comparison the significance of this differentiation is shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF THE QUALITY OF SCHOOL STAFF
AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Rating of 1 thru 6	163(66.3)	75(50.0)	15(31.3)
Rating of 7 (highest)	80(32.5)	74(49.3)	33(68.8)

The issue of having a relationship with colleges showed that this factor was more important to parents and students than it was to staff. All of the Local School Council members (100%), 91.4% of the parents, and 90.6% of the students rated this factor at a level of five or higher. Over half of the students and parents gave this descriptor the highest rating. However, 76.9% of the staff rated this factor at a level of five or higher. Type of constituency group in this instance significantly differentiated the importance attached to having a relationship with colleges. Using the three group comparison the significance of this differentiation is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF
RELATIONSHIP WITH COLLEGES AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS,
AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Rating of 1 thru 6	115(46.7)	72(48.0)	34(70.8)
Rating of 7 (highest)	129(52.4)	77(51.3)	13(27.1)

The issue of opportunity for parental involvement was
also significantly differentiated by the type of group
constituency as seen in Table 7. The interesting finding
here, however, is that this factor was more important to staff
and LSC members than it was to the parents and students. All
of the LSC members and 89.7% of the staff rated this factor at
a level of five or higher. Taken together, 91.5% of the
officials rated this descriptor as very important. Yet only
43.6% of the students and 67.1% of the parents themselves
rated this factor at a level of five or higher.

TABLE 7

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF OPPORTUNITY FOR PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT
AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Rating of 1 thru 4	137(53.7)	48(32.0)	4(08.3)
Rating of 5 thru 7(highest)	106(43.6)	98(67.1)	43(91.5)

The issue of dissatisfaction with neighborhood schools
was significant in relationship to the group constituency
comparison between students, parents and officials as seen in
Table 8. However, the real comparison here was between

<u>students and parents</u>. In fact, 43.9% of the students rated

this factor at a level of five or above compared to 52% of the

parents. It was generally much less important to staff and

Local School Council members because the item simply may have

been less applicable to them.

TABLE 8

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF <u>DISSATISFACTION WITH</u>
<u>NEIGHBORHOOD</u> SCHOOL AMONG STUDENTS,
PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Rating of 1 thru 4	134(54.5)	70(46.7)	30(62.5)
Rating of 5 thru 7(highest)	105(43.9)	76(51.6)	14(29.2)

The issue of having <u>3X class offerings</u> was also

significantly differentiated by the type of group constituency

as seen in Table 9. The nature of this relationship shows

that this factor was more important to students and parents

than it was to staff and Local School Council members. Some

54.1% of the parents and 50% of the students rated this factor

at a level of five or higher. Only a third (33.3%) of the

Local School Council members and a fourth (25%) of the staff

rated this factor at a level of five or higher. Under

"officials", this represents 26.7% of the group.

TABLE 9

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF <u>3X CLASS OFFERINGS</u>
AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

<u>Ratings on 7-point Scale</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Parents</u>	<u>Officials</u>
Rating of 1 thru 4	121(49.2)	66(44.0)	33(68.8)
Rating of 5 thru 7 (highest)	121(50.0)	78(54.2)	12(26.7)

The issue of providing an <u>emphasis on college prep</u>

<u>courses</u> was also significantly differentiated by the type of

group constituency. The four groups varied not in their

percentage of rating this descriptor at a level of five or

higher, but rather in terms of the extreme importance attached

to this issue. That is, <u>59.9%</u> of the students rated this

factor as a <u>seven</u> (the highest possible level of importance).

Among parents, 60.7% rated this factor at a level of seven.

While 44.4% of the Local School Council members rated this

factor at a level of seven, only 28.2% of the staff rated this

factor at a level of seven. The significant differentiation

of this factor is shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF <u>EMPHASIS ON COLLEGE PREP COURSES</u>
AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

<u>Ratings on 7-point Scale</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Parents</u>	<u>Officials</u>
Rating of 1 thru 6	97(39.4)	59(39.3)	33(68.8)
Rating of 7 (highest)	145(59.9)	91(60.7)	15(31.3)

When rated at a level of five (important) to seven (highest level of importance), 90.6% of students and parents both rated this descriptor as important.

The issue of <u>safety in the school neighborhood</u> was also significantly different in comparing the ratings of students, parents, and school officials as seen in Table 11. The implication of this difference was quite interesting. This issue was most salient (rated at seven, the highest rating) for the watchful eyes of parents and school officials and less so for students.

TABLE 11

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF <u>SAFETY IN THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD</u>
AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Rating of 1 thru 6	135(54.9)	54(36.0)	17(35.4)
Rating of 7 (highest)	111(45.1)	95(63.3)	31(64.6)

When rated five and higher, 89.6% of the parents, 84.7% of the staff, 83% of the students, and 77.8% of the Local School Council considered this descriptor to be important.

A most interesting finding emerged in what has traditionally been considered an important marketing factor for options programs like that of the Steinmetz Academic Centre: the <u>attractiveness of the school building</u>. As seen in Table 12, indeed a significant difference existed in the ratings of the importance attached to this factor when comparing students, parents, and school officials. What is

remarkable, however, is that this factor was viewed as much more important to the <u>school officials</u> than it was to the <u>students and parents</u>. As seen in Table 12 which follows, 52% of the students and 54% of the parents rated this factor at a level of five or higher, compared to 72.9% of the school officials (staff and Local School Council members). Students were about equally split but school officials rated this descriptor important by a 3:1 ratio.

TABLE 12

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF <u>THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE SCHOOL</u>
BUILDING AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Rating of 1 thru 4	117(47.6)	68(45.3)	13(27.1)
Rating of 5 thru 7(highest)	127(52.0)	80(54.0)	35(72.9)

Finally, one factor on which variation was certainly expected by group was the student-related factor of <u>my friends attend the school</u>. As seen in Table 13, significant differences did in fact emerge in comparing students, parents, and school officials. The students (120) clearly viewed this as a much more important factor than did parents (54) or school officials (15). It is interesting to see that approximately half of the students rated this descriptor important and half did not. For the parents and officials, this descriptor was rated not important by a 2:1 margin (68% to 31%).

TABLE 13

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF "MY FRIENDS ATTEND THE SCHOOL"
AMONG STUDENTS, PARENTS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Ratings on 7-point Scale	Students	Parents	Officials
Rating of 1 thru 4	125(50.8)	94(62.7)	32(66.7)
Rating of 5 thru 7(highest)	120(49.1)	54(36.0)	15(31.3)

Program Descriptor Preferences by Gender

Hypothesis #2: Program preferences will vary
significantly by gender.

Hypothesis number two stated that there was a difference by gender in the preference ratings attached to the various program descriptors. The valence or the direction of difference was therefore expected to vary by the nature of the program component.

Table 14 summarizes the results of twenty-two different contingency table analyses made which examined whether the gender factor significantly differentiated preference ratings. Four descriptors were shown to be significantly differentiated in the ratings by whether the respondent was a male or female. There was, as expected, a significant difference in the level of importance attached to special sports-related courses (Males 48%, Females 29%). The other variables that gender significantly differentiated were a racially integrated staff (Females 54%, Males 42%), reputation of school (Females 74%, Males 63%), and distance from home to school (Females 53%, Males 42%). A discussion of these four descriptors follows.

TABLE 14. SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS

OF <u>GENDER</u> ON PREFERENCE RATINGS

(Students, Parents, School Authorities)

<u>Significant Differences By Gender on These Preferences</u>

Special courses in sports-related areas

Racially integrated staff

Reputation of the school

Distance from home to school

<u>No Significant Differences by Gender on These Preferences</u>

Emphasis on college prep courses

Safety in the school building

Quality of school staff

Extracurricular activities

School philosophy

Relationship with cultural institutions

5th major requirement

No study hall

Racially integrated student body

Attractiveness of the school building

Recruiting brochure

3x classes

Opportunity for parent involvement

Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school

Friends at school

School size

Table 15 shows the contingency table analysis for the effect of gender on the level of importance ratings attached to the issue of having special courses in sports-related areas. As seen in Table 15, 48% of the males rated this factor at a level of five or higher. This compares with only 29% of the females who rated the importance of special sports-related courses at a level of five or higher. Clearly, gender significantly differentiates this preference.

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY OF PREFERENCE RATINGS
FOR SPECIAL COURSES IN SPORTS-RELATED AREAS BY GENDER

Importance Ratings:		Males	Females
Not Important	1	10(06.3)	28(10.3)
	2	4(02.5)	24(08.8)
	3	22(13.8)	45(16.4)
	4	47(29.4)	97(35.4)
	5	28(17.5)	43(15.7)
	6	20(12.5)	11(04.0)
Very Important	7	29(18.1)	26(09.5)

In analyzing the subsamples of the four groups (students, parents, staff, and LSC members) the same tendency for males to attach a higher level of importance to sports-related course was found to be significant among the student subsample (Chi-square = 20.9, p = .002). There were seventy-seven males (48.1%) who rated this descriptor at five or higher. Only 28.8% of the females rated this descriptor five or higher. However, there was no such significance for the subsample of parents, nor for staff. It is important to clarify that both the parent and staff subsamples tend to over represent

females. Therefore, the generalization that gender significantly differentiated preference for sports-related courses must be limited to the student subsample. The student subsample clearly represents the largest proportion of respondents in this sample. While the tendency was there among parents and staff, for males to attach more importance to sports-related courses, it simply was not a large enough difference among either parents or staff to be a statistically significant difference in the levels of importance given to this factor.

Females attached more significance to racially integrated staff (Females, 54%; Males, 42%), reputation of the school (Females, 74%; Males, 63%), and distance from home to school (Females, 53%; Males, 41%). As seen in Table 16, racially integrated staff was significantly differentiated by gender. Females attached significantly more importance to the issue of staff integration. Over 22% of the females rated this descriptor at the highest level of seven.

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY OF LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE FOR
RACIALLY INTEGRATED STAFF BY GENDER
(Frequency, %)

Importance Ratings:	Male	Female
5	25(15.9)	46(17.0)
6	22(14.0)	38(14.0)
7	20(12.7)	61(22.5)

In Table 17 almost three-fourths or 74% of the females rated reputation of the school at a level of five or higher. Of that, over a third (36.3%) rated this descriptor at the highest level of seven. Males (63%) also feel that school reputation is important; however, there was a significant difference of eleven percentage points between the females and males on this descriptor. However, 31.8% of the males rated reputation of school at the highest level of seven.

TABLE 17

FREQUENCY OF LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE
FOR   REPUTATION OF SCHOOL BY GENDER
(Frequency, %)

Importance Ratings:	Male	Female
5	21(13.4)	52(19.0)
6	28(17.8)	51(18.7)
7	50(31.8)	99(36.3)

Finally, Table 18 showed that females (52.7%) attached significantly more importance to the factor of distance from home to school than did their male counterparts (41.1%). It is also interesting to note that males (59.9%) indicated that distance traveled is not an important consideration in selecting a school. The relationship between distance from home to school and safety in the school neighborhood among females showed a Pearson correlation coefficient of r = .16 which was not that strong. Nevertheless, some interaction effect may have existed by gender, but this was beyond the scope of the present analysis.

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY OF LEVELS OF IMPORTANCE
FOR <u>DISTANCE FROM HOME TO SCHOOL</u> BY GENDER
(Frequency, %)

Importance Ratings:		<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Not Important	1	15(09.4)	18(06.5)
	2	9(05.6)	18(06.5)
	3	27(16.8)	26(09.4)
	4	43(26.8)	68(24.8)
	5	31(19.3)	46(16.7)
	6	17(10.6)	47(17.1)
Very Important	7	18(11.2)	52(18.9)

<u>Program Descriptor Preferences by Race</u>

Hypothesis #3: Program   preferences   will   vary
significantly by race

The analysis of program descriptor preferences by race
focused on the three largest racial groups of the sample
population. The absence of sufficient representation of Asian
and Native Americans impacted on the ability to test for
significant differences. Therefore, the analysis of race at
this juncture was restricted to the subsample comprised of
whites, blacks and Hispanics. In a later section of this
chapter, a more robust statistical method for dealing with
small samples was employed to ascertain differences in
variance which addressed sensitivity to races other than
whites, blacks and Hispanics. The method collapsed "American
Indians" and "Asians" into one category labelled "Asians."

Table 19 summarized the statistical findings which
examined the effects of race (whites, blacks, Hispanics) on
preference ratings. As seen in Table 19, race was shown to

TABLE 19

**SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF RACE ON PREFERENCE RATINGS
(Students, Parents and School Officials)**

<u>**Significant Differences By Race On These Preferences:**</u>

Recruiting brochure

Emphasis on college prep courses

Relationship with colleges

Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school

Attractiveness of the school building

Friends attend or work at Steinmetz

<u>**No Significant Difference By Race On These Preferences:**</u>

Special courses in sports-related areas

Quality of the school staff

Safety in school neighborhood

Safety in school building

Racially integrated student body

Racially integrated staff

Size of student body

Relationship with cultural institutions

"No study hall" choice

Extracurricular activities

3X class offerings

School Philosophy of "sound mind/body"

Reputation of school

Opportunity for parental involvement

5th major requirement

significantly differentiate the importance ratings for a number of descriptors that are relevant to marketing an options program such as the Steinmetz Academic Centre. There were six descriptors that showed significant differences: recruiting brochure, emphasis on college prep courses, relationship with colleges, dissatisfaction with neighborhood school, attractiveness of the school building, and friends attend or work at Steinmetz. A discussion of these descriptors follows.

The descriptor emphasis on college prep courses was shown to be significantly differentiated by race when comparing the rating preferences of whites, blacks, and Hispanics as seen in Table 20. When rated five or higher, blacks (96.0%) and Hispanics (92%) rated this descriptor more significantly than whites (86.1%). Clearly, this factor was viewed as having much higher importance among Hispanics and blacks than among whites.

TABLE 20

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF EMPHASIS ON COLLEGE
PREP COURSES AMONG WHITES, BLACKS, AND HISPANICS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Importance Ratings:	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
Ratings 1 thru 6	74(51.4)	34(34.0)	59(39.6)
Rating of 7 (highest)	71(49.3)	62(62.0)	90(60.4)

Relationship with colleges also varied significantly by race in comparing the preference ratings between whites,

blacks, and Hispanics. The direction of this difference was of some importance, for it showed that this was a more important factor for blacks and Hispanics than it was for whites. Some 81.3% of whites rated this factor at a level of five or higher, compared to 92% for blacks, and 94.6% for Hispanics. When examining the extreme importance attached to this factor (e.g., rating it seven, the highest level of importance) the differences by race were even more pronounced as seen in Table 21. Blacks and Hispanics placed much more significance to this descriptor than whites.

TABLE 21

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF RELATIONSHIP
WITH COLLEGES AMONG WHITES, BLACKS, AND HISPANICS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Importance Ratings:	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
Ratings of 1 thru 6	86(59.7)	44(44.0)	65(43.6)
Rating of 7 (highest)	58(40.3)	55(55.0)	81(54.3)

Dissatisfaction with the neighborhood school also varied significantly by race in comparing whites, blacks, and Hispanics as seen in Table 22. The nature of this difference showed this factor was most important to blacks where some 52% rated this factor at a level of five or higher. While 47.7% of the Hispanics rated this factor at a level of five or higher in terms of importance, only 36.1% of whites rated this factor at a level of five or higher. Blacks and Hispanics clearly showed more dissatisfaction with the schools (in their respective communities) than the whites.

TABLE 22

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF DISSATISFACTION WITH NEIGHBORHOOD
SCHOOL AMONG WHITES, BLACKS, AND HISPANICS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Importance Ratings:	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
Ratings of 1 thru 4	87(60.4)	46(46.0)	73(48.9)
Ratings of 5 thru 7	52(36.1)	52(52.0)	71(47.7)

The program preference factor attractiveness of the school building also emerged as a descriptor that varied significantly when comparing the ratings among whites, blacks, and Hispanics as seen in Table 23. This marketing feature was shown to be least salient among blacks. However, whites (61.1%) considered this descriptor to be very important.

TABLE 23

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE
SCHOOL BUILDING AMONG WHITES, BLACKS, AND HISPANICS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Importance Ratings:	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
Ratings of 1 thru 4	56(38.9)	54(54.0)	63(42.3)
Ratings of 5 thru 7	88(61.1)	43(43.0)	85(57.0)

The effect of race on the descriptor preference my friends attend the school revealed significant differences between the three largest racial groups. Table 24 shows that almost half of the whites rated this "friends" factor at a level of five or higher and 40% of the Hispanic respondents rated it at a level of five or higher. However, only 33% of blacks rated this factor at a level of five or higher.

TABLE 24

DIFFERENTIAL RATINGS OF <u>MY FRIENDS ATTEND THE SCHOOL</u>
AMONG WHITES, BLACKS, AND HISPANICS
(FREQUENCY, %)

Importance Ratings:	<u>Whites</u>	<u>Blacks</u>	<u>Hispanics</u>
5	18 (12.5)	15 (15.0)	19 (12.8)
6	18 (12.5)	7 (7.0)	24 (16.2)
7	33 (22.9)	11 (11.0)	22 (14.9)

All other variables listed in Table 19 as not significant in relationship to race were again analyzed for the subsample of students only. Aside from the <u>friends attend the school</u> factor, none of the other factors was significant (p < .05) in relationship to race, as measured by differences between the three largest single racial groups (whites, blacks, and Hispanics).

Within the parent subsample separate tests were made to examine whether there was any significant difference among white, black, and Hispanic parents in their ratings of two factors of safety. These two factors measured <u>safety in the school neighborhood</u> and <u>safety in the school building</u>. Recalling the message from Terkel (Chapter II) which cited the higher concern of white parents with school safety, our data showed that white parents were <u>not significantly</u> more concerned about two different measures of school safety than were their black and Hispanic counterparts. However, in the analysis of variance test, results showed that white parents ranked this descriptor <u>first</u> in importance.

Analysis of Variance Results

Up to this point in the analysis the hypotheses have been examined primarily through Chi-square tests which are traditionally used with survey data. The only problematic aspect of the current data was that it was delimited to the larger subsamples. Since the Chi-square statistics is less appropriate on small samples, and our sample of staff and LSC members was rather small, there was a need to combine them into a group labelled "school officials." Similarly, the data was not fully exploited in terms of racial comparisons because of the smaller size of the Asian and American Indians in the sample. The Asian and the American Indians were combined into a racial category named "Others." The advantage of using this statistical technique was that for the analysis of the three independent variables of interest, we can more robustly exploit the full data environment.

Each of the ratings for the twenty-two descriptors was thus subjected to analysis of variance tests, using three independent variables in separate analyses. The three variables corresponding to the hypotheses were: school constituency group, race, and sex (gender).

The results of these analysis of variance tests are rank ordered by mean. Table 25 shows the mean rank order of all descriptors by all groups (parents, students, staff, LSC members), all races (white, blacks, Hispanics, Other), and gender (male, female). Four descriptors had means of six and

above, considering that seven was the highest mean possible on a scale of one through seven where one was lowest and seven was highest, the sample population clearly showed that these four descriptors were very important in selecting Steinmetz. These descriptors include <u>safety in the school building</u>, <u>emphasis on college prep courses</u>, <u>relationship with colleges</u>, and <u>safety in the school neighborhood</u>.

As seen in Table 25, the most important descriptor was <u>safety in the school building</u> with a mean rating of 6.19 which was closely followed by <u>emphasis on college prep courses</u> with a mean rating of 6.18. The small differential (.01) clearly indicates that both descriptors are almost equally as important to the total sample population. <u>Relationships with colleges</u> (6.05) was ranked third while another safety descriptor, <u>safety in the school neighborhood</u> (6.00), ranked fourth in the overall ranking.

<u>Quality of the school staff</u>, <u>extracurricular activities</u>, <u>reputation of the school</u>, and <u>school philosophy</u> all received a mean rating of five or higher. This mean level of five says that the sample population rated these descriptors as "important."

It is interesting to note that while the remaining descriptors received mean ratings <u>below five</u>, the means all averaged <u>above four</u>. The <u>least</u> important descriptor in selecting Steinmetz was <u>size of the student body</u>. The fact that the mean was 4.04 indicates that the sample population

TABLE 25

MEAN RANK ORDER FOR ALL DESCRIPTORS
BY ALL GROUPS, ALL RACES AND GENDER

Rank	(Mean)	Survey Item
1.	(6.19)	Safety in the school building
2.	(6.18)	Emphasis on college prep courses
3.	(6.05)	Relationship with colleges
4.	(6.00)	Safety in the school neighborhood
5.	(5.76)	Quality of school staff
6.	(5.39)	Extracurricular activities
7.	(5.25)	Reputation of the school
8.	(5.09)	School philosophy
9.	(4.98)	5th Major requirement
10.	(4.84)	Relationship with cultural institutions
11.	(4.72)	Opportunity for parental involvement
12.	(4.59)	A racially integrated student body
13.	(4.58)	A racially integrated teaching staff
14.	(4.57)	Attractiveness of the school building
15.	(4.50)	Recruiting brochure
16.	(4.49)	No study hall programming choice
17.	(4.48)	Distance from home to school
18.	(4.43)	3X Class offerings
19.	(4.31)	Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school
20.	(4.15)	Friends in school
21.	(4.14)	Special courses in sports-related areas
22.	(4.04)	Size of the student body

attached <u>some</u> importance to it. <u>Courses in sports-related</u>
<u>areas</u>, perceived to be important to this researcher was the
second least important descriptor. The "friend" descriptor
and <u>3X class offerings</u> were also ranked in the bottom five.

A complete summary of the results of these analysis of
variance tests can be seen in Table 26. In Table 26, any
significant differences that emerged between these comparisons
were also described in terms of the mean ratings. For the
variables with four categories (group constituency and race)
a range test was used following the ANOVA results to detect
which groups differed significantly from each other. These
contrasts are shown in terms of mean ratings in Table 26.
Since there was a gross under-representation of American
Indians or Native Americans in the sample, the groups for the
analysis of race therefore included whites, blacks, Hispanics,
and "Others."

Table 26 shows that twelve of the twenty-two items were
rated significantly different in terms of group constituency,
(students, parents, staff, LSC members). The differences in
ratings as a function of school group constituency were
numerous.

On the following items, council members, parents and
students rated these more important for selecting Steinmetz
than did the teachers:

    $p < .001$ <u>3X class offerings</u>

    $p < .01$ <u>Relationship with colleges</u>

    p < .01   <u>Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school</u>

    p < .02   <u>Extracurricular activities</u>

    p < .04   <u>My friends attend/work at the school</u>

    p < .05   <u>Emphasis on college prep courses</u>.

On several items, the ratings by students were lower than that of other groups:

    p < .001   <u>Quality of school staff</u>

    p < .01   <u>Safety in the school neighborhood</u>

    p < .04   <u>School philosophy of "sound mind/body"</u>

Parents and students both rated the following two items significantly lower than did staff and LSC members:

    p < .001   <u>Opportunity for parental involvement</u>

    p < .02   <u>Attractiveness of the school building.</u>

The single remaining item where there was a significant difference by group constituency showed that school council members felt that the <u>distance from home to school</u> was less important when compared to teachers and parents. Table 26 shows that this descriptor is the only one in which <u>all three hypotheses were collectively supported</u>.

A further analysis of groups rating descriptors five or higher shows some interesting results. Table 27 shows the rank order of descriptors rated five or higher for all constituency groups. When compared with Table 25 the mean rankings of all the descriptors by groups in Table 27 shows that <u>emphasis on college prep courses</u> received an important rating by 92.1% of all the respondents. <u>Safety in the building</u>

TABLE 26

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCES RESULTS FOR ALL ITEMS BY
CONSTITUENCY, RACE, AND SEX
RANK ORDERED BY OVERALL SAMPLE MEAN RATINGS

Survey Item	Sample Mean	Constituency	Race	Sex
Safety in the school building	6.19	NS	NS	p < .01 F=6.34 M=5.94
Emphasis on college prep courses	6.18	p < .01 C=6.33 S=6.22 P=6.21 T=5.64	p < .001 B=6.43 H=6.28 O=6.00 W=5.93 (B>O, B>W)	NS
Relationship with colleges	6.05	p < .01 P=6.13 S=6.11 C=6.00 T=5.28	p < .001 B=6.27 H=6.27 O=5.92 W=5.770 (B>W, H>W)	NS
Safety in the School Neighborhood	6.00	p < .01 P=6.30 C=6.22 T=6.05 S=5.80	NS	p < .01 F=6.16 M=5.72
Quality of the school staff	5.76	p < .001 C=6.78 T=6.36 P=5.93 S=5.52 (C>S)	p < .02 B=5.95 W=5.88 H=5.69 O=5.20 (B>O,W>O, H>O)	NS
Extra Curricular Activities	5.39	p < .02 S=5.47 P=5.46 C=5.33 T=4.62	NS	NS
Reputation of the school	5.25	NS	NS	p < .01 F=5.42 M=4.95

TABLE 26 CONTINUED

<u>Sample</u>

Survey Item	Mean	Constituency	Race	Sex
School philosophy of "sound mind/ sound body"	5.09	p < .04 C=5.67 P=5.34 T=5.18 S=4.87	NS	NS
5th Major Requirement	4.98	NS	NS	NS
Relationship with cultural institutions	4.84	NS	p < .04 H=5.07 B=4.92 W=4.67 O=4.44 (H>O)	NS
Opportunity for parental involvement	4.72	p < .001 C=6.50 T=5.87 P=5.17 S=4.22 (C>P, C>S, T>S, P>S)	NS	p < .01 F=4.89 M=4.43
A racially integrated student body	4.59	NS	NS	p < .03 F=4.74 M=4.33
A racially integrated teaching staff	4.58	NS	p < .04 B=5.02 H=4.52 W=4.42 O=4.27	p < .01 F=4.75 M=4.28
Attractiveness of the school building	4.57	p < .02 C=5.67 T=5.26 S=4.51 P=4.51	p < .01 W=4.87 H=4.72 O=4.53 B=4.05 (W>B,H>B)	NS
Recruiting Brochure	4.50	NS	NS	NS
"No study hall" programming choice	4.49	NS	NS	NS

TABLE 26 CONTINUED

Survey Item	Sample Mean	Constituency	Race	Sex
Distance from home to the school	4.48	p < .01 T=5.31 P=4.69 S=4.26 C=4.11	p < .01 O=4.79 W=4.70 B=4.53 H=4.17	p < .01 F=4.64 M=4.19
3X class offerings	4.43	p < .001 P=4.62 S=4.50 C=4.00 T=3.22 (P>T,S>T)	p < .01 H=4.71 B=4.69 O=4.08 W=4.06	NS
Dissatisfaction with neighbor-hood school	4.31	p < .01 P=4.54 S=4.34 C=4.00 T=3.34	P < .01 H=4.60 B=4.57 O=4.06 W=3.93	NS
My friends attend the school	4.15	p < .04 C=4.44 S=4.37 P=3.88 T=3.63	p < .01 W=4.38 O=4.35 H=4.25 B=3.55 (W>B, O>B, H>B)	NS
Special courses in sports related areas	4.14	NS	NS	p < .001 M=4.58 F=3.88
Size of the Student body	4.04	NS	NS	NS

LEGEND OF SYMBOLS:

	Constituency	Race	Gender
	C=LSC member	H=Hispanic	F=Female
	P=parent	W=white	M=male
	S=student	B=black	
	T=teacher/	O=other	
	staff	race	

p = probability level
NS = not significant (p > .05)
Results of the Newman-Kuels Range Test are shown in parentheses for those comparisons where individual groups differed. Means were based on a 7-point Likert scale with 1=not important, 7=very important.

(91.3%) ranked second. Relationship with colleges, safety in the school neighborhood, and quality of school staff were evenly matched in ranking in both Table 25 and Table 27. However, it is interesting to see that opportunity for parental involvement which was selected by three fourths of the survey population and ranked sixth in Table 27, was ranked eleventh in the overall mean rankings shown in Table 25. Extracurricular activities, mean-ranked sixth by all groups, only ranked tenth in importance by 70% of the groups in Table 27. Racial integration of both students and staff ranked higher in the mean rankings than the "important factor" rankings.

Descriptors which were rated "not important" were alike when compared by their mean rank order or "important factor" rank order. The least important descriptor in both was size of school.

A closer look at rank comparison of each of the groups in the survey population can be seen in Table 28. The significant differences by the school constituency groups (Students, parents, staff, LSC members) related to: emphasis on college prep courses, relationship with colleges, safety in the school neighborhood, quality of school staff, extra-curricular activities, school philosophy, opportunity for parental involvement, attractiveness of the school building, distance from home to school, 3X class offerings, dissatisfaction with neighborhood school, and whether friends

TABLE 27.   RANK ORDER OF DESCRIPTORS

RATED 5 OR HIGHER FOR ALL GROUPS

1	Emphasis on college prep courses	92.10%
2	Safety in the school building	91.30%
3	Relationship with colleges	89.40%
4	Safety in the school neighborhood	83.80%
5	Quality of the school staff	76.60%
6	Opportunity for parental involvement	74.70%
7	School Philosophy	71.73%
8	5th Major requirement	71.70%
9	Reputation of school	70.40%
10	Extra-curricular activities	68.70%
11	Relationship w/cultural institutions.	66.10%
12	Attractiveness of school building	64.60%
13	No study hall programming choice	55.10%
14	Distance from home to school	52.20%
15	Recruiting brochure	52.20%
16	Racially integrated student body	48.10%
17	Racially integrated staff	45.90%
18	Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school	42.20%
19	3X class offerings	40.60%
20	Sports-related courses	40.00%
21	Having friends	39.80%
22	Size of school	36.20%

TABLE 28

RANK COMPARISON BY GROUPS

(Rated 5 or Higher)

	STUDENTS	PARENTS	STAFF	LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCIL (LSC)
01	Emphasis on College Prep Courses	Rel. W/ Colleges	Quality of Staff	Quality of Staff
02	Rel. W/ Colleges	Emphasis on College Prep Courses	Safety in School	Safety in School
03	Safety in School	Safety in School	Parental Involvement	Parental Involvement
04	Safety in Neighborhood	Safety in Neighborhood	Emphasis on Coll. Prep Courses	Emphasis on College Prep Courses
05	Quality of Staff	Quality of Staff	Safety in Neighborhood	Relationship With Colleges
06	Extracurricular Activities	Philosophy of Sound Mind/Body	Relationship With Colleges	Philosophy of Sound Mind/Body
07	School Reputation	Extracurricular Activities	School Reputation	Attractive School Building
08	5th Major Requirement	5th Major Requirement	Relationship with Colleges	5th Major Requirement
09	Philosophy of Sound Mind/Body	School Reputation	Distance from Home to School	Safety in the Neighborhood
10	Relationship with Cult. Institutions	Parental Involvement	5th Major Requirement	Extracurricular Activities
11	Racially Integrated Student Body	Relationship with Cult. Institutions	Philosophy of Sound Mind/Body	School Reputation
12	Attractive Building	No Study Hall Program	Attractive Bldg.	Relationship with Cult. Institutions

13	Recruiting Brochure	Recruiting Brochure	Extracurricular Activities	No Study Hall Program
14	Racially Integrated School Staff	Distance from Home to School	Recruiting Brochure	Recruiting Brochure
15	3X Classes	Attractive Building	School Size	Sports-Related Courses
16	No Study Hall Program	3X Classes	Racially Integrated Student Body	Racially Integrated School Staff
17	Friends at Steinmetz	Dissatisfied with Neighborhood Sch.	No Study Hall Program	Racially Integrated Student Body
18	Dissatisfied with Neighborhood Sch.	Racially Integrated Student Body	Racially Integrated School Staff	Distance from Home to School
19	Parental Involvement	Racially Integrated School Staff	Sports-Related Courses	Friends at Steinmetz
20	Distance from Home to School	School Size	Friends at Steinmetz	Dissatisfied with Neighborhood Sch.
21	Sports-Related Courses	Friends at Steinmetz	Dissat. with Neighborhood Sch.	3X Classes
22	School Size	Sports-Related Courses	3X Classes	School Size

work at or attend school.

Students ranked emphasis on college prep courses as the most important descriptor in their choice of Steinmetz. Relationship with colleges was the second most important reason for choosing Steinmetz. Safety was a high priority; whether it was safety in the school or safety in the community that surrounds the school. While quality of staff (ranked 5th) was important, the racial composition of the staff was not as important (ranked 14th). Also significant was the fact that neither opportunities for parental involvement (ranked 19th) nor distance from home to school (ranked 20th) was considered important. Of all groups, students ranked the "friend" descriptor higher than any of the other constituency groups. This was brought up in an earlier discussion.

Parents of students ranked safety factors two of the four most important descriptors for selecting Steinmetz. Safety in the school and safety in the neighborhood were rated at a level of five or higher by 90% of the parents. Relationship with colleges and emphasis on college prep courses were both selected by over 90% of the parents. Opportunity for parental involvement was not rated as highly as expected by this researcher. Extracurricular activities, school philosophy, the 5th major requirement, and the reputation of the school were ranked higher. Racial integration of the staff or the student body was also ranked low. Along with school size, the friend factor, and sports-related courses, the concern for

racial integration ranked among the five least important reasons for selecting Steinmetz for their children.

Staff ranked <u>quality of school staff</u> as the most important descriptor. <u>Safety in the school</u> ranked second and <u>safety in the neighborhood</u> ranked fifth. This was not unusual in that teachers in large urban schools have continually been faced with student attacks, student gang problems, theft of and damage to personal property, and other daily situations associated with large urban school systems. Tied in with the staff's concern for safety was the descriptor <u>opportunity for parental involvement</u> which ranked third as a preference. It was clear that teachers and other staff members want parents to become more involved with the education of their children. Staff ranked <u>distance from home to school</u> ninth in importance but other groups ranked this descriptor as one of the five least important descriptor.

Council members differed from parents and students when ranking <u>quality of school staff</u>. Like the staff, council members ranked this descriptor as the <u>most</u> important descriptor whereas parents and students ranked this factor only fifth. Council members again differed from students in the ranking of the descriptor <u>relationship with colleges</u>. Council members did not rank this descriptor high on the priority list. In contrast, students ranked <u>relationship with colleges</u> second only to <u>emphasis on college prep courses</u>.

Local School Council members ranked five descriptors
equally as important in terms of highest level of importance.
One hundred percent of the council members rated the following
descriptors seven (highest): quality of staff, safety in
school, opportunity for parental involvement, school emphasis
on colleges prep courses, and relationship with colleges.
Eight of nine council members rated school philosophy and
attractiveness of the school building as very important. It
is curious to note here that school building attractiveness
was rated higher by the council members than any other
constituency group. The members of the LSC, all adults,
responded much differently than the parent group (presumed to
be all adults). While the LSC ranked this descriptor seventh
in importance, the parent group ranked this a low fifteenth in
importance ranking. Another descriptor that showed a
significant difference in ranking was emphasis on sports-
related courses. Over half of the council members (55.5%) and
only a third (34.7%) of the parents considered sports-related
courses to be important. For the parent group, this
descriptor was ranked least important. It is also interesting
to note that among the Steinmetz Local School Council members,
four descriptors were rated alike in being not important.
Forty-four percent of all LSC members rated the two racial
integration items, distance from home to school and the friend
factor as being unimportant. Together with 3X classes and

school size, they account for the descriptors that were rated not important.

Table 29 lists the descriptors rated five or higher by gender in rank order by percent. It is interesting to note that for the top ranked descriptors selected there were no significant gender differences. However, gender differences began to appear among the descriptors that were ranked lower than fifth in importance. The significant gender differences related to: safety in the school building, safety in the school neighborhood, reputation of the school, opportunity for parental involvement, a racially integrated student body, a racially integrated staff, distance from home, and special courses in sports-related areas.

Safety in the school building and safety in the neighborhood were rated five or higher by more females than males. Females ranked safety in the school building second in importance only to emphasis on college prep courses.

Females also ranked racially integrated staff as important; males did not. Somewhat interesting to the researcher was the stronger significance that males attached to the descriptor building attractiveness. More males than females considered this descriptor to be important. Building attractiveness was less important to the females. The reputation of the school, however, was seen as very important to more females. Approximately three fourths of the females

rated this descriptor at a level of five or higher. As
expected, males rated emphasis on sports-related courses
much higher than females. Males ranked this descriptor
fifteenth in importance whereas females ranked this descriptor
last. Travel distance from home to school was of particular
importance to females but not to males. It is also
interesting to note that the descriptor opportunity for
parental involvement was rated important by more male
respondents than female respondents. Over 50% of the males
rated this descriptor important and less than 50% of the
females rated this descriptor important.

To summarize the mean gender difference, females cited
seven items as being significantly more important than males.
These were:

     p < .01   Safety in the school building

     p < .01   Safety in the school neighborhood

     p < .01   Reputation of the school

     p < .01   Opportunity for parental involvement

     p < .01   A racially integrated teaching staff

     p < .01   Distance from home to school

     P < .01   A racially integrated student body

Males, on the other hand, cited only one item as much more
important compared to the ratings by females:

     p < .01   Special courses in sports-related areas.

Significant racial differences related to: emphasis on
college prep courses, relationship with colleges, quality of

TABLE 29

DESCRIPTORS RATED 5 OR HIGHER
BY GENDER IN RANK ORDER

RANK	%	(FEMALES)	%	(MALES)
1	91.7	Emphasis on College Prep Courses	88.6	Emphasis on College Prep Courses
2	90.4	Safety in School Building	86.0	Relationship With Colleges
3	90.3	Relationship with Colleges	83.4	Safety in Neighborhood
4	88.0	Safety in Neighborhood	83.4	Safety in School
5	83.4	Quality of School Staff	79.7	Quality of School Staff
6	74.0	Reputation of School	72.3	Extra Curricular Activities
7	72.0	Extra Curricular Activities	65.5	5th Major Requirement
8	68.5	School Philosophy	63.0	School Reputation
9	64.7	Relationship with Cult. Inst.	61.0	School Philosophy
10	64.3	5th Major Requirement	58.5	Relation W/Cultural Institutions
11	56.4	No Study Hall	55.8	Attractiveness of Sch. Building
12	54.7	Racially Integ. Student Body	50.2	Parental Involvement Opportunity
13	54.6	Attractiveness of School Building	49.7	Recruiting Brochure
14	54.0	Recruiting Brochure	48.1	3X Classes
15	53.5	Racially Integ. Staff	47.7	Sports-Related Courses
16	52.5	Distance from Home	47.4	No Study Hall
17	50.0	3X Classes	47.2	Racially Integrated. Student Body
18	49.5	Parent Involvement	43,7	Dissatisfied With Neighborhood School
19	45.5	Dissatisfied With Neighborhood School	43.3	Friends
20	43,3	Friends	42.6	Racially Integrated Staff
21	41.0	School Size	42.1	Distance from Home to School
22	29.3	Sports Rel. Courses	32.7	School Size

school staff, relationship with cultural institutions, a
racially integrated staff, attractiveness of the school
building, distance from home to school, 3X class offerings,
dissatisfaction with neighborhood school, and whether friends
attend, work, or are at school. Table 30 is an aggregate
rating of different racial groups in their descriptor ratings
of five and higher. The responses of all racial groups were
combined (white, black, Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian)
and ranked from highest to lowest by percent. As seen in
Table 30, all racial groups rated the same descriptors in the
top five level of preference as the four constituency groups
(students, parents, staff, and LSC members) as well as the
gender (male, female) preferences. Emphasis on college prep
courses ranked first by group, by gender, and by race. While
there were intra-ranking differences within ranks two through
five, the same descriptors were ranked as most important:
relationships with colleges, safety in the school, safety in
the neighborhood, and quality of school staff. Differences in
significance level began to appear from rank six through
twenty-two.

The extracurricular activities descriptor was an important
factor racially. This descriptor was ranked sixth in
importance when subjected to racial analysis. Reputation of
the school was another important descriptor and ranked seventh
in importance. These two rankings were similar to the gender
ranking by females in Table 29. However, when compared with

TABLE 30. DESCRIPTORS RATED 5 OR HIGHER BY ALL RACES

Rank %

Rank	%	Descriptor
1	(90.5)	Emphasis on college prep courses
2	(88.9)	Relationship with colleges
3	(86.8)	Safety in the school building
4	(85.4)	Safety in the Neighborhood
5	(79.1)	Quality of school staff
6	(71.8)	Extracurricular activities
7	(68.0)	Reputation of the school
8	(63.7)	5th major requirement
9	(63.2)	School philosophy
10	(61.2)	Relationship with cultural institutions
11	(55.2)	Opportunity for parental involvement
12	(53.3)	Attractiveness of school building
13	(52.9)	Recruiting brochure
14	(50.4)	Racially integrated student body
15	(50.0)	Distance from home to school
16	(49.0)	No study hall programming choice
17	(48.9)	Racially integrated staff
18	(46.8)	3X class offerings
19	(45.3)	Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school
20	(42.9)	Having friends at school
21	(37.9)	Size of student body
22	(35.5)	Sports-related courses

the aggregate group analysis in Table 27, extracurricular activities and school reputation ranked far below that of the racial analysis ranking in Table 30. All groups ranked opportunity for parent involvement sixth in importance but racial analysis ranking of this descriptor was eleventh. The least important descriptors by race were consistent with the aggregate group rankings and only the male ranking results on Table 29 (gender).

In order to show a clearer picture of where the different racial groups differed, Table 31 shows a mean rank order comparison of the four races (black, white, Hispanic, and Others). Hispanics, blacks and "Others" (Asians and American Indians) all agreed on the three most important descriptors: emphasis on college prep courses, relationship with colleges, and safety in the school. In addition, to Hispanics and "Others," safety in the neighborhood was the fourth most important descriptor in selecting Steinmetz.

Whites, on the other hand, were most concerned with safety factors. It is notable that safety in the school and safety in the neighborhood ranked first and second, respectively. Whites also placed higher emphasis on the reputation of the school than all the other races. What is also interesting is the amount of emphasis placed on attractiveness of the school building which was not considered important enough by the other races to rank in the top ten rankings.

TABLE 31. MEAN RANK COMPARISON BY RACE
Top Ten Descriptors

	BLACK	WHITE	HISPANIC	OTHERS
1	College Prep Courses	Safety in School	College Prep Courses	College Prep Courses
2	Relationship With Colleges	Safety in Neighborhood	Relationship With College	Relationship With Colleges
3	Safety in School	College Prep Courses	Safety in School	Safety in School
4	Quality of Staff	Quality of Staff	Safety in Neighborhood	Safety in Neighborhood
5	Safety in Neighborhood	Relationship With Colleges	Quality of Staff	Extra Cur. Activities
6	Extra Cur. Activities	Reputation of School	Extra Cur. Activities	Quality of Staff
7	School Philosophy	Extra Cur. Activities	School Reputation	School Reputation
8	School Reputation	School Philosophy	5th Major Requirement	5th Major Requirement
9	Racial Integ. of Staff	Attract. of Building	Relationship W/Cult. Inst.	Distance
10	Parental Involvement	5th Major Requirement	School Philosophy	School Philosophy

Two descriptors, <u>racial integration of staff</u> and <u>opportunity for parental involvement</u>, were only important to blacks. Both of these descriptors ranked in the top ten rankings. <u>Distance from home to school</u> was only considered most important by "Others" in the top ten ranking.

Hispanics rated <u>relationship with cultural institutions</u> more significantly than the other races. Asians, Native Americans, whites and blacks did not rank this descriptor as being that important. As seen in the comprehensive summary in Table 26, blacks and Hispanics rated these items higher than all whites and "Others" as indicated by the significance levels:

p<.001　<u>Relationship with colleges</u>

p<.01　<u>Emphasis on college prep courses</u>

p<.01　<u>3X class offerings</u>

p<.01　<u>Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school</u>

p<.04　<u>Relationship with cultural institutions</u>

Additionally, blacks, Hispanics, and whites rated the following items as more important than did the other races:

p<.02　<u>Quality of school staff</u>

p<.04　<u>A racially integrated teaching staff</u>

On the remaining three items where there were differences by race, the ratings were as follows. Blacks considered the <u>attractiveness of the school building</u> and the fact that <u>my friends attend the school</u> as much less important factors than the other three groups. Hispanics considered the <u>distance</u>

from home to school as much less of a factor than did the other three groups.

Taking a closer look at race, Table 32 shows the rank comparison by race of descriptors rated five and higher. While the top four descriptors are the same as those shown in Table 31, their rank order differs. One of the most interesting outcomes is the descriptor quality of school staff which now ranks as the most important descriptor for whites. School safety, which ranked first in the aggregate tally, now ranks second when ranked according to descriptors rated five and higher. The 5th Major descriptor, ranked tenth in the aggregate analysis, ranked seventh when ranked by descriptors ranked five and higher in the racial analysis.

Another interesting outcome emerged when descriptors rated five and higher were ranked by race. Racial integration of staff, which was ranked ninth in the aggregate descriptor analysis of blacks, was not ranked in the top ten descriptor ranking of descriptors rated five or higher. Relationship with cultural institutions, however, ranked ninth for blacks. For the Hispanic racial group, the top ten descriptors in Table 31 appeared in Table 32. With the exception of the top two descriptors which were in reverse order (relationship with colleges and emphasis on college prep courses), all descriptors appeared in the same rank order on both tables.

In the "Others" racial category, nine out of ten descriptors were alike on both Table 31 and Table 32.

philosophy of the school did not rank among the top ten descriptors when rated five and higher. Two other descriptors, relationship with cultural institutions and recruiting brochure, ranked higher than the school philosophy descriptor. Opportunity for parental involvement was ranked in the top ten descriptors in both Table 31 and Table 32 by blacks only. All other racial groups did not prioritize this descriptor. Only 58% of Hispanics and 48% of the "Others" categories rated the parental involvement descriptor at a level of five or higher. In this era of school reform, this seems to be a rather small percentage of interest.

Descriptors impacting on integration were more important to blacks. Nearly 60% of blacks rated integration of staff and integration of student body at a level of five or higher. Whites (51%) rated the school integration descriptor as important and 46% rated integrated staff at a level of five or higher. There were 52% of the Hispanic group that rated integrated student body at a level of five or higher and 49% that rated integrated staff at a level of five or higher. The "Others" category did not rate these descriptors too highly. Both descriptors were rated at a level five or higher by approximately 40% of the respondents.

Several descriptors failed to show any significant differences by any of the three independent variables (constituency, race, gender). Therefore, consensus existed on these factors: 5th major requirement, recruiting brochure,

TABLE 32.   RANK COMPARISON BY RACE
(Descriptors Rated 5 and Higher)

	BLACK	WHITE	HISPANIC	OTHERS
1	College Prep Courses	Quality of Staff	Relationship With Colleges	College Prep Courses
2	Relationship with Colleges	School Safety	College Prep Courses	Rel. With Colleges
3	School Safety	College Prep Courses	School Safety	Neighb. Safety
4	Quality of Staff	Neighborhood Safety	Neighborhood Safety	School Safety
5	Neighborhood Safety	Relationship With Colleges	Quality of Staff	Extra Cur. Activities
6	School Philosophy	School Reputation	Extra Cur. Activities	Quality of Staff
7	Extra Cur. Activities	5th Major Requirement	School Reputation	School Reputation
8	School Reputation	Extra Cur. Activities	5th Major Requirement	5th Major Requirement
9	Rel. With Cult. Instns.	School Philosophy	Rel. With Cult. Instns	Rel. With Cult. Instns
10	Parent Involvement	Attractive Building	School Philosophy	Distance
11	5th Major Requirement	Parent Involvement	Recruitment Brochure	Recruitment Brochure
12	Racially Integ. Staff	Rel. W/Cult. Institutions	Attractive Building	School Philosophy
13	Racially Integ. Student Body	No Study Hall	3X Classes	Attractive Building
14	Recruitment Brochure	Distance	No Study Hall	Parent Involvement

15	Dissat. With Neighb. Sch.	Racially Integ. Student Body	Parent Involvement	Friends
16	3X Classes	Friends	Racially Integ. Student Body	Dissat. W/ Neighb.Sch
17	Distance From Home to School	Racially Integ. Staff	Racially Integ. Staff	Racially Integ. Staff
18	No Study Hall	3X Classes	Dissat. With Neighb. Sch.	Integrated Stud. Body
19	Attractive Building	Recruitment Brochure	Friends	No Study Hall
20	Sports Rel. Courses	School Size	Distance from Home to School	School Size
21	Friends	Dissat. With Neighb. Sch.	Sports Rel. Courses	Sports Rel. Courses
22	School Size	Sports-Rel. Courses	School Size	3X Classes

"no study hall" programming choice, and size of student body.

A complete summary of descriptor preferences significantly

differentiated by constituency, gender, and race is shown in

Table 26.

A Closer Look At Parents and Students

Since the purpose of this study was to provide recruitment

information to those engaged in the recruitment of "options"

students in the Chicago Public Schools, taking a closer look

at two constituency groups was necessary to strengthen the

utility of this case study dissertation. This study now

focuses on the descriptors rated important (5 or higher) by

two constituencies: parents and students. The discussions

will focus on parents and students by gender, parents and

students by race, and parents and students by gender and race.

Table 33 shows a breakdown of the entire sample by

constituency group (parents and students) by gender.

As seen in Table 33, female parents attached strong

importance to the following descriptors: emphasis on college

prep courses, relationship with colleges, safety in the school

building, and safety in the neighborhood. Each of these

descriptors was rated at a level of five or higher by over

90% of the female parents. Female students also placed strong

emphasis on three of the factors cited by female parents.

These were: relationship with colleges, emphasis on college

prep courses, and safety in the school building. Male

students, on the other hand, showed less concern for the

TABLE 33

Descriptors Rated 5 or Higher
By Group By <u>Gender</u>

(Note: All figures are recorded in percent)

DESCRIPTOR	FEMALE PARENT	MALE PARENT	FEMALE STUDENT	MALE STUDENT
1. Emphasis on College Prep Course	91.6	87.5	92.0	89.4
2. Relationship With Colleges	92.5	87.5	90.0	87.4
3. Safety in School Building	91.6	82.5	89.8	81.8
4. Safety in the Neighborhood	91.5	87.5	86.5	76.9
5. Quality of School Staff	85.1	87.5	79.7	77.6
6. Extra Curricular Activities	75.9	72.5	73.8	73.6
7. Reputation of School	75.2	61.6	74.1	69.6
8. School Philosophy	75.4	75.0	63.2	53.8
9. 5th Major Requirement	71.0	73.7	60.0'	60.9
10. Relationship with Cult. Institutions	66.3	65.0	61.2	53.7
11. Attractiveness of School Building	53.7	53.8	55.1	47.9
12. No Study Hall Programming Choice	63.6	55.3	54.7	42.0
13. Recruiting Brochure	54.3	55.0	54.7	47.4
14. 3X Class Offerings	49.6	64.1	53.5	45.7

DESCRIPTOR	FEMALE PARENT	MALE PARENT	FEMALE STUDENT	MALE STUDENT
15. Opportunity for Parent Involvement	70.8	55.0	47.0	38.9
16. Dissatisfaction with Neighborhood School	54.3	42.5	41.0	47.9
17. Having Friends at Steinmetz	41.6	57.5	57.6	45.3
18. Distance From Home to School	62.9	45.6	47.8	39.7
19. Sports-Related Courses	33.9	36.6	28.4	52.6
20. Integrated Student Body	53.2	44.6	59.3	45.5
21. Integrated School Staff	53.2	42.5	57.6	42.7
22. School Size	40.5	37.3	37.4	30.6

safety factors in the survey. Reputation of the school was rated important by three fourths of the female parents and only 62% of the male parents. Female students attached more significance to this descriptor than their male counterparts. School philosophy, also rated important by three fourths of the parents, was not important to students. Male students did not rate this descriptor important. A huge discrepancy between female parents and male students can be seen for the descriptor opportunity for parental involvement. Almost 71% of female parents rated this descriptor important and only 39% of the male students rated this descriptor important. It is interesting to note that both male parents and female students had nearly the same response percentage for the descriptor having friends at Steinmetz. Nearly 58% of male parents and female students rated this descriptor at a level of five or higher, compared to 42% for female parents and 45% for male students. Another descriptor where gender differences were pronounced was sports-related courses. A strong 53% of male students compared to 28% of female students rated this descriptor at a level of five or higher.

Table 34 shows the tabulation of parents and students by race. As seen in Table 34, over 90% of black, Hispanic and "Others" students and black parents rated emphasis on college prep courses at a level of five or higher in their reason for selecting Steinmetz. Black, Hispanic, and "Others" students, and black and Hispanic parents rated relationship with

TABLE 34. DESCRIPTORS RATED 5 OR HIGHER
By Group By <u>Race</u>

(Note: All figures are recorded in percent)

Descriptor	(PARENTS)				(STUDENTS)			
	B	W	H	O	B	W	H	O
1. Emphasis on College Prep Courses	94.5	88.1	91.3	84.6	96.6	83.1	92.2	90.7
2. Relationship With Colleges	94.4	86.1	94.8	84.7	91.4	78.8	94.4	90.6
3. Safety in the School Building	88.9	90.5	87.9	92.3	84.2	84.3	90.0	80.0
4. Safety in the Neighborhood	94.4	86.1	91.2	92.3	79.3	81.8	85.5	84.4
5. Quality of School Staff	86.1	90.7	80.6	61.6	84.5	83.2	76.3	62.5
6. Extra Curricular Activities	77.7	72.1	78.9	61.1	72.5	65.2	77.8	81.1
7. Reputation of School	69.5	66.6	88.1	61.6	67.8	65.1	72.3	64.6
8. Sports-Related Courses	27.7	28.0	41.3	46.2	39.7	33.3	42.7	31.3
9. School Philosophy	86.1	72.2	71.4	69.3	67.3	54.6	57.3	58.1
10. 5th Major Requirement	70.6	74.5	74.6	58.3	55.4	54.6	67.5	61.3
11. Relationship With Cultural Instns	66.7	55.8	68.4	76.9	59.6	47.0	68.9	48.4
12. Attractiveness of School Building	45.8	58.1	58.6	46.2	40.4	57.5	56.6	50.0
13. No Study Hall Program. Choice	45.6	62.8	67.9	69.3	43.1	53.8	48.3	58.0
14. Recruiting Brochure	58.3	47.7	61.2	46.2	56.9	33.3	60.7	56.4
15. 3X Class Offerings	57.1	43.9	60.7	50.0	50.1	53.9	52.8	34.4
16. Opport. For Parent Involvement	70.6	69.0	60.4	69.3	51.6	34.9	47.2	35.5
17. Dissat. With Neighborhood School	61.1	47.5	51.7	38.5	49.1	33.3	47.6	46.7
18. Having Friends at Steinmetz	58.3	46.5	33.9	30.8	38.0	53.0	51.2	56.3
19. Distance From Home to School	40.0	69.8	47.4	75.0	45.7	35.0	40.8	53.9
20. Racially Integ. Student Body	55.0	47.3	46.1	50.0	55.7	55.0	55.5	43.3
21. Racially Integrated Staff	54.3	44.9	46.2	50.0	57.2	48.7	49.5	45.2
22. Size of School	28.4	41.7	35.5	50.0	25.1	34.4	43.2	33.4

colleges as being very important. Over 90% of these racial
groups rated this descriptor at a level of five or higher.
Safety factors were a concern for all parents of all races and
especially important for Hispanic students. Only Hispanic
students had 90% of their respondents rating a safety
descriptor at a level of five or higher.

Quality of school staff was rated important by 91% of
white parents. Only 62% of "Others" parents and students
rated this descriptor important. It is interesting to note
that the descriptor reputation of school was rated at a level
of five or higher by 88% of Hispanic parents and 72% of
Hispanic students. These percentages represented the highest
percentages for this descriptor. All other groups were
represented below 70%. Of all the groups, black parents rated
school philosophy important. Over 86% of black parents rated
this descriptor at a level of five or higher. Opportunity for
parental involvement was rated at a level of five or higher by
71% of black parents. White and "Others" students did not
place much importance on this descriptor. Both white and
"Others" students showed 35% of the respondents rating this
descriptor at a level of five or higher. The "friend"
descriptor was rated important by over half of black parents,
white students, Hispanic students, and "Others" students.
Black students did not rate this descriptor as highly as the
rest of the students.

Table 35. Descriptors Rated 5 or Higher By <u>Group</u>, By <u>Gender</u>, By <u>Race</u>

DESCRIPTOR	SEX	(PARENTS)				(STUDENTS)			
		W	B	H	A	W	B	H	A
1. College Prep Courses	M	91.0	83.3	89.5	75.0	84.2	95.2	87.5	93.3
	F	87.0	96.6	92.2	87.5	82.5	97.3	96.0	93.3
2. Relationship-College	M	81.9	100.0	89.5	75.0	73.6	90.5	90.0	93.3
	F	87.5	93.4	97.4	87.5	74.9	91.9	98.0	86.7
3. Safety-Building	M	81.8	100.0	79.0	75.0	83.4	76.1	85.0	78.5
	F	93.6	86.7	92.1	100.0	84.8	88.9	94.0	92.9
4. Safety-Neighborhood	M	90.9	100.0	84.2	75.0	79.0	66.6	80.0	79.9
	F	84.3	93.3	94.6	100.0	81.9	86.5	90.0	86.7
5. Quality of School Staff	M	91.0	83.4	73.8	50.0	84.2	80.9	76.8	66.7
	F	90.7	86.7	83.8	62.5	82.7	86.4	75.0	46.7
6. Extra Curr. Activities	M	72.7	66.6	79.0	50.0	57.9	80.9	72.5	86.7
	F	71.9	80.0	78.9	62.5	68.0	67.5	82.0	80.0
7. School Reputation	M	60.0	83.4	63.2	25.0	52.7	65.0	62.5	53.3
	F	68.8	66.7	85.6	87.5	70.2	69.4	80.0	78.5
8. Special Courses in Sports-Related Areas	M	27.3	50.0	47.5	25.0	63.2	61.9	47.5	39.9
	F	28.2	23.3	36.9	50.0	21.2	27.0	38.7	20.0
9. School Philosophy	M	81.9	83.3	73.7	50.0	42.2	61.9	47.5	73.4
	F	68.8	86.7	72.2	75.0	59.6	70.2	65.3	50.0
10. 5th Major Requirement	M	72.8	83.3	70.5	75.0	63.1	50.0	60.6	73.3
	F	75.0	67.9	75.7	42.9	51.0	58.3	73.0	49.9
11. Relationship With Cultural Institutions	M	36.4	83.4	68.4	100.0	47.5	52.4	57.5	53.3
	F	62.6	63.3	70.2	75.0	46.8	63.9	78.0	42.9
12. Attractiveness of School Building	M	72.8	20.0	57.9	25.0	63.2	30.0	50.0	46.9
	F	53.2	49.9	57.9	50.0	55.3	45.9	62.0	53.3
13. No Study Hall Programming	M	63.7	40.0	59.2	25.0	44.5	38.1	40.0	50.0
	F	62.5	46.7	72.9	87.5	57.5	45.9	55.1	66.7

14. Recruiting Brochure	M	45.5	66.6	79.0	50.0	57.9	80.9	72.5	86.7
	F	48.4	60.0	55.9	50.0	38.3	59.4	67.3	53.3
15. 3X Classes	M	63.7	100.0	57.9	50.0	57.9	38.1	46.2	40.0
	F	36.7	50.0	63.8	42.9	52.1	57.1	58.0	43.3
16. Opportunity For Parental Involvement	M	63.7	40.0	52.7	50.0	31.6	47.6	40.0	33.4
	F	71.0	75.8	63.2	87.5	36.2	54.0	53.1	42.9
17. Dissatisfied With Neighborhood School	M	45.5	16.7	52.7	25.0	42.1	55.0	50.0	40.0
	F	48.2	70.0	50.0	37.5	29.8	45.9	45.6	49.9
18. Friends at Steinmetz	M	18.2	66.7	42.1	25.0	36.9	42.8	47.5	53.3
	F	56.2	23.3	27.7	37.5	59.6	35.1	54.0	60.1
19. Distance From Home to School	M	72.8	16.7	47.4	75.0	31.7	42.8	37.5	46.7
	F	65.7	63.4	47.4	75.0	38.3	48.6	44.0	60.0
20. Racially Integrated Student Body	M	36.4	50.0	47.4	50.0	52.7	47.5	55.0	26.6
	F	58.1	60.0	44.8	50.0	57.4	63.9	56.0	59.9
21. Racially Integrated School Staff	M	27.3	50.0	50.1	50.0	47.4	45.0	45.0	33.3
	F	62.0	58.6	42.2	50.0	50.0	49.4	54.0	57.1
22. Size of School	M	36.4	16.7	21.1	75.0	36.8	9.6	42.5	33.4
	F	46.9	40.0	50.0	25.0	31.9	40.5	44.0	33.3

Table 35 shows the percentages of the parent and student groups by gender and by race. The major concerns of these groups focused on three areas: <u>safety factors,</u> <u>college courses</u> and <u>linkages,</u> and <u>staff expertise.</u> The discussions that follow are based on data summarized in Table 35.

Concern for safety in selecting a school was once again clearly defined by apparent groups. All racial parent groups rated these descriptors at a level of five (important) or higher (7, most important). At least 90% of one or both parents of all races rated the two safety factors as important. <u>Safety in the neighborhood</u> is the primary concern of all parents who elected to send their child to Steinmetz. <u>Safety in the neighborhood</u> was selected by all black male parents, 93.3% of black female parents, and all "Others" female parents. Second to neighborhood safety was <u>safety in the school.</u> <u>Safety in school</u> was selected by all of the black male parents and "Others" female parents, 94% of white female parents, and 92% of Hispanic female parents. Female parents selected this descriptor by a 3:2 margin over male parents.

Students, however, did not share the same intensity of concern towards safety factors. Students in general were most concerned about <u>college prep emphasis</u> and the <u>relationship with colleges.</u> School safety was not their major priority. However, when analyzing students by gender and race, safety concerns become quite significant.

In the Hispanic student group, females showed strong concern for safety factors. <u>Safety in school</u> was rated important by 94% of the females while <u>safety in the neighborhood</u> was rated important by 90% of the female students. Both Hispanic males and females ranked safety factors third and fourth in level of importance.

While female students showed the strongest concern for safety, of all the student groups, white females ranked <u>safety in the building</u> as the <u>most</u> important reason for selecting Steinmetz. <u>Safety in the neighborhood</u> was the third most important reason for their choice of Steinmetz. White males selected safety reasons as their third and fourth choice.

Table 35 indicates that the most important descriptor selected by all parents and students together in rank order were:

1) Emphasis on college prep courses

2) Neighborhood safety

3) Relationship with colleges

4) School safety

5) Quality of staff

When each group was analyzed, the following descriptor rankings occurred:

Parents: 1) Safety in the neighborhood

2) Safety in school

3) Relationship with colleges

4) Emphasis on college prep courses

          5) Quality of staff

Students: 1) Emphasis on college prep courses

          2) Relationship with colleges

          3) Safety in school

          4) Safety in the neighborhood

          5) Quality of school staff

The descriptor emphasis on college prep courses was rated important by at least 90% of each parent racial group except the "Others" category. Black female parents rated this descriptor as the most important reason for selecting Steinmetz. Black female parents (96.6%) and black female students (97.3%) represented the highest percentages tallied for this descriptor. Over 90% of Hispanic parents (male and female) and white male parents also rated this descriptor important.

While Asian and Indian American female parents rated this descriptor as the third most important reason for selecting Steinmetz, both male and female "Others" students rated emphasis on college prep courses as the most important reason for attending Steinmetz. As seen in Table 35, 93% of the "Others" student group rated this descriptor at a level of five or higher.

Black male (95.2%) and black female (97.3%) students had the highest percentages of respondents rating this descriptor as being important in selecting Steinmetz. Hispanic female students (96%) also considered emphasis on college prep

courses important in their decision to attend Steinmetz. White students, on the other hand, did not rate this descriptor as highly in their choice of school when compared to the other three racial groups. Black male and female students, "Others" male and female students and white male students rated this descriptor as the most important reason for selecting Steinmetz. Hispanic male and female students selected this descriptor as the second most important factor that influenced their decision of choosing a high school.

The descriptor relationship with colleges showed some interesting results. All genders and groups of blacks and Hispanics showed strong concern for this descriptor. Over 90% of these respondents rated college relationships at a level of five and higher. Male "Others" students (93.3%) also showed strong concern for this descriptor. While blacks did not rate this as the most important factor, all Hispanic groups and genders selected this factor as the most important reason for selecting a school as Steinmetz.

White students (male and female) ranked this descriptor fifth in level of importance. White female students rated this descriptor closely with school reputation and extracurricular activities. For the white male students, extracurricular activities and building attractiveness tied for sixth place ranking. Although 88% of the "Others" female parent groups ranked this descriptor fourth in overall importance, three fourths of the "Others" male parents rated

this descriptor at a level of five or higher. Relationship with colleges, therefore, proves to be a descriptor that is more important to black parents, Hispanic parents, black students, Hispanic students, and "Others" males.

Quality of staff, ranked fifth by all parents and students, also showed some interesting outcomes. White parents rated this descriptor second only to safety factors. To all white parents and female white students, quality of staff was more important than coursework or college linkages. As mentioned earlier, only staff and LSC members rated quality of staff as the most important descriptor.

The only other race and groups that selected staff quality within the top five descriptors were black parents and black students. Staff quality and school reputation were tied for fifth place in the male black parent rankings. School philosophy and quality of staff tied for fifth place ranking for female black parents. Black male students ranked staff quality fourth in importance and black female students ranked this descriptor fifth in importance. Hispanic male students ranked quality of staff fifth in level of importance.

Looking at the other end of the "preferred" descriptor rankings, in general, parents and students both agreed that the following descriptors were among the least important: school size, having a friend at Steinmetz, dissatisfaction with neighborhood school, and sports-related courses. In addition, parents cited integration factors as being less

important than the other descriptors. <u>Students</u> cited <u>distance</u>
<u>from home</u> and <u>opportunity for parental involvement</u> as being
less important than the other descriptors. When analyzed by
racial groups, interesting results appeared. Black parents
and students showed that <u>dissatisfaction with neighborhood</u>
<u>schools</u> was not on the bottom third of the rankings. <u>Black</u>
<u>parents</u> also attached <u>more</u> significance to the "friend"
factor. Whites and Hispanics did not deviate from the general
ratings. However, the "Others" student group, like the black
parents, attached more importance to the "friend" factor. In
addition, <u>distance from home to school</u> was also important for
the "Others" male.

A Look at the Gallup Poll and Choice Issues

Parental choice issues have been measured by the Gallup
Polls since 1979. School choice received a cool endorsement
with only 11% to 12% of parents indicating they would send
their children elsewhere than their neighborhood school.
Eight years later (1986), 68% of public school parents said
they wanted to choose the public schools their children would
attend, 25% said no, and 7% did not respond to the question.
What is interesting is that 73% of the mothers were in favor
of choice and only 62% of fathers wanted choice. A year later
(1987), only 20% said they did not want choice.[1]

---

[1]Stanley Elam, "The 23rd Annual Gallup Poll of Public
Attitudes Toward the Public School," <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u> 73
(September 1991): 40.

A new dimension to the 1979 questionnaire was added to the survey's treatment of parental choice in 1990. Respondents were asked to relate the aspects of the school characteristics which would be most influential in deciding what school to attend. Twelve characteristics were measured. These characteristics included:

1) Quality of the teaching staff

2) Maintenance of student discipline

3) Curriculum (i.e., the courses offered)

4) Size of classes

5) Grades or test scores of the student body

6) Track record of graduates in high school, in college, or on a job

7) Size of the school

8) Proximity to home

9) Extracurricular activities, such as band, orchestra, theatre, clubs

10) Social and economic background of the student body

11) Racial or ethnic composition of the student body

12) Athletic program.

The above factors were measured on a five-point Likert scale from "not important," "not too important," "fairly important," "very important," to "don't know."[2]

Over three fourths of the respondents felt that quality of the teaching staff and the maintenance of student discipline

---

[2]Ibid., 44.

were very important. Other factors of importance in descending order included the curriculum (73%), class size (56%), grades or test scores (48%), track record of graduates (43%), size of school (35%), proximity to home (31%), extracurricular activities (24%), social and economic background of the student body (22%), racial or ethnic composition of the student body (21%), and the athletic program (20%). In 1991, these identical factors were measured and the results were virtually the same for the top eight in rank order.[3]

A comparison of descriptors ranked in this case study dissertation showed many likenesses to the factors in the 1990 and 1991 Gallup Poll surveys. In the present study, the descriptors which may be equated with the Gallup Poll factors are shown in Table 36; these eight areas of factors and descriptors will be later compared by percentages and ranked. In arriving at the eight areas of comparison and ranking, it was necessary to "collapse" or combine some of the Gallup Poll factors and the case study descriptors. For example, the Gallup Poll factors grades or test scores of the student body and track record of graduates in high school, college or on the job were collapsed and equated with the case study descriptor reputation of the school. The factors extracurricular activities and athletic program were collapsed

---

[3]Ibid., 48.

TABLE 36. COMPARISON & EQUATING
OF GALLUP POLL FACTORS
WITH CASE STUDY DESCRIPTORS

GALLUP POLL FACTORS	CASE STUDY DESCRIPTORS
Quality of teaching staff	Quality of school staff
Maintenance of student discipline	Safety in the school building
Curriculum (i.e., courses offered)	Emphasis on college prep courses
Grades or test scores of the student body and track record of graduates in high school, college, or on the job	Reputation of the school
Size of the school	Size of the student body
Proximity to home	Distance from home to school
Extracurricular activities and athletic program	Extracurricular activities
Racial or ethnic composition of the student body.	A racially integrated student body

and equated with the descriptor <u>extracurricular activities</u>.
With the acceptance of these comparisons, a review of Table 37
shows the comparisons by percentage and rank. Table 37 shows
the factors from the Gallup Poll rated "fairly important" and
"very important" by percentage and the descriptors from this
case study dissertation rated "important" and "very important"
by percentage. The Gallup Poll percentages represent the
total population responses. The case study percentages are
shown by aggregate or total population responses, parents
only, and students only.

As seen in Table 37, the Gallup Poll respondents felt that
<u>quality of teaching staff</u> and <u>maintenance of student
discipline</u> were equally as important as 96% of the respondents
ranked both of these factors important. The respondents in
the case study did not select either of those factors as their
most important reason for choosing a school. The <u>curriculum</u>
which has a college prep emphasis was the most important
reason for selecting a school such as Steinmetz. In looking
at only the student respondents, the <u>emphasis on college prep
courses</u> (curriculum) was also ranked first. The parent group,
however, like those in the Gallup Poll, selected <u>school safety</u>
(maintenance of school discipline) as being most important in
selecting a school. Both the respondents in the 1991 Gallup
Poll and the case study dissertation questionnaire agreed that
the <u>three</u> most important reasons for selecting a school were

staff quality, school safety or maintenance of discipline, and
the school curriculum. It is interesting to note that the
case study respondents ranked extracurricular activities
fourth in the order from highest to lowest. The respondents
in the Gallup Poll ranked it second from the bottom of the
eight areas measured. School reputation, ranked fourth by the
Gallup Poll, ranked fifth in the case study questionnaire
results. Another interesting finding was the response to
school size. The Gallup Poll respondents ranked this factor
fifth in importance. The aggregate response rank of the case
study dissertation population was seventh. However, between
students and parents of the case study dissertation, this
factor or descriptor ranked last (8th). An integrated student
body was more important to the parent group and student group.

A closer look at the percentage differences shows
significant response variations. In the area of school
reputation, only 67.5% of the case study parent group rated
this descriptor important in comparison to the 88% of parents
and other adults who rated this factor important in the Gallup
Poll. School size also showed a significant difference in
percentage results. The Gallup Poll respondents (88%)
perceived this factor important but only 38.9% of the parent
group and 34% of the student group rated this descriptor
important. Proximity to home also showed significant
differences (Gallup Poll 84%, parent group 55.5%, and student
group 43.7%). On the distance issue, the Gallup Poll and the

TABLE 37. FACTORS/DESCRIPTORS RATED IMPORTANT

FACTOR/ DESCRIPTOR	1991 GALLUP POLL		CASE STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE					
	TOTAL RESP.		TOTAL RESP.		PARENTS		STUDENT	
	%	R	%	R	%	R	%	R
Quality of Teaching Staff/Staff	96	1	81.6	3	76.3	3	78.7	3
Maint. of Student Discip./Sch. Safety	96	2	88.1	2	88.5	1	85.5	2
Curriculum/ Emphasis on Coll. Prep Courses	95	3	90.2	1	87.8	2	91.2	1
Grades, Test Scores, Graduation Track Record/ Sch. Reputation	88	4	69.8	5	67.5	5	66.5	5
School Size	88	5	48.2	7	38.9	8	34.0	8
Proximity to Home	84	6	52.2	6	55.5	6	43.7	7
Extracurricular Activities	72	7	71.4	4	70.2	4	73.7	4
Integrated Student Body	68	8	45.7	8	49.4	7	52.4	6

student group responses showed a 2:1 ratio response; twice as many Gallup Poll respondents considered this important. Also showing significant differences was the concern for an integrated student body. Almost 70% of the Gallup Poll respondents considered this factor important while only 49% of the parent group considered it important. Students in the school, however, responded more favorably as over half (52%) rated this descriptor important.

It is appropriate at this time to insert a word of caution when comparing the results of the Gallup Poll and the case study. While the Gallup Poll respondents reflect the total population of the United States and their racial/ethnic distributions, the case study respondents reflect those who are at Steinmetz in one capacity or another. Racially, the case study respondents show a roughly tri-ethnic balance. It should also be noted that the Gallup Poll survey represented 68% of the adult sample with no children in school. Of the parents surveyed with children in school, 29% were in public schools and 5% were in private or parochial schools. The parents in the case study dissertation are an exclusive entity; their children all attend a public school. In addition, staff and LSC members may also be parents with children in school. What is important to note at this time is the fact that the case study parent population (33.8%) and the Gallup Poll parent population (34%) were alike in representative percentages of their respective survey

populations. Given these and other precautions, the reader must exercise caution in making any generalizations from the results of this comparison of the Gallup Poll and the case study.

What is very important in the findings of the Gallup Poll of 1991 is the fact that parents will face new problems if parental choice ever becomes a reality in more than a few experimental situations in various school systems. These problems include but are not limited to lack of information about individual public schools in the community, and the ability to obtain accurate information about the schools in the community.[4]

Summary

This chapter provided both a descriptive and bivariate level of statistical analysis. The descriptive statistical analysis summarized the central tendencies of the data. The bivariate level of analysis tested the hypotheses that type of constituency group (student, parent, staff, LSC member), race, and gender would be significantly related to the preference ratings for twenty-two different aspects often used to describe magnet programs or useful for their marketing.

This chapter also presented analyses of descriptors by parent and student groups by gender, by race, and by gender and race. While the study focused mainly on aggregate

---

[4]Ibid., 49.

analyses of the total survey population, it was important to take a closer look at the groups that strongly impact on the school population. These focal groups are the parents who send their children to the school and the students who elected to come to the school.

All three hypotheses were supported from the data. The groups did view these program features differently. Therefore, there are some factors on which no consensus exists when comparing students, parents, staff, and LSC members. Still, where no significant differences emerged by the group comparison, this indicated that some level of consensus existed for these limited preference patterns. There were also important differences by gender and by race. While statistically significant from this research, it takes on an even greater level of importance when it comes to marketing and seeking to improve upon this high school options program.

A closer look at parents and students by race, by gender, and by race and gender generated interesting differences. The significant differences and variations in response to the survey questionnaire items strongly supported all three hypotheses.

The chapter also included a comparison of the 1991 Gallup Poll with the results of this case study. It was important to look at the Gallup Poll results and compare the case study results to see if any similarities or differences existed. Both results showed that the three most important reasons for

selecting a school were staff quality, curriculum, and the maintenance of student discipline or school safety.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the summary of the study and procedures followed, the conclusions drawn from the findings of this study, and provide recommendations and suggestions for further study.

Summary

This case study examined the historical emergence of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science and the community conflict setting in which it arose. Magnet and options programs in the research literature show the value of empirically assessing how to market such programs. The research undertaken and described analyzed data from 444 questionnaires dealing with program preference ratings. Four different sets of questionnaires were distributed to the four different groups of respondents.

The study sought to answer three major questions:

1) What are the program descriptor preferences of students, their parents, the school staff, and the members of the Local School Council?

2) What differences exist in program descriptor preferences among students, their parents, the school staff, and members of the Local School Council? Alternatively, how much consensus exits

164

between these four major groups in terms of program preferences?

3) Do these program preferences vary significantly by gender or race?

Three hypotheses were tested in this case study. They included:

1) Program descriptor preferences will vary significantly between students, parents, staff, and members of the Local School Council.

2) Program descriptor preferences will vary significantly by race.

3) Program descriptor preferences will vary significantly by gender.

The procedures followed in the study included:

1) A search of the literature to determine whether an options program in wellness and sports science had been studied.

2) A search of the literature to gain background information on magnet schools, magnet programs, the concept of choice, and viable research and methodologies employed by researchers.

3) The case study method was determined to be the methodology that would best meet the needs of this research project.

4) A survey instrument was developed, field-tested, approved by the Loyola University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects, and administered to the survey population.

5) The surveys were tallied and analyzed by the Loyola University Computing Services' Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Statistical Analysis System (SAS), and the System Statistics (SYSTAT).

6) Conclusions were arrived at on the basis of the statistical data presented.

Conclusions

The study showed that the five most important program descriptors preferred by the survey population were safety in the school building, emphasis on college prep courses, relationships with colleges, safety in the neighborhood and the quality of the school staff. Choice of descriptors varied significantly by groups, gender, and race. While groups reached some consensus on a broad scope, individual group differences were prevalent. Therefore, any significant variation with respect to constituency, gender, and race was the central focus in the attempt to support the hypotheses that were tested.

HYPOTHESIS #1: Program descriptor preferences will vary significantly among students, parents, staff, and Local School Council members.

The program preferences for the options program at Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sports Science differed significantly in some cases by constituency groups (students, parents, staff, and Local School Council members). These significant differences ($p < .05$) were shown for the following preference patterns: special courses in sports-related areas, distance from home to school, quality of the school staff, relationship with colleges, opportunity for parental involvement, 3X class offerings, "no study hall" programming choice, extra curricular activities, and the

emphasis on college prep courses. For these factors there

exists no consensus among the four groups.

In an effort to support the hypothesis, five most salient

descriptor preference variations will be presented. These

are:

1) Safety in the neighborhood was not viewed as an
    important descriptor by the Local School Council.
    This is in direct conflict with parents who
    selected this descriptor as their most important
    reason for sending their child to Steinmetz. This
    was also interesting in that 80% of the Local
    School Council were parents of students attending
    Steinmetz Academic Centre.   (six parent slots
    mandated by law and two community slots held by
    parents living in the community.)

2) Emphasis on college prep courses was found to be
    the most significant reason for students choosing
    Steinmetz Academic Centre and not as important for
    teachers or Local School Council members.

3) Significant differences were evident between
    students and teachers in the descriptor
    relationships with colleges. Students ranked this
    factor as the second most important reason for
    attending Steinmetz Academic Centre whereas
    teachers ranked this very low.

4) Quality of school staff was ranked first in
    importance by teachers and Council members, but
    parents and students rated this item low.

5) Council members and teachers significantly differed
    from parents and students on the descriptor
    opportunity for parent involvement. The Local
    School Council ranked this descriptor as the third
    most important reason for selecting Steinmetz in
    contrast to parents who ranked this descriptor
    ninth. While teachers considered this as the
    fourth most important descriptor, students ranked
    this on the bottom of the ranking list.

HYPOTHESIS #2:   Program descriptor preferences will vary
                     significantly by gender

Gender was shown to significantly differentiate the

following program features:

1) <u>Safety items</u> appeared to be more important to females than males. Whether it was safety in the building, to and from school, or safety in the neighborhood surrounding the school, these items were reported to be <u>significantly more important to females</u> than to males. Males ranked this descriptor highly insignificant that statistical data could not be generated, for any analysis.

2) Special <u>courses in sports-related areas</u> proved to be only important to the males. However, this item was not high on the priority list for gender.

3) <u>Racial integration</u> was not significant to males but was somewhat significant to females.

4) <u>Attractiveness of the school building</u> was somewhat significant to the females and less significant to the males.

HYPOTHESIS #3: Program descriptor preferences will vary significantly by race.

In this study, race was a variable that significantly differentiated several program features: distance from home to school, quality of school staff, relationship with colleges, opportunity for parent involvement, dissatisfaction with neighborhood school, 3X class offerings, safety, and the recruiting brochure --- and among students, whether their friends attend the school.

The most salient differentiations will be addressed in an effort to support the hypothesis "program descriptor preferences will vary significantly by race." These include:

1) Whites rated <u>safety in the school building</u> as the most important reason for selecting Steinmetz. Another safety item, <u>safety in the school neighborhood</u> was ranked second in importance. Blacks and the other races did not place such significance on those two items.

2) Whites differed from the other races in the descriptor <u>relationships with colleges</u>. All other races ranked this item as the second most important consideration for selecting Steinmetz. Whites rated this item very low.

3) <u>Emphasis on college prep courses</u> was the most important descriptor selected by blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and Native Americans who rated this item as the number one priority for attending Steinmetz. Whites did not rank this factor as high.

4) Blacks were the only constituents who felt that <u>racial integration of staff</u> was important. The other races did not rate them high enough to produce any statistical significance.

5) <u>Distance from home to school</u> was another descriptor that was important to Whites as well as Asians and Native Americans. Hispanics and blacks rated this descriptor low; a possible indication that traveling by public transportation for any given length of time was acceptable.

This study showed that all three hypotheses were supported. Program descriptor preferences varied significantly by group, gender, and race. A closer examination of the parent and student group responses by gender, by race, and by gender by race strongly supported all three hypotheses. There were many significantly differentiated items which showed that parents and students differ in the level of importance attached to the descriptors. The following major conclusions were justified from this case study of Steinmetz Academic Centre:

1) Significant group differences (p < .05) were shown for ten of the twenty-two indicators.

2) Prospective students will not be favorably impressed by the same program preferences that appeal to their parents, staff, or Local School Council members.

3) Gender is a factor that impacts on special courses, safety factors in and about school, and distance from home to school.

4) Race must be considered in the areas of college collaborations, staff quality, and distance from home to school.

5) Marketing strategies must recognize the differential preferences represented by group, gender, and race in order to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of the recruitment strategy employed to attract potential students.

The survey population had also justified these additional conclusions regarding the reasons why Steinmetz was their choice for learning. The data analyzed in this study indicated that Steinmetz was perceived to:

1) be a safe school
2) emphasize a college prep curriculum
3) maintain good relationships with colleges and universities
4) be located in a safe neighborhood
5) employ staff that is highly skilled and trained

In addition, a comparative analysis of the 1991 Gallup Poll and this case study survey further substantiated some of the findings which supported the three hypotheses. In analyzing the eight identifiable areas of comparison, respondents from the 1991 Gallup Poll, the Steinmetz parent group, and the Steinmetz student group all agreed that quality of staff, maintenance of discipline (school safety), and the curriculum (emphasis on college prep courses) were the most important considerations for choosing a school. While the rank orders differed, all three groups agreed on the importance of these factors or descriptors. Significant differences appeared in the relative importance attached to

other items such as <u>school reputation,</u> <u>school size,</u> <u>proximity</u> <u>to home,</u> and <u>integrated student body.</u>

The overall evidence presented in this case study does tend to suggest that considerable merit be given to the notion that "options" programs represent a potential strategy for achieving school desegregation. Again, this study represents only one such program; a unique one at that; unique in the sense that it emphasizes "wellness and sports-science." However, it is not unique in facing community conflict, organized resistance from political groups, and difficulty in gaining required resources for effective implementation.

<u>Recommendations</u>

1) Since significant variations in preference ratings were evident in this case study, those professionals who are involved with the marketing of the options program at Steinmetz must address these differential preferences in groups, gender, and race. Separate recruitment strategies must be developed to address each of the constituencies.

2) Recruitment of whites must focus on addressing concerns over safety factors. There is strong evidence that indicate a sense of fear that some schools may be dangerous for white students. Until this perceived problem is resolved, whites will continue to avoid Steinmetz. As the most basic survival needs become addressed, other descriptors

might surface as being important to selecting a school.

3) College preparatory course offerings must be expanded so that students will have more choices of courses to prepare them for college entry.

4) Relationships with colleges must be strengthened and expanded to ensure students more opportunities for entrance and choices.

5) The variety and number of sports-related courses in the Physical Education strand need not be expanded at the present time as this descriptor did not rank high in the constituency preferences.

6) While staff and LSC want more opportunities for parental involvement, parents themselves did not rate this descriptor important.

7) Safety measures must continually be monitored and strengthened to ensure that all groups develop a sense of feeling safe and secure in their travel to school and during the time spent in school.

8) Recruitment of staff must focus on exemplary role models who will place the needs of students first on their priority list.

9) While the LSC numbers are small, the results of the survey from this group must be weighed and treated more significantly since the LSC is the body that recommends improvement in the areas of curriculum,

policy, budget allocations, etc. The decisions rendered by this group strongly impact on the school.

Recommendations for Further Study

1) This study was conducted with constituencies from the Steinmetz Academic Centre. A study of the entire school might be done to determine why any student would select Steinmetz as their school of choice.

2) Measures of cultural diversity and values added to the present study might be worthwhile to investigate. Aspects of social class or economic factors might be added. Within the next two to five years, as the fastest growing minority population (Asian Americans) begins to select high schools, the probability of Steinmetz adding a fourth subgroup to the tri-ethnic population is feasible.

3) A study focusing on student productivity based on time-on-task information is recommended. Are Steinmetz students focused learners or are they wasting too much time?

4) A follow-up study of graduates from the Steinmetz Academic Centre to determine program, curriculum, and college preparatory effectiveness should be conducted.

5) A study focusing on the community and their
perception of Steinmetz Academic Centre should be
done.

6) Longitudinal studies are recommended as Steinmetz
will continue to be a "living laboratory" for
educational change for the 21st century. The
school will continue to be in a planned change mode
through the turn of the century. We live in a
world where the only certainty is change. Past
studies become quickly outdated as the technology
which produced them becomes obsolete. Speculation
about the present conditions of options programs
such as Steinmetz need to be continually assessed
to ensure that what is perceived is reality.

7) Applicants who were accepted for admission to the
options lottery who chose not to enroll at Steinmetz
should be surveyed to find out why those accepted
decided to go elsewhere. This effort would assist
recruiters in their search for prospective students.

APPENDIX A: SURVEY LETTERS

October 18, 1990

Dear Steinmetz Student,

Like you, I am also a student. I too have responsibilities
that I must fulfill. One such responsibility is to complete
a study of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and
Sports Science in a timely manner.

Since you are a student in the Steinmetz Academic Centre,
your input is very important. With your help, I will gather
data and try to determine from your responses, what you feel
is important when you chose to attend Steinmetz. Your
responses will contribute to the decisions affecting present
and future students of Steinmetz.

Please be assured that your responses are confidential and
you cannot be identified. Great care has been taken to keep
this questionnaire anonymous.

During this division period, please complete the attached
questionnaire, fold it in half, and place it in the box
labelled "Student Questionnaire" on the teacher's desk.

Your assistance is appreciated. Please feel free to see me
in Room 104A if you have any questions regarding this
survey.

Sincerely,

Kay Tokunaga

October 18, 1990

Dear Parent:

I am a graduate student at Loyola University of Chicago and am doing a research study of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sport Science. With your help, I am gathering data to determine what is important to you in your choice of Steinmetz as a learning center. I hope to gather sufficient information to make a contribution to the school administration toward a better understanding of descriptors that are important to you in selecting Steinmetz for a high school.

Please take a few minutes of your busy schedule to complete the attached questionnaire. Be assured that your responses are confidential and you cannot be identified in the results. Great care has been taken to keep the survey participants anonymous.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided. You may choose to return it with your child to the division teacher or may return it in person on Parent Report Card Day, November 13, 1990. A box labeled "A.C. Parent Questionnaires" will be available in Room 122, the report card pick-up site..

Your assistance is appreciated. If you have any questions regarding this study, feel free to call me at (312) 804-3030.

Sincerely,

Kay Tokunaga

October 18, 1990

Dear (LSC Member):

I am a graduate student at Loyola University of Chicago and am doing a research study of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sport Science. With your help, I am gathering data to determine what is important to you in your choice of Steinmetz as a learning center. I hope to gather sufficient information to make a contribution to the school administration toward a better understanding of descriptors that are important to you in selecting Steinmetz for a high school.

Please take a few minutes of your busy schedule to complete the attached questionnaire. Be assured that your responses are confidential and you cannot be identified in the results. Great care has been taken to keep the survey participants anonymous.

Please return the completed questionnaire by selecting one of the options listed:
1.   U.S. Mail
2.   Give to your child to bring to his division teacher
3.   Bring it in person to the November council meeting and place it in box labeled "A.C. Questionnaires"
4.   Bring it in person to Parent Report Card Day (Nov. 13, 1990

Your assistance is appreciated. If you have any questions regarding this study, feel free to call me at (312) 804-3030.

Sincerely,

Kay Tokunaga

October 18, 1990

Dear Staff:

I am a graduate student at Loyola University of Chicago and am doing a research study of the Steinmetz Academic Centre for Wellness and Sport Science. With your help, I am gathering data to determine what is important to you in your choice of Steinmetz as a learning center. I hope to gather sufficient information to make a contribution to the school administration toward a better understanding of descriptors that are important to you in selecting Steinmetz for a high school.

Please take a few minutes of your busy schedule to complete the attached questionnaire. Be assured that your responses are confidential and you cannot be identified in the results. Great care has been taken to keep the survey participants anonymous.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided to the school office and place it in the box labeled "A.C. Staff Questionnaires" located on the office counter. A return on or before Parent Report Card Day (Nov. 13, 1990) is appreciated.

Your assistance is appreciated. If you have any questions regarding this study, feel free to call me at (312) 804-3030.

Sincerely,

Kay Tokunaga

APPENDIX B: CODE KEY

APPENDIX B

CODE KEY FOR THE INSTRUMENT AND GUIDE

TO IDENTIFICATION OF VARIABLES

The first part of the questionnaire to be completed by the respondent represents twenty-three different program features indicated as "A" through "W". These are the variables ITEMA through ITEMW in the analysis undertaken here. The ratings for these variables could vary between a low of one to a high of seven as is reflected in the distributions for these variables.

Where indicated in the surveys by the respondent, ITEMW also has an open-ended item. Because of the relative infrequency with which this data did appear, it has not been judged to be of value for a content analysis.

In question numbers two and three on the questionnaire, the respondent again is asked to "fill in the blank" in an open-ended format. Where the respondent indicated a letter this was sequentially numbered as follows: A = 1; B = 2; C = 3, etc., V = 22, W = 23.

Race was precoded on the questionnaire: 1 = white, 2 = black, 3 = American Indian, 4 = Hispanic, and 5 = Asian.

Gender was coded: 1 = male, 2 = female.

APPENDIX C: SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE (Parent of Attending Student)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information to help us evaluate the existing program. You are in a unique position to describe what the program does, the type of student it attracts, and how it affects you. Your responses will be kept confidential and cannot be identified with you personally. Thank you for your assistance.

1) On a scale of 1 (NOT IMPORTANT) to 7 (VERY IMPORTANT) please indicate how important each of the following was in affecting your decision to send your child to Steinmetz Academic Centre. Circle the number that best fits your answer.

EXAMPLE:

	NOT IMPORTANT			VERY IMPORTANT		
Size of Swimming Pool	1	2	③	4	5	6	7
Computer classes	1	2	3	4	⑤	6	7
Science Labs	1	2	3	4	5	6	⑦

	NOT IMPORTANT			VERY IMPORTANT		
A) Special courses in sports-related area	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B) Attractiveness of school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C) Safety in the school neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D) Safety in the school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E) Distance from home to school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F) Racially integrated student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G) Racially integrated staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H) Size of the student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I) Quality of school staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J) Relationship with cultural institutions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K) Relationship with colleges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
L) Opportunity for parent involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
M) Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
N) 3X class offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
O) "NO STUDY HALL" programming choice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P) Extra curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q) Emphasis on college prep courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
R) "Sound mind/body" philosophy of school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S) Recruiting brochure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
T) Reputation of school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
U) Friends' children attend the school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
V) 5th major requirement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
W) Other_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2) Which would you consider to be the most important of the factors?
(Write in appropriate letter) ____

3) Which would you consider to be the least important of the factors?
(Write in appropriate letter) ____

4) What ethnic or racial group do you represent? (Circle appropriate number)

1	2	3	4	5
White	Black	American Indian	Hispanic	Asian

5) What is your gender? (circle one)   Male   Female

Thank you again for completing this questionnaire. Feel free to add any comments on the back of this sheet.

LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information to help us evaluate the existing Academic Centre program. You are in a unique position to indicate your perception of the program. Your responses will be kept confidential and cannot be identified with you personally. Thank you for your assistance.

1) On a scale of 1 (NOT IMPORTANT) to 7 (VERY IMPORTANT) please indicate your perception of how important each of the following descriptors is in influencing students, parents, and staff to select Steinmetz Academic Centre as a choice for schooling or employment. Circle the number that best fits your answer. See the examples below.

EXAMPLE:	NOT IMPORTANT				VERY IMPORTANT		
Size of Swimming Pool	1	2	③	4	5	6	7
Computer classes	1	2	3	4	⑤	6	7
Science Labs	1	2	3	4	5	6	⑦

		NOT IMPORTANT				VERY IMPORTANT		
A)	Special courses in sports-related areas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B)	Attractiveness of school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C)	Safety in the school neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D)	Safety in the school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E)	Distance from home to school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F)	A racially integrated student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G)	A racially integrated teaching staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H)	Size of the student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I)	Quality of school staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J)	Relationship with cultural institutions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K)	Relationship with colleges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
L)	Opportunity for parental involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
M)	Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
N)	3X class offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
O)	"NO STUDY HALL" programming choice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P)	Extra curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q)	Emphasis on college prep courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
R)	School Philosophy of "Sound mind/body"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S)	Recruiting brochure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
T)	Reputation of school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
U)	My friends attend the school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
V)	5th major requirement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
W)	Other_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2) Which would you consider to be the most important of the factors?
                                        (Write in appropriate letter) _____

3) Which would you consider to be the least important of the factors?
                                        (Write in appropriate letter) _____

4) What ethnic or racial group do you represent? (Circle appropriate number)

      1   2   3   4   5
    White   Black   American Indian   Hispanic   Asian

5) What is your gender? (circle one)   Male   Female

Thank you again for completing this questionnaire. Feel free to add any comments on the back of this sheet.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE (Attending Student)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information to help us evaluate the
existing program. You are in a unique position to describe what the program does,
the type of student it attracts, and how it affects you. Your responses will be
kept confidential and cannot be identified with you personally. Thank you for your
assistance.

1) On a scale of 1 (NOT IMPORTANT) to 7 (VERY IMPORTANT) please indicate how
   important each of the following was in helping you decide to attend Steinmetz
   Academic Centre. Circle the number that best fits your answer. See the
   examples below.

EXAMPLE:

		NOT IMPORTANT				VERY IMPORTANT	
Size of Swimming Pool	1	2	③	4	5	6	7
Computer classes	1	2	3	4	⑤	6	7
Science Labs	1	2	3	4	5	6	⑦

			NOT IMPORTANT				VERY IMPORTANT	
A)	Special courses in sports-related areas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B)	Attractiveness of school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C)	Safety in the school neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D)	Safety in the school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E)	Distance from home to school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F)	A racially integrated student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G)	A racially integrated teaching staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H)	Size of the student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I)	Quality of school staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J)	Relationship with cultural institutions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K)	Relationship with colleges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
L)	Opportunity for parental involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
M)	Dissatisfaction with neighborhood school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
N)	3X class offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
O)	"NO STUDY HALL" programming choice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P)	Extra curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q)	Emphasis on college prep courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
R)	School Philosophy of "Sound mind/body"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S)	Recruiting brochure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
T)	Reputation of school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
U)	My friends attend the school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
V)	5th major requirement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
W)	Other_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2) Which would you consider to be the most important of the factors?
                              (Write in appropriate letter) ____

3) Which would you consider to be the least important of the factors?
                              (Write in appropriate letter) ____

4) What ethnic or racial group do you represent? (Circle appropriate number)

         1   2   3   4   5
       White   Black   American Indian   Hispanic Asian

5) What is your gender? (circle one)   Male   Female

Thank you again for completing this questionnaire. Feel free to add any comments
on the back of this sheet.

STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE (Academic Centre Staff)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information to help us evaluate the existing program. You are in a unique position to describe what the program does, the type of student it attracts, and how it affects you. Your responses will be kept confidential and cannot be identified with you personally. Thank you for your assistance.

1) On a scale of 1 (NOT IMPORTANT) to 7 (VERY IMPORTANT) please indicate how important each of the following was in affecting your decision to apply for a position at Steinmetz Academic Centre. Circle the number that best fits your answer. See the examples below.

EXAMPLE:	NOT IMPORTANT			VERY IMPORTANT			
Size of Swimming Pool	1	2	③	4	5	6	7
Computer classes	1	2	3	4	⑤	6	7
Science Labs	1	2	3	4	5	6	⑦

	NOT IMPORTANT			VERY IMPORTANT			
A) Special courses in sports-related areas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B) Attractiveness of school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C) Safety in the school neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D) Safety in the school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E) Distance from school to home	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F) A racially integrated student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G) A racially integrated staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H) Size of the student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I) Quality of school staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J) Relationship with cultural institutions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K) Relationship with colleges	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
L) Opportunity for involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
M) Dissatisfaction with my former school or program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
N) 3X class offerings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
O) "NO STUDY HALL" programming choice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P) Extra curricular sponsorship	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q) Emphasis on college prep courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
R) School Philosophy of "Sound mind/body"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S) Recruiting brochure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
T) Reputation of school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
U) My friends work in the school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
V) 5th major requirement for students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
W) Other_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2) Which would you consider to be the most important of the factors?
(Write in appropriate letter) ____

3) Which would you consider to be the least important of the factors?
(Write in appropriate letter) ____

4) What ethnic or racial group do you represent? (Circle appropriate number)

1	2	3	4	5
White	Black	American Indian	Hispanic	Asian

5) What is your gender? (circle one)   Male   Female

6) What is your position at SAC? (Please check one)
____ teacher
____ quasi-administrator (Dept. chair, counselor, assistant principal, coordinator)
____ ancillary staff
____ career service

Thank you again for completing this questionnaire. Feel free to add any comments on the back of this sheet.

APPENDIX D: HOUSE RESOLUTION

STATE OF ILLINOIS
EIGHTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

House Resolution No. 1429

Offered by Representative White

WHEREAS, The members of this body are pleased to recognize the outstanding curriculum at the Steinmetz Academic Center for wellness and Sports Science; and

WHEREAS, Steinmetz High School has maintained a tradition of excellence for over 50 years, and the Steinmetz Academic Center for Wellness and Sports Science was begun in September of 1988; and

WHEREAS, The Steinmetz Academic Center for Wellness and Sports Science strives to educate the whole child by furthering classical ideals which assume a scientific approach to the harmonious development of both mind and body; and

WHEREAS, The Steinmetz Academic Center, a four year college preparatory academic center, can open the door to a rewarding future in the world of wellness and sports science; and

WHEREAS, The goal of the program at Steinmetz Academic Center is to help the students realize their potentials through self-discipline, courage, self-esteem, perseverance and physical fitness and to grow through these qualities to achieve academic as well as life-long success; and

WHEREAS, The Steinmetz Academic Center offers four comprehensive curriculum options: Science/Math, Communications, Humanities and Physical Education, and this offers students a chance to explore career opportunities in areas of personal interest; and

WHEREAS, The faculty members at Steinmetz Academic Center have been selected for their expertise in this specialized curriculum and hold advanced degrees in their individual fields; and

WHEREAS, The executive board of Steinmetz Academic Center for Wellness and Sports Science is composed of numerous State and local dignitaries from the areas of sports, education, business, medicine, government and law and media; and

WHEREAS, In addition to the traditional sports such as football and basketball, students at Steinmetz Academic Center are offered an expanded field of athletics which include: volleyball, judo, track/field, team handball, karate, synchronized swimming, field hockey, gymnastics and tae kwon do; and

WHEREAS, Throughout the first two years of Steinmetz Academic Center for Wellness and Sports Science, students and faculty members have been awarded numerous honors and continue to strive to advance the program; and

WHEREAS, At a time when the education system is under extreme scrutiny, it is reasuring to find a program that encourages students to strive to excel in academics, while encouraging athletic achievement; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate and commend the Steinmetz Academic Center for Wellness and Sports Science for the outstanding curriculum it provides; that we commend the students and faculty for their various achievements; and that we extend our best wishes to them for continued success in the future; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to the Steinmetz Academic Center for Wellness and Sports Science.

Michael J. Madigan

Michael J. Madigan, Speaker of the House

BIBLIOGRAPHY

<u>Books</u>

Austin, Michael J. and Jill Crowell. "Survey Research." In M.
    Grinnell, Jr. ed. <u>Social Work Research and Evaluation</u>.
    Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers Incorporated, 1985.

Babbie, Earl. <u>The Practice of Social Research</u>. Belmont,
    California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1990.

Backstrom, Charles H. and Gerald Hursh-Cesar. <u>Survey
    Research</u>, Second Edition, New York; John Wiley and Sons,
    1981.

Best, John W. and James V. Kahn. <u>Research in Education</u>. New
    Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Estes, Nolan and Donald R. Waldrip, eds. <u>Magnet Schools:
    Legal and Practical Implications</u>. Piscataway, N.J.:
    New Century Education Corporation, 1978.

Fantini, Mario. "History and Philosophy of Alternative
    Schools." In Nolan Estes and Donald R. Waldrip eds.
    <u>Magnet Schools: Legal and practical implications</u>.
    Piscataway, New Jersey: New Century Education
    Corporation, 1978.

Goodlad, John <u>A Place Called School</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill,
    1984.

Isaac, Stephen and William B Michael. <u>Handbook in Research
    and Evaluation</u>. San Diego, California: Edits Publishers,
    1984.

Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. <u>Qualitative
    Data Analysis</u>. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

Naisbitt, John. <u>Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming
    Our Lives</u>. New York: Warner Books, 1982.

Niehoff, Arthur H. <u>A Casebook of Social Change</u>. Chicago:
    Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Paine, Frank T. and William Naumes. <u>Organizational Strategy And Policy</u>. New York: CBS College Publishing, 1982.

Patton, Michael Quinn. <u>Qualitative Evaluation Methods</u>. Beverley Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1984.

Peters, Thomas J. and Robert H. Waterman, Jr. <u>In Search of Excellence</u>. New York: Warner Books, 1984.

Sarason, Seymour. <u>The Culture of the School</u>. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Company, 1971.

Terkel, Studs. "Two Superintendents Discuss Integration: Interview." Interviewed by Meyer Weinberg. <u>Integrated Education</u>. Beverley Hills, CA: Glencoe Press, 1968.

Tyler, Ralph W. <u>Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Wegman, Robert G. "The White-flight Controversy and its Implications for Big-City Schools." <u>The Future of Big-City Schools</u>. eds. Daniel U. Levine and Robert J. Havighurst Berkeley: McCutchan Co., 1977.

Journals

Abadzi, Helen. "A Texas Magnet Program: 1981-1983 Evaluation Materials Results." <u>Resource in Education</u> 1: 233099, (December 1983).

Clinchy, Evans. "Public School Choice: Absolutely Necessary But Not Wholly Sufficient." <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u> 69 (December 1989): 285-291.

Coleman, James S. "Racial Segregation in the Schools: New Research with New Policy Implications." <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u> 55 (October 1975): 74-76.

Cuddy, Dennis L. "A Proposal to Achieve Desegregation Through Free Choice." <u>American Education</u> 19 (May 1983): 25-31.

Doyle, Denis P. and Levine, Marsha. "Magnet Schools: Choice and Quality in Public Education." <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u> 64 (December 1984): 23-31.

Elam, Stanley. "The 23nd Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward the Public School." <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u> 73 (September 1991): 41-56.

Fuller, Bruce and Jo Ann Izu. "Explaining School Cohesion."
    What Shapes the Organizational Beliefs of Teachers?"
    American Journal of Education (August 1986): 501-531.

Fullington, Gail G. "Magnet Schools: What Are They? Where Are
    They Going?" OSSC Bulletin 21 (March 1978): 3-8.

Johnson, Larry. "Parents' Preferences for Educational
    Alternatives." Elementary School Journal 76 (December
    1975): 161-169.

Kenney, Robert N. and Arden D. Grotelueschen. "Making the Case
    for Case Study." Journal of Curriculum Studies 16
    (January/March 1984): 37-50.

Levine, Daniel U. and Connie C. Moore. "Magnet Schools in a
    Big-City Desegregation Plan." Phi Delta Kappan 57 (April
    1976): 507-509.

McMillan, Charles B. "Magnet Education in Boston." Phi Delta
    Kappan 59 (February 1977): 158-163.

Metz, Mary. "Different by Design: The Context and Character
    of Three Magnet Schools." Research in Education
    (November 1986).

Metz, Mary H. "Magnet Schools in their Organizational and
    Political Context." National Institute of Education
    Washington, D. C. April 1982.

Nelsen, Edward A. and Norman P. Uhl. "The Influence of
    Racial Composition of Desegregated Secondary Schools
    Upon Black Students' Perceptions of the School Climates."
    Research in Education (May 1976).

Ogletree, Earl J. and Stanley S. Starkman. "Parents and
    Students' Attitudes Toward the Chicago Desegregation
    Plan." Research in Education (June 1981) (ERIC Document
    No. 198 221).

Raywid, Mary Anne. "The Case for Public Schools of Choice,"
    PDK Fastback 283 (1989): 4-11.

Rossell, Christine H. "What is Attractive About Magnet
    Schools?" Urban Education 20 (April 1985): 7-22.

_____. "Magnet Schools as a Desegregation Tool." Urban
    Education 14 (October 1979): 303-320.

_____. "School Desegregation and White Flight."
    Political Science Quarterly 90 (1976): 675-695.

_____. "Does School Desegregation Policy Stimulate Residential Integration? A Critique of the Research." Urban Education 21 (January 1987): 403-420.

Swartz, Robert J. "Restructuring Curriculum for Critical Thinking." Educational Leadership (May 1986) 43-44.

Snider, William. "The Call for Choice: Competition in the Educational Marketplace." Education Week 20 (June 1987): 2-6.

_____. "Cavazos Couples Parental Choice, Site Management," Education Week 25 (October 1987): 20-22.

Tsapatsaris, George. "How We Magnetized a City School System." Principal (January 1985): 8-10.

Warren, Constancia. "The Magnet School Boom: Implications for Desegregation." Equal Opportunity Review (Spring 1978): 1-4.

Weintraub, Robert J. "Meaningful Participation and an Effective School: Students, Parents, and Teachers Run Their Own Microsociety." Equity and Choice 1 (February 1984): 31-36.

Other Sources

Beck, Joan. "High-Risk Pupils Increase Even as Desegregation Fades." Chicago Tribune (1 October 1987): 1:23.

Bobbitt, Leslie. "Discipline in Desegregated Schools." Proceedings of the Conference on Development in School Desegregation and the Law. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1972.

Comerford, James. "Parent Perceptions and Pupil Characteristics of a Senior High Magnet School." Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1981.

Loveridge, Robert L., Joseph G. Whittling, and Thomas E. Brooks. "Parent Perceptions of Magnet Schools as a Method of Desegregation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 27-31, 1978.

Raivetz, Mark L., et al. "High School for Creative and Performing Arts: Student Attitudes and Perceptions." A report prepared by the Office of Research and Evaluation, Philadelphia School System, March, 1980.

Royster, Eugene C., Catherine D. Baltzell, and Karen Ferb. "Study of the Emergency School Aid Act Magnet School Program: Interim Report." A report prepared by Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass: 1978.

Schafft, Gretchen. "Together Yet Separate: Territoriality Among White Children in Predominantly Black Classrooms." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, 1975.

Stanley, Cheryl F. and Stephan R. Rosser. "A National Survey of Magnet Schools Utilized for Voluntary Integration." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Weinberg, Meyer. "Minority Students: A Research Appraisal," Report prepared by the U.S. Department of HEW, NIE, Washington, D.C., March 1977.

VITA

The author, Kay Tokunaga, was born in Kauai, Hawaii. After graduating from elementary and high school on Kauai, she continued her education at the University of Hawaii, on the island of Oahu, where she earned a Bachelor of Science in Education. She also received a Fifth Year Diploma in Education after completing an internship program. She moved to Chicago, Illinois and received a Master of Arts in Special Education from Northeastern Illinois University in 1969.

Mrs. Tokunaga began her career in educational service twenty-eight years ago. While having served the Chicago Public Schools as a teacher, counselor, and assistant principal, she is currently the Administrative Assistant at Steinmetz Academic Centre.

<u>APPROVAL SHEET</u>

The dissertation submitted by Kay Tokunaga has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. L. Arthur Safer
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Diane Schiller
Associate Professor
Curriculum and Instruction
Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

July 15, 1992
Date

MaxBailey
Director's Signature