

Leaving and staying: An exploratory study of Northern students' perceptions of school leaving stressors, the coping mechanisms they employ, and possible strategies for how stressors might be reduced.

by

Harold MacDonald

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Education in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Manitoba.



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-23398-7

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE

**LEAVING AND STAYING:
AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF NORTHERN STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
OF SCHOOL LEAVING STRESSORS, THE COPING MECHANISMS THEY EMPLOY,
AND POSSIBLE STRATEGIES FOR HOW STRESSORS MIGHT BE REDUCED**

BY

HAROLD MACDONALD

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of
MASTER OF EDUCATION**

Harold MacDonald 1997 (c)

**Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell
copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis
and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to Dissertations Abstracts International to publish
an abstract of this thesis/practicum.**

**The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor
extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's
written permission.**

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank everyone connected with this study for their patience and support. This thesis took a long time to happen. In particular, I want to thank my family (Patti, Karin, Sarah, and John) for their understanding and for providing the time for me to undertake this study. The Thompson Stay In School Committee deserves recognition for providing the original impetus for this study. The folks at the Canadian Council for Exceptional Children and at the Canadian Education Association helped by providing vast quantities of high quality information. Also, the records clerks at R.D. Parker Collegiate put a lot of extra effort into providing data for analysis. Finally, I want to thank Dr. Rick Freeze from the University of Manitoba for his efforts and help. Without Rick's guidance, this study would have been impossible to complete.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT..... 4

INTRODUCTION

 Literature review 5

 School leaving stressors 12

 General research problem 25

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

 Specific research questions 25

 Site characteristics 26

 Research role 28

 General research design 28

 Limitations of the design and methodology 33

RESULTS

 Quantitative surveys 37

 Table 1. Demographic profile 38

 Table 2. Disposition of discontinued students 40

 Qualitative data 42

 Table 3. Post hoc MWU two group analysis: significant results 44

 Table 4. Ethnographic information sources 47

 Additional post hoc analysis 53

 Table 5. Post hoc KW four group analysis: significant results 55

DISCUSSION

 Mann Whitney U results 57

 Statistically significant stressors: post hoc MWU analysis 58

 Ethnographic results 61

 Statistically significant stressors: post hoc KW analysis 62

 Educationally significant stressors: post hoc KW analysis 65

 Contributions to knowledge and further research 66

 Participants suggestions for improvements 67

 Table 6. RDPC monthly dropout pattern 70

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

 Answers to specific research questions 74

 Recommendations for changes 78

REFERENCES 81

APPENDICES

 Appendix A 82

 Appendix B 86

 Appendix C 91

 Appendix D 112

 Appendix E 115

 Appendix F 116

 Appendix G 137

 Appendix H 141

 Appendix I 162

 Appendix J 183

Abstract

Students' perceptions of the stressors commonly considered to result in early school leaving by secondary school students are described and analyzed in this study.

Thirty-two students at R.D. Parker Collegiate (RDPC) in Thompson, Manitoba identified school leaving stressors, described how they coped with them, and suggested how they might be reduced for students at risk of early school leaving. Two groups of students, those who had left school early and those who stayed in school, were included in the study in order to compare similarities and differences in the stressors they faced and the coping mechanisms they employed.

A post hoc analysis of the data suggests that four groups of students were operative within the sample group. The four groups consisted of students who had (a) never experienced discontinuation from school, (b) been discontinued previously and returned to school, (c) been discontinued recently from school for the first time, and (d) experienced multiple discontinuations from school. Further analysis of these four groups was undertaken.

Significant differences in the stressors faced by students in the different groups were discovered. The participants coping processes also were identified and analyzed qualitatively. Recommendations for initiatives to reduce school leaving stressors are made.

Leaving and staying: An exploratory study of Northern students' perceptions of school leaving stressors, the coping mechanisms they employ, and possible strategies for how stressors might be reduced.

Introduction

Literature Review

Significance of dropping out of school. Graduation from secondary school is of enormous social and economic significance in our society. Describing the sociological value of graduation as a cultural right of passage, marking the successful movement of an individual from adolescence into adulthood, Neufeld (1992) indicated that failure to achieve this benchmark carries severe consequences for individuals and for society as a whole. Catteral (1986b) noted that society holds a deep-seated belief in the value of education and considers high school completion to be a minimum preparation for life. Catteral (1985) has estimated that the total lifespan fiscal losses of a single national annual cohort of dropouts in the United States of America (USA) amounts to US\$228 billion dollars, with a tax loss to the government of US\$68.4 billion dollars. For individuals, the consequences of dropping out of school may include: fewer job opportunities, low income, poor paying jobs, longer and more frequent unemployment, the need for welfare, more frequent use of unemployment supports, the use of food banks, early parenthood, suicidal behaviour, poor physical health, criminal behaviour, mental health problems, substance abuse, low self-esteem, and imprisonment (Stay In School Initiative, 1991; Neufeld, 1992).

Historical perspective. Dropping out of school is neither a new nor a strictly Canadian phenomenon. Mann (1986) reported that the rate of dropping out has been in decline in the United States from a rate of 90% in 1900, to 76% in 1940, to a rate of 25% in 1986. Comparatively, figures released by the Canadian Government indicate that average dropout rates currently range from a low of 20% in New Brunswick to a high of 60% in the Northwest Territories (Stay in School Supplement, 1991). Neufeld (1992)

estimated that 30 to 35% of Canadian students failed to graduate and that it was reasonable to estimate that 50% of all students were thereby at risk of dropping out of school. Noting that a 30% dropout rate has been a constant for two decades now in the United States and suggesting that this may be indicative of the saturation level of the educational system, Catteral (1985, 1986b) has noted that the basic rate of dropping out has remained unchanged regardless of recent initiatives undertaken to increase the graduation rate.

Need for a restructuring of the system. With one of every two students possibly at risk of dropping out of school, are the theoretical and operational models used in the school system today adequately meeting the needs of society? The idea of restructuring the educational system is a common theme among current researchers. For example, Goodlad (1984) has provided a comprehensive plan for reorganization. The tenets of his plan were that: (a) a school's effectiveness was a function of its ability to retain students, (b) all educators shared responsibility for student retention, and (c) better schools will come about through multiple actions, no one of which can be sufficient independently. Expressing similar ideas in Thompson, Manitoba, Canada, local stakeholders voiced their concerns regarding a perceived high dropout rate at R.D. Parker Collegiate (RDPC). A need for change was felt to be imperative, but people were unsure as to an appropriate course of action.

Magnitude of the local dropout problem. In 1991, the Thompson Stay In School Initiative Committee undertook a quantitative research study of students who had entered RDPC in 1984 and 1985. The Committee's goal was to identify the type of student who was a potential dropout and the high risk factors involved so that intervention strategies could be designed. Reporting that the dropout rate at RDPC ranged from 31% of the total enrollment of students to 100% of groups constituted by classifying students according to specific criteria, Horton (1991) established the extent of the problem and identified some general risk factors. This study lacked input from the dropouts themselves as to what had

caused them to drop out and what types of supports might have induced them to remain in school.

The need for qualitative research. How school-based dropout prevention programs at RDPC have affected the dropout rate is not clear. In recent years, the school added a major vocational component to its course offerings, moved from full year programming to a semestered system, increased support services for special needs students, and sensitized staff members to the local dropout phenomenon. An assessment of the effectiveness of these interventions was lacking. Any dropout prevention program is likely to be inefficient unless its successes can be evaluated (Catteral, 1986b).

In 1981, the National Commission for Employment Policy recommended that evaluations of program effectiveness should incorporate qualitative research designs due to four methodological problems in quantitative research designs (Batche, 1984). First, dropouts generally have not participated in the studies due to their physical absence and unavailability. Second, studies typically have only described the characteristics of dropouts and teachers, problems with the environment, and curriculum modifications. Third, defining dropouts and those at risk of dropping out has been problematic. Fourth, it has been difficult, if not impossible, to design a study to statistically control for the variety of student characteristics. Coladarci (1983) reiterated a need for ethnographic research to clarify findings reported in quantitative studies.

Why do students stay in school? Absent in the dialogue surrounding dropout issues were the voices of those students who chose to stay in school. King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) noted that few studies question what would keep students in school. In evaluating the dropout phenomena, researchers have tended to assume that the opposite of what caused students to drop out would keep students in school. However, those who stayed in school surely faced stressors similar to those who quit. How did eventual graduates cope with these stressors? Karp (1988) reported that "at risk" students viewed themselves in precisely the same way that "university bound" students did. Why

then did so many students opt to discontinue their studies? What behaviours made a difference for some students but not for others? Catteral (1986b) felt that researchers had become over-involved in describing the dropout phenomenon and had neglected researching positive aspects of school that might be used to combat school leaving stressors. Determining how students cope with stressors and educating classroom and support services teachers to meet the needs of the "at risk" population by arming them with positive, meaningful, coping strategies is a necessary task.

Most relevant studies. Undertaking an ethnographic study of Hispanic dropouts in Texas, Davis (1990) identified why students quit school and what would have kept them in school. The demographic profile of the group Davis studied was, in general characteristics, similar to Thompson's: 40% ethnic minority with English as a second language, high transiency rate, high crime rate, high dropout rate, many social problems, and diverse socioeconomic, racial, and cultural characteristics. Texas, like Manitoba, lacked (a) a common definition of the term "dropout", (b) a regional database of pertinent information, and (c) information management procedures which might have alleviated some of the problems associated with the identification of dropouts. While the results of the Davis study were situation-specific, it provided many of the factors that were considered in this study.

Reporting on causes, manifestations, and prevention of the student dropout problem in Ontario's secondary schools in a comprehensive ethnographic study, Karp (1988) demographically profiled a typical dropout, examined the school system, reviewed students' rationales for dropping out, reported the implications of dropping out for students, discussed reclamation of early leavers, and gave voice to dropouts' suggestions for educational improvements. Karp's study was one of the few to include data from students who chose to stay in school. While providing so much information on so wide a range of topics that readers can become overwhelmed with detail, inclusion of over 100 pages of questionnaires in the final report made this a useful tool in designing and

structuring interview and survey procedures.

A quantitative survey commissioned by the Thompson Stay-In-School Committee involved a search of student records to determine outcomes of students education in the local school district. Reviewing archival records of two cohorts of RDPC students, Horton (1991) determined common successes, failures, and identifiable traits of the students. Many of the dropouts had experienced stressors for many years before they entered RDPC. Horton confirmed that many students had chosen to leave school early.

Conducting a study among American Indian high school students in Montana whose demographic characteristics may be similar to the First Nations population in Thompson, Coladarci (1983) identified problematic aspects of information acquisition: lack of research funds, lack of personnel, poor reading abilities and low comprehension levels among dropouts, interpersonal relationships between interviewers and subjects, a need for the piloting of survey and interview questions, inaccessibility of subjects, difficulties in standardizing open-ended interviews, the skewed sampling of dropouts who make themselves available for study, and the limited time to access transient dropouts common to ethnographic studies. Coladarci (1983) discussed five major findings as critical to the decision to drop out: (a) the usefulness and relationship of curricula to First Nations culture as perceived by students, (b) the nature of the teacher-student relationship as either caring or unhelpful, (c) the desire to be with other dropouts and the degree to which such a desire is influenced by drugs, alcohol, and peer pressure, (d) the unavailability of part-time school, and (e) personal and family crises.

Multifaceted issues. The issues surrounding an individuals' early school leaving are multi-faceted, making it difficult to identify any single causative stressor generalizable to a wide context of settings. Each stressor identified within the multiplicity of possible stressors may vary widely in significance to an individual student contemplating dropping out of school. For example, Catteral (1986a) and Neufeld (1992) saw dropping out as a cumulative process that begins in elementary school and continues

longitudinally into secondary and post-secondary schools. They argue that negative perceptions and skill deficits accumulate to the point where individuals are unable to perform at the level of their peers and consequently drop out of school. Hahn (1987) described the dysfunctional attributes of students and the institutional characteristics which facilitated the dropping out process as being so complex that no experiment could encompass the phenomenon. Mann (1986) supported the view that dropping out was not the result of any one cause and that multiple palliatives are needed to correct the problem. Noting that causative factors were inter-related and mutually reinforcing, the authors of the Stay in School Supplement (1991) generalized the associated maladies leading to school leaving as symptomatic of the schools' host communities. Such communities were described as unhealthy places where people lacked purpose, control over decision-making, responsibility, initiative, sense of belonging, focus, cohesion, power, and integration of efforts. In contrast, Davis and Doss (1982) found that most dropouts tended to diminish or negate factors problematic to their situation and saw quitting school as a positive experience.

In summary, researchers tended to believe that dropping out was a long-term, cumulative, multi-issue process fostered in poor, unhelpful environments which students were glad to exit and that remedies needed to utilize a wide variety of strategies specific to the needs of each school's cohort of students.

Problems with definitions and data. Problems with databases, information management procedures, and basic definitions of the term "dropout" abound. Hahn (1987) identified poor definition of terms and inefficient information management practices as indicative of a systemic failure as authorities can not reliably report any descriptive statistics when planning intervention strategies. Reporting that existing data sources were biased and skewed as a consequence of the way they were compiled and maintained, Lecompte and Goebel (1987) found that impossible research questions were asked, conclusions about dropouts often were misguided, and programs were designed

that did not meet the needs of the dropouts. Flores (1986) reported that over 80% of American school boards could not provide data on the dropout rate of migrant students. In Manitoba, Lee (1983) wrote that the tracking of students longitudinally was impossible as the basic database was incomplete. Mann (1986) and Parkin (1989) added that persons inputting data may be unaware of the student's status and may incorrectly include or exclude students on attendance records.

Identifying inconsistent definitions of terms such as "dropout", "fallout", "pushout", "fadeout", and "discontinued" used by the school staff responsible for providing descriptive statistics, Davis (1990) warned of attaching an "at risk" descriptor to students as it often became a self-fulfilling prophesy. Warning that the term "dropout" is pejorative, Parkin (1989) felt that its use may have fostered uncooperative attitudes when collecting information. Davis (1990) and Flores (1986) reported extreme difficulties in gathering data on ethnic and migrant students due to non-standardized definitions of the term "dropout". Mann (1986) stated that definitions and statistics were manipulated to serve the immediate political purposes of local districts.

Quantifying dropout statistics is difficult because of diverse information management procedures and policies. In a comprehensive study, Lecompte and Goebel (1987) reiterated a need for standardized definitions and practices reporting that large error factors occur in databases because (a) transfer students were not tracked, (b) individual records were poorly maintained and merged into larger records which increased error factors, (c) summer dropouts were counted as dropouts the next September skewing distributions, (d) changing technology created mismatches in database information formats, (e) many authorities were untrained in the use of new technology, and (f) students who dropped out and reregistered were included several times in the same statistic. The incorrect counting of transfer students alone may account for up to 25% of the dropout rate (Lecompte and Goebel, 1987).

Seeking solutions, Flores (1986) advocated acceptance of common definitions as

the first remedial step and proposed adoption of the USA Department of Education National Center for Educational Statistics descriptor which read “a dropout is a pupil who leaves school for any reason except death before graduation or completion of a program of studies and without transferring to another school”. Both Flores (1986) and Lecompte and Goebel (1987) allude to a database program called the Migrant Student Record Transfer System as an exemplary model, but they considered it too expensive to maintain nationally in the USA.

School Leaving Stressors

Researchers have identified numerous stressors surrounding those persons who leave school before graduation. Each of the stressors listed in this review was found to be significant in the study undertaken by the researcher(s) noted in each section. These stressors served only as a guide in gathering information in this study. They are listed alphabetically solely for ease of reference and their order of presentation does not indicate any order of importance or relationship. Stressors are neither mutually exclusive of one another nor categorical and it is probably true that these factors operate conjunctively. Appendix A provides a synopsis of these stressors.

Abuse. Issues of family violence have been linked to dropping out of school. Violence is variously defined as including physical, verbal, and sexual abuse. Noting that the majority of “street kids” witnessed violence at home and that most discontinued their schooling, Coladarci (1983) and the authors of the Stay in School Supplement (1991) reported that victims of abuse were more concerned with personal security than with educational issues.

Academic failure/underachievement. The more often a student was retained in a grade level, or was identified as an underachiever, the more likely that person was to drop out of school before graduation (Catteral, 1985, 1986a, 1986b). Academic failure/underachievement was a factor common to the majority of dropouts in many studies (Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Frontier, 1989; Gastright,

1987; Hahn, 1987; Horton, 1991; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987; Neufeld, 1992). School grades may be the best single predictor of academic longevity (Catteral, 1986b; Gastright, 1987; Hahn, 1987).

Alienation. In several studies, dropouts were found to have feelings of isolation from classmates, teachers, and school as an institution. Students who found it difficult to integrate socially into the local educational milieu often discontinued their studies (Batche, 1984; Catteral, 1986a, 1986b; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987; Neufeld, 1992).

"At risk" labelling as self-fulfilling prophesy. Students labelled as "at risk" academically and/or behaviourally in junior high or late elementary school generally did not complete senior high school programs. Students aware of the negative perceptions others held for them seemed to work towards fulfilling those perceptions especially if those others were deemed to be significant persons whose opinions are usually considered valid or reliable (Catteral, 1986b; Davis, 1990; Parkin, 1989).

Attendance. Absenteeism, truancy, and skipping classes were associated with early school leaving in several studies. Absenteeism may be related to extended illness (personal or familial), travel, mental health problems, suspension and expulsion from school, a need for employment, pregnancy and child care requirements, homemaking responsibilities, migrancy, substance abuse, running away from home, or involvement with the criminal justice or social welfare system. Dropouts often had decisions regarding school attendance made for them by persons significant to them who placed a low priority on staying in school. Truancy and skipping classes seemed linked to lack of school success, negative attitudes, bad interpersonal relationships with teachers, and peer-related issues. Poor attendance patterns were considered to be a prime indicator of those at risk of leaving school (Catteral, 1986a, 1986b; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Gastright, 1987; Horton, 1991; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987).

Attitude/discipline/misbehaviour. Most studies of dropouts' records indicated concerns expressed, at some stage, about the students' poor attitudes toward school and learning, lack of discipline, and general misbehaviour (Horton, 1991; Coladarci, 1983; Davis, 1990; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Neufeld, 1992). Many dropouts professed to dislike school, resent authority and controls, and felt a need for greater freedom (Flores, 1986; Hahn, 1987). A record of suspensions from school and attempted interventions by counsellors was common (Catteral, 1986b).

Bad teachers/methodologies. Catteral (1986a) and Davis (1990) reported that dropouts held the following perceptions: (a) teachers lacked interest in kids, (b) discipline systems were ineffective and unfair, (c) class sizes were too large, (d) teachers were poorly trained, (e) teaching methodologies were ineffective, (f) students needed individualized attention, (g) more attention needed to be paid to extracurricular activities, and (h) a wider variety of work-based and school-based experiences were needed. Batche (1984) saw a need to change school environments to reflect current needs in vocational areas. Flores (1986) advocated a massive intervention in many forms including: (a) monitoring of progress, (b) parental involvement, (c) academic and counselling supports, (d) work experience programming, (e) peer tutoring, (f) needs assessments, (g) job-coaching, (h) transition and individual program plans, (i) more caring and effective staffs, (j) parent education programs, (k) child-find programs, (l) database maintenance, (m) alternate accreditation programs, (n) standardized data accrual, (o) more placement options, and (p) revised placement policies. Frontier School Division (1989) urged that staff define themselves in a much broader role than that of simply delivering academic material: teachers must actively help failing students, tie academic work to extrinsic rewards, adapt teaching and learning to meet student needs, and create and use specialized materials. Hahn (1987) identified a need for mentorship programs, year-round schools, alternative schools, strong administrations, small schools, relevant curriculums, non-traditional learning environments, and daycare facilities for

students' children.

Choice of educational program. Noting that schools control the implementation of provincial curriculums and must adapt their instructional methodologies to meet the needs of the students who might otherwise drop out, Frontier School Division (1989) encouraged mandates that encompassed work education, vocational education, and the streaming of students into appropriate programs. Hahn (1987) believed that schools did not offer a wide enough variety of program choices available to students at risk of dropping out and thereby forced, or provided rationales for, the early leaving of school. Horton (1991) reported that the majority of dropouts in Thompson exited general level courses. This is consistent with the findings of King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) in a study of Ontario schools. Naylor (1987) found that the most successful programs in terms of retaining "at risk" students were intensive goal-orientated programs with class sizes of 10 to 12 students.

Chronic failure. Davis (1990) characterized dropouts as having a history of multiple retentions in elementary school and/or social promotions due to the age of the students and a need for peer-grouping. Davis and Doss (1982) viewed dropouts as chronic educational underachievers. Flores (1986) felt that failure at school was a feature of migrant students due to their highly transitory lifestyle, language difficulties, interrupted educational experiences, social and physical isolation, and the heavy familial economic demands placed upon them.

Counselling and resource supports. Noting that the individual skills of Counsellors and Resource teachers made a difference in whether students exited or remained in school, Batche (1984) reported that the quality of supports available to at risk students was more important in terms of keeping them in school than was the quantity of supports available. However, to enable contact between at risk students and support teachers, sites with higher dropout rates needed more supports than sites with lower dropout rates. Arguing that it is critical to address the needs of the student as perceived

by the student, Catteral (1986b) cautioned that the school that ignores the students' perceptions will be viewed as uncooperative and unhelpful by the student and will enable his or her discontinuance. Flores (1986) saw a need for greater advocacy for students to diminish their myriad of problems. Frontier School Division (1989), Hahn (1987), and King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) saw a need for all staff to enter into mentorship relationships with students. Lee (1983) stated that greater awareness of, and sensitivity to, the needs of aboriginal students would decrease Manitoba's dropout rate.

Curriculums of control rather than instruction. Davis (1990) discovered that a significant number of dropouts felt that their curriculum of study was designed to control them, rather than to instruct them.

Dislike school/teachers. In a number of studies, researchers reported dropouts stated personal dislikes for institutions and specific teachers (Coladarci, 1983; Davis, 1990; Flores, 1986; Gastright, 1987; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Neufeld, 1992). Students reported a need for greater freedom and demonstrated nonconformist attitudes. While rationales for disliking school and teachers varied with each individual, in general, students seemed to dislike intransigent policies and uncaring personnel.

Dropout reclamation programs. Hahn (1987) noted an absence of services for dropout reclamation, pointing out that the focus had been on dropout prevention. Writing that most school administrators were poorly trained in the "exit counselling" and "suspensions" of students, Parkin (1989) advocated the development of informational "exit packages" detailing (a) community and governmental support programs, (b) how to access alternate educational venues, and (c) how to re-enter school. Lecompte and Goebel (1987) urged development of better information management practices to longitudinally track students to determine whether dropout reclamation programs were necessary or if students gravitated to available adult-services programs over time. King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) pointed out that a multiplicity of programs were

necessary in the areas of dropout prevention, crisis intervention, and reclamation.

Employment. Quoting dropouts stating that they quit school to get a job and graduates who said they stayed in school so that they could get a job, Davis and Doss (1982) identified that a need or desire for employment was a primary factor influencing individuals' educational goals and concomitant behaviours. What varied between groups was a perception of immediate financial needs versus delayed future financial rewards. Davis and Doss (1982) reported that 75% of all dropouts were employed shortly after dropping out. Catteral (1985) claimed that high school graduates earn up to US\$266,000 dollars more, on average, than non-graduates over a lifetime. King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, (1989) noted that most dropouts got jobs, not careers. Dropouts limited themselves to a lifetime of low paying, dead end jobs and experienced more frequent unemployment, had little chance of promotion, took jobs which required few skills and provided meager amounts of intellectual stimulus, needed welfare more often, experienced poverty, and required high levels of social services (Mann, 1986; Flores, 1986; Catteral, 1985; Hahn, 1987).

Ethnic background. Frontier School Division (1989) has estimated that First Nations students are only a third to a half as likely to complete high school than non-aboriginal students. Horton (1991) noted that 83% of all First Nations students, 77% of students who spoke English as a second language, and 58% of all students who moved to Thompson to attend high school dropped out of school. Davis (1990) felt that school leaving occurred due to the educational traditions of ethnic, economic, cultural, or racial groups. Coladarci (1983) argued that curricula reflected Caucasian culture and impacted negatively on First Nations students. Lee (1983) declared that social and cultural barriers prohibited First Nations' students from accessing posts-secondary education in Manitoba.

Family problems. Several studies have found that many dropouts had poor relationships with family members (Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Hahn, 1987; Neufeld, 1992). Family problems tended to escalate and were often compounded by

other stressors, finally forcing students to choose between furthering their education or maintaining their home life. Students may have been reluctant to discuss family problems with researchers perhaps feeling either that educators could not significantly intervene in family matters or that family secrets needed to be maintained.

Family structure. The nature of the family unit affected the decision-making of some dropouts. Students may feel compelled to replicate the model set by a parent who may have quit school early to work, not valued education, or had negative attitudes towards educational institutions. In some studies, students did not attend school in order to fulfill adult roles at home when a parent was absent or lacking in skills or abilities. Less often, a student gave up a place in school so that another sibling could attend school because some families had limited resources and could not send all children to school (Catteral, 1986b; Davis, 1990; Frontier, 1989; Gastright, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987).

Gender. Horton (1991) noted that, compared to females, males in Thompson were twice as likely to drop out of school. Hahn (1987) supported this finding among the high school he students surveyed in the USA. King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) reported that this trend continued in post-secondary school where more females opted to continue their education while more males than females opted to drop out. No researcher offered rationales for this phenomenon beyond speculating that jobs may be more readily available for uneducated young males than for females.

Inadequate goals/aspirations. Studies found that dropouts often lacked clear goals or aspired to goals too easily attained. Catteral (1986a) argued that a survey of academic aspirations could identify the "at risk" population in terms of early school leaving. Reporting that most dropouts lacked plans for further education and saw nothing wrong with quitting school, Davis and Doss (1982) noted that most had convinced themselves that the benefits of dropping out outweighed the benefits of staying in school. Dropouts tended to opt for short-term rewards available through the entry level job market. Setting

and working toward long-term goals were challenges left unmet by many dropouts.

Intelligence and achievement test scores. Catteral (1986a, 1986b) noted that more than 75% of all dropouts ranked in the first quartile of standardized achievement tests and that more than 40% of students who had "D" averages on their report cards quit school. Davis (1990) argued that IQ is a factor to be considered and reported that the lower the IQ, the higher the dropout rate. Flores (1986) predicted higher dropout rates as school districts raise standards to conform with national appeals for more "effective" schools. Hahn (1987) acknowledged the low IQ: high dropout ratio, but said that curriculum-based grades assigned by teachers were the more effective predictor of students at risk. It seems that IQ scores correlate more highly with success at school than the factors that make up intelligence.

Irrelevant curriculum. Most dropouts cited irrelevant curriculum(s) as a factor influencing their decision to leave school. The dropouts claimed that the skills taught and abilities developed at school had little relevance other than at school. Some dropouts saw the function of a school as being a training ground for industry and felt that, unless specific work skills were taught, the curriculum lacked relevance (Batche, 1984; Coladarci, 1983; Davis, 1990; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Stay in School Supplement, 1991).

Language problems. In schools where the sole language of instruction was English, having English as a second language can be a significant factor in deciding to drop out. Flores (1986) and Horton (1991) reported that dropout rates for English as a second language (ESL) students range from 30% to 77%, far exceeding the norm of approximately 30% for other stressors. Catteral (1986a) equated language facility with students' social integration and noted that the more unsuccessful the integration, the higher the dropout rate.

Legal problems. Catteral (1986a) noted that students on probation are at high risk of dropping out of school. Parkin (1989) observed that conflicts with the law has become

an acceptable rationale for dropping out of school.

Low self-esteem and self-concept. Dropouts exhibited traits indicative of low self-esteem and self-concept (Batche, 1984; Davis, 1990; Hahn, 1987; Neufeld, 1992). By the time they were ready to drop out, these students had faced countless crises and felt unsuccessful in their resolution of them. Recognizing that the school system tried to make students feel responsible for their behaviour, Davis (1990) declared that dropouts learnt to internalize their failures so that they perceived themselves as “losers”. Finding that school was just one more of many unsuccessful endeavours, Davis and Doss (1982) reported that, for the dropouts, quitting was deemed acceptable, desirable, and even expected.

Low socioeconomic status and poverty. Many studies have reported significant numbers of dropouts classified as poor or of low socioeconomic status (Batche, 1984; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Frontier, 1989; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987; Neufeld, 1992). Describing poor students as lacking funds for what others took for granted (i.e., books, food, clothing, entertainment, etc), The **Stay in School Supplement** (1991) noted that school was a very unequal place in terms of opportunity from a student perspective. To compensate, poor students sought employment which further limited the number and type of educational opportunities available to them. Sporting activities, field trips, social events, extra-curricular activities, after school tutoring, and other benefits of school were missed due to the time demands of employment. Affected students demonstrated narrowed outlooks, reduced expectations, induced defense mechanisms, hurting behaviours, and a growing sense of isolation and worthlessness. Many felt that all they were good for was menial jobs and did not see school as being able to provide any relief (**Stay in School Supplement, 1991**).

Nature of discontinuation. Noting that conflict with the legal system was an acceptable reason for quitting school, while boredom, malice, and pregnancy were

unacceptable reasons, Parkin (1989) wrote that one's value system becomes the issue in evaluating dropout rationales. Catteral (1986a) observed that dropping out of school may not be deviant behaviour but simply the outcome of the "right" combination of circumstances.

Parent's education levels. Several researchers noted that many dropouts reported that their parents had low levels of education. In general, they assumed that dropouts imitate their parental model and do not optimize their educational potential (Catteral; 1986a; Davis, 1990; Flores, 1986; Hahn, 1987; Neufeld, 1992).

Peer-related issues. Finding that failure to integrate socially with peers at school impacted heavily upon the decision to quit school, Catteral (1986a) argued that social allegiances (or lack thereof) with peers, teachers, and the institution are highly correlated with one's achievements in the early school years. Coladarci (1983) stated that significant numbers of dropouts based decisions to quit school on the behaviours and influences of friends who had recently discontinued their education.

Place of residence. Identifying place of residence as a factor contributing to quitting school, Naylor (1987) reported that persons living in substandard housing dropped out of school at higher rates than those from more affluent neighbourhoods. However, Davis (1990) reported that the school attended was more of a factor influencing dropout decisions than the neighbourhood.

Pregnancy/marriage/child-care. In numerous studies, female dropouts cited pregnancy, marriage, and child-care as reasons for quitting school. Few male dropouts cited these reasons (Coladarci, 1983; Davis, 1990; Gastright, 1987; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Mann, 1986; Neufeld, 1992).

Retention. Horton (1991) reported that a single retention at any grade level is a primary indicator, in Thompson, of students at serious risk of dropping out of school. Other researchers shared a similar concern noting that multiple retentions are indicative of a serious lack of academic and/or social success, either of which are cited as major

reasons for quitting school (Catteral, 1986a, 1986b; Flores, 1986; Gastright, 1987; Hahn, 1987; Neufeld, 1992).

School environment. Batche (1984) and Naylor (1987) reported that students majoring in vocational and business subjects were less prone to drop out than those majoring in English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. Describing schools with high dropout rates as sharing similar characteristics, Davis (1990) identified high rates in the following areas as being possibly indicative of high risk schools: discipline problems among staff and students, urban locations, large numbers of students, many financially poor students, disadvantaged ethnic minority groups, poor inter-staff relationships, emphasis on control rather than instruction, unfair and unclear rules, and disciplinary practices that were perceived by students as being neither effective nor fair. Davis and Doss (1982) observed that dropouts reported being unchallenged and bored in school. Hahn (1987) stated that dropouts disliked teachers and the school itself, felt that they were constantly at odds with authorities, lacked freedom, were over-controlled, needed lower teacher-student ratios, and required site-based social services. King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) called for changes to school environments that would increase vigilance by teachers and upgrade the effectiveness of programs. Goodlad (1984) recommended both a change in paradigm and an increase in the effectiveness of staff and their programs. His proposal would involve moving away from the traditional graded lockstep model to a continuous progress life-centred career education system.

Study skills and work habits. Batche (1984), Frontier School Division (1989), and King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) reported that students cited a lack of study skills and poor work habits as major reasons for their lack of success in school. Studies from the 1970's and earlier tended to focus on this area differently by criticizing the students' work ethic.

Substance abuse. Friedman, Glickman, and Utada (1985) observed that parents of students abusing substances wanted to believe that problems in school could be attributed

to the substances, or to the affects of the substances on their children. However, drug use may be indicative of a more basic and widespread disaffection with life. Catteral (1986a) and Coladarci (1983) indicated that many dropouts used drugs regularly. While this was accepted as fact by Friedman, Glickman, and Utada (1985), they found that equally significant numbers of drug users stayed in school and graduated with no appreciable affects on their grades. Neufeld (1992) feared that lack of success in school compels people to turn to drugs for relief. Friedman, Glickman, and Utada (1985) reported a correlation between drug use and absenteeism but felt that it was unclear which problem preceded the other and that the causal factors of both problems were so complex that no conclusions could be drawn.

Teacher-administrator-parent-student cooperation. Uncooperative relationships among students and adult stakeholders were cited as having a great impact upon the decision to quit school in many studies (Batche, 1984; Coladarci, 1983; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Lee, 1983; Naylor, 1987; Stay in School Supplement, 1991). Surveys of students generally found that they perceived adults to be uncooperative. "Cooperation" was poorly and variously defined in the studies, however.

Teacher and school policies. In many studies, policies governing teacher, student, and administrator behaviour were cited as being incompatible with the behaviours desired by the students. Students viewed school policies as anachronistic, punitive, unfair, inflexible, ambiguous, inconsistent, and biased. Changes in policy were desired, sometimes by all stakeholders, but were slow in coming, which heightened frustration levels. Potential dropouts were usually unsuccessful with the curriculum taught in schools and unsuccessful with the rules of the school, placing them in a "double jeopardy" situation in terms of being at risk of discontinuing school (Batche, 1984; Catteral, 1986b; Coladarci, 1983; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Frontier, 1989; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987; Stay in School Supplement, 1991).

Timing of discontinuation. Davis (1990) identified Junior High (grades 7, 8, and 9), age 16, and immediately prior to graduation as times when students were most likely to quit school. Junior high was seen as a high risk period as students make the transition out of elementary school and into senior high school over a short period of three years. At age 16, students can legally quit school; many chose to exercise this option making Senior 1 and Senior 2 significant school years in terms of preventative programs. Potential graduates who found themselves short of credits and ineligible for graduation often quit rather than return to school for another year.

Transiency. Horton (1991) and Flores (1986) reported that transient and migrant students have dropout rates of up to 100% in some locales. King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989) corroborated these findings adding that many transient students had never completed a full year at any one school making attainment of curriculum objectives, let alone educational consistency, next to impossible.

Transition planning. Many researchers have identified the move from elementary school to high school as a crucial time for students at risk of dropping out. Gathering demographic data, school progress and behavioural records, and compiling meaningful information about these students for distribution to their new schools were major difficulties to be overcome in smoothing school to school transitions. While the longitudinal tracking of transient students at risk was considered virtually impossible, by some researchers, due to information management obstacles, teachers' prior knowledge of the needs of their future students was seen as imperative to enable effective and appropriate programming (Catteral, 1986a; Flores, 1986; Frontier, 1989; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Lecompte and Goebel, 1987; Naylor, 1987; Stay in School Supplement, 1991).

Undiagnosed learning disabilities. Studies of student profiles suggested low intelligence quotient and/or achievement test scores among substantial numbers of dropouts. Dropouts, who otherwise appeared to lack common or generalizable attributes,

may share a common trait of possessing specific but undiagnosed learning disabilities (Catteral, 1986a; Flores, 1986; Hahn, 1987; Neufeld, 1992). This notion is entirely speculative, however, as neither IQ nor achievement tests measure learning disabilities.

General Research Problem

Review of such a multiplicity of possible stressors may confuse and alarm those who care about students, education, and society in general. The literature seems to suggest that approximately 25% of the students in our education system may not benefit sufficiently from the experience. This study was intended to identify and clarify three general areas of concern: the school leaving stressors at RDPC, how students were coping with those stressors, and what might be done to help the students.

Design and Methodology

Specific Research Questions

Statistically, the null hypothesis tested in this study was that there would be no difference in the types of school leaving stressors faced by students who remained in school and students who left school prior to graduation as measured by a stressor survey. The alternative hypothesis tested in this study was that there would be differences in the types of school leaving stressors faced by students who remained in school and students who left school prior to graduation as measured by a stressor survey.

Supplementary qualitative research questions included:

1. What is the minimum rate of student dropout at RDPC?
2. Why is attending school important to RDPC students?
3. What restructuring needs to be undertaken to meet the needs of RDPC students at risk of early school leaving?
4. Will stressors identified in the survey be identified as stressors during interviews and records searches?
5. What specific criteria need to be established at RDPC to identify those students at risk of early leaving of school?

6. What stressors do RDPC students perceive themselves facing?
7. How do RDPC students perceive themselves coping with stressors?
8. Do stressors vary with how students are categorized and/or perceived by others?
9. Are information management procedures at RDPC sufficient to provide data that would justify interventions to prevent early leaving of school or to reclaim dropouts?
10. Is it possible to differentiate between transient students who transfer to other schools from transient students who drop out of RDPC?

Site Characteristics

In 1993, R.D. Parker Collegiate, a public secondary school located in Thompson, Manitoba, offered comprehensive programming to Senior 1 to Senior 4 students. Servicing students from the local community and the North-Eastern region of the province, approximately 1200 students attended this semestered school with approximately 300 students registered at each grade level at the time of the study.

At the time of the study, programs in Special Education (05), Work Education (04), General Level (01), University Entrance (00), Vocational/Industrial (03), Business and Marketing (02), Cooperative Vocational (03), Music (05), Developmental Education (05), School Initiated Programs (05), and Student Initiated Projects (05) were available.

Reflecting the multicultural nature of Thompson, approximately 40% of RDPC students were of First Nations heritage. Canadians of East Indian and Atlantic provinces heritages made up a large proportion of the schools cultural plurality. A high transiency rate was evident with an approximate turnover rate of 40% of the total enrollment annually. In most cases, students new to the community would enroll, attend school for a few weeks, and then return to their home communities either to attend school there or wait until the next semester at RDPC began.

A 30% average dropout rate was documented at RDPC in 1991. Students who fit certain descriptors dropped out at rates up to 100%. For example, Horton (1991) reported

that 100% of those students studied who (a) had elementary school records indicating attendance concerns, and/or (b) enrolled in other than "00" or "01" Mathematics programs dropped out of school prior to graduation. Interestingly, the school graduated the most students in its history in 1990. This suggested an extremely disparate nature to the student population and warranted further investigation.

Resources in the form of instructional and support personnel varied widely. Specialist staff tended to have graduate level training which classroom personnel lacked. The staff split along lines of seniority as well: personnel tended to have either 10 or more years of experience or less than five years.

On a referral basis, the services of personnel from Community Services, the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, the Society for Manitobans with Disabilities were used. Other agencies provided services but these three groups were accessed most often.

Support services were a major feature of RDPC during the 1993-1994 school year. The school employed three counsellors, three resource teachers, a First Nations student advisor, a chemical counsellor, a public health nurse, two special needs teachers, a special education teacher, an English as a second language teacher, an English language enrichment teacher for First Nations students, and 10 full-time educational assistants to help students with special needs. Since 1993-1994, a 30% rate of referral for special placement in Senior 1 programs offering exceptional educational supports has been documented.

Student support services were organized in a manner conducive to this study. Students were grouped by the first letter of their last name (alpha-grouping) to receive help from counsellors and resource teachers and by grade level to be handled by administrators. Each student was serviced by a three person team which included other specialists and instructional personnel as needed. These staff members were incorporated into the study as key informants to assist in data verification.

RDPC had developed information management procedures concerning student

attendance, placement, behaviour, evaluation and reporting, welfare, and special needs. Discontinued students were identified in a central computing system. Lists of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of discontinued students were made available to the principal investigator. These lists were often inaccurate and/or incomplete. Archival information was available for most students.

Research Role

The principal investigator had been employed for the past four years as a resource teacher at RDPC and served as head of the Special Services Department (SSD). As a result, immediate access to available information was possible once University and Divisional academic, ethical, and administrative approvals for the study were obtained and the subjects gave permission. Special Services intervened in many discontinuation situations and provided services to all students within the school in one form or another.

In conducting the study, the principal investigator interacted in an observer role whenever the person in question had no apparent special needs and had no direct contact with the SSD. The principal investigator interacted in a participant role if the student had special needs and was on the SSD caseload.

Support and endorsements for this study were solicited and received from the School District of Mystery Lake, Keewatin Tribal Council, and the Thompson Stay in School Committee.

General Research Design

Type of study. A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was planned. Participants completed a survey about the possible school leaving stressors they faced. Those who completed the survey were requested to take part in an interview in which they were asked to discuss their methods of coping with stressors. Participants were required to permit access to Manitoba Cumulative Records and any personal Resource files held by the local school district. Also, they were requested to name individuals who were familiar with their situation to be interviewed. The interview with

the participant, the search of archival records, and the interviewing of key informants were all part of a triangulation process employed to gather more information, corroborate information provided, and supplement existing information.

Subject selection. A comprehensive sampling of students who dropped out of RDPC during the 1993-1994 school year was attempted. At the end of each month, summaries of discontinued students were provided to the principal investigator. Telephone contact was attempted with each former student. If contact was made, participation in the study was requested. Those who desired inclusion were scheduled for an interview and survey or mailed a survey if he or she declined to be interviewed.

Matching discontinued students with continuing students by enrolled program for later comparison was intended. Due to the unavailability of discontinued students, it was necessary to match continuing students (who were more readily available) with those discontinued students who chose to participate in the study. Once a survey and/or interview with a discontinued student was complete, that student was matched by enrolled program with a continuing student. That continuing student was approached by telephone to solicit participation in the study. Those who desired inclusion were scheduled for an interview and survey or mailed a survey if they declined to be interviewed. If that individual declined participation in the study, another continuing student was solicited using the same selection criteria and procedure.

Network selection was utilized with both of the sample groups. Students referred members of their peer group whom they believed might have an interest in the study to the principal investigator. This strategy was employed as accessing students became problematic.

Survey. Each stressor previously identified in other studies as contributing to early school leaving by students was phrased as a declarative statement and included on a survey form. Each survey item was phrased in both positive and negative terms so that reliability of response could be determined simply by comparing responses.

Contradictory responses to matching items could have identified that item for exclusion in later analyses if so desired. The items were placed randomly on the survey form. For example: one item (#35) read "I like myself" while a second item (#66) read "I dislike myself". Refer to Appendix B to view the survey form.

Beside each stressor a five point Likert rating scale with the following alternatives appeared: strongly disagree, disagree, did not think about, agree, and strongly agree. Three essential responses were solicited. Participants selecting a negative response had two options as did those who chose a positive response to an item. A neutral response (did not think about) was available to those who were indecisive or had not contemplated that issue. The reverse side of the page provided space for recording interview data.

The survey was either completed by the participant prior to the beginning of their interview or was mailed to them with a pre-paid return envelope provided if an interview was declined.

Interviews with participants. A guided interview method was used initially as part of the triangulation procedure to gather, corroborate, and supplement information. Survey items provided the focus for the interviews with a simple review of each item identified as a major stressor. Interviews typically became unstructured when students were asked to elaborate on stressors. Reflective interviewing techniques were employed which generally consisted of repeating the participants' last comment back to them and asking them to describe "what does that mean?" or asking them to be more descriptive by saying "tell me more about that".

Participants found it most convenient to meet after school hours in the SSD office area. Demographic information collected was limited to that which is ordinarily collected by the school. Information such as age, gender, sponsoring agencies, health status, and affiliations with community groups was discussed. Each interview took between 30 and 60 minutes to conduct. All data was collected from each source in a single session. Students were informed of the purpose of the study and given the

opportunity to opt out of participation. Individual identities were kept confidential. Anonymity was guaranteed to ensure cooperation.

Artifact collection. An artifact collection procedure was undertaken as part of the triangulation procedure used to gather, corroborate, and supplement information. A search of Manitoba Cumulative Records and individual Resource files was performed by the principal investigator when such records were available. This search consisted of noting transfers between schools, repeated grades, disciplinary notices, special program outlines, report card scores, and any anecdotal comments that were repeated more than three times in different years.

Interviews with key informants. Key informants were interviewed as part of the triangulation procedure to gather, corroborate, and supplement information. Individuals identified by participants as being significant to them were interviewed by the principal investigator using an informal conversational technique. Information provided by the student was disclosed to the key informant who was asked to comment on the accuracy of the statements. They were then asked if they could elaborate on the students' situation or provide alternative information. All the key informants were school based personnel including most often an administrator, a resource teacher, several classroom teachers, and a counsellor.

Key informants as secondary sources of information were excluded from the study whenever the student did not wish their participation. Honesty was considered critical to this study and it was hoped that participants might be more open in their responses if they felt secure in being unchallenged by others in their perceptions and responses.

Information management. Terminology was clarified and issues discussed before recording data during interviews. The principal investigator recorded verbal responses in writing during interviews and read those responses back to the participants for verification.

Data was transcribed the same day onto a computer record. Elaborations regarding interview sessions were made at this time and included comments on rapport, reactions, and ancillary information. The computer system consisted of an Apple Macintosh IIsx with a System 7.1 operating system running FileMaker Pro database software from Claris Corporation. A word processing program from Paragon Concepts known as Nisus was used later in recording this study. Statview from Abacus Concepts provided statistical analysis of data.

Data analysis. Descriptive information was summarized and saved on a database reporting system. Anecdotal records were kept by compiling information from participants' interviews, key informants interviews, and archival searches. Survey responses were loaded into a statistical spreadsheet as both nominal and continuous variables to facilitate frequency counts and statistical analysis. Anecdotal information and survey data were coded by demographic descriptors such as name, gender, age, status in school (discontinued or continuing), and enrolled program. These demographic descriptors were used as discriminating factors in later analyses.

The nonparametric Mann Whitney U test was used as the sample groups lacked normal distributions demographically. To analyse the data, the survey items were divided into positively and negatively phrased items. The mean score for each participant was calculated gaining a result for positively phrased questions and a result for negatively phrased questions. Next, the two sample groups' responses were analysed in terms of positively phrased questions and negatively phrased questions to determine if the responses were significant statistically when $\alpha \leq .05$.

Post hoc analysis of all survey questions comparing continuing and discontinued students' responses was undertaken to identify educationally significant differences using the Mann Whitney U test. Probability values were reported for each survey item.

Preliminary inductive analysis of non-survey data indicated that four distinct groups of students had participated in the study rather than just the discontinued and

continuing groups of students. The data suggested that the continuing group of participants was composed of students who had never been discontinued from school and students who had been previously discontinued and had re-enrolled in school. The discontinued group of participants was composed of students who had been discontinued from school for the first time and students who had experienced multiple discontinuances from school. Each group shared common attributes to study. This categorization made for smaller sample groups but provided more information to be made available as data became complementary rather than contradictory. Interview data and information gained through records searches was summarized, synthesized, and presented using this four group categorization.

Post hoc analysis of all survey questions comparing the never discontinued, previously discontinued, first-time discontinued, and multiple discontinuances groups' responses was undertaken to identify educationally significant differences using the Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric test of variance. Probability values were reported for each survey item.

Limitations of the Design and Methodology

Nature of perception. The experiential backgrounds of the students who took part in the study varied widely. Experiences perceived as distressing by one individual may have been considered invigorating by another student.

Denial. Students may have felt a need for confidentiality which may have prohibited or inhibited honest, complete responses to some interview questions. Further, some students may have been practicing denial as a defense mechanism for so long that they formed beliefs contradictory to the facts of their situation.

Lack of percipience. Students may have lacked understanding of the stressors they faced. Many seemed unaware of the primary stressors affecting them and focused instead on secondary stressors. Contradictory or neutral responses may have indicated a lack of concern about some stressors.

Ambiguous responses. Some students were unable or unwilling to fully articulate how stressors affected them, how they coped with situations, or how remediation could take place. Responses were predicated on language skills and the ability to analyze stressors.

Confused responses. The length of the survey and/or the immediacy of the interview may have stimulated students to respond too quickly without taking time for reflection. Replication of survey items using both positive and negative phrasing may have confused some participants. When confronted with a lengthy list of possible stressors in an interview, many students chose contradictory responses.

Changing perceptions. Perceptions of events changed over time. Events may have become more negative or more positive in nature depending upon the biases and conceits of the participant. Memory of specific details seemed fallible. It seemed that old beliefs were integrated with new beliefs and changed with the present needs and circumstances of the individual. Some individuals appeared to possess selective memories.

Single interviewer. Lack of a female interviewer may have been problematic. The principal investigator was a participant in many of the students' situations. Interviewers perceived to be neutral or disinterested may have generated greater participation.

Triangulation. It was overly optimistic to assume that information supplementary to the survey data could be collected and corroborated from students, significant others, and archival records. Some participants were unknown to those identified as key informants. Archival records were often incomplete. Most often the key informant and archival data could only corroborate rather than supplement data provided by the participant.

Stakeholders. People may have seen little value in participating in the study or may have feared that provision of information would somehow damage an existing

situation. Facing stressors was central to participation in this study and may have been considered threatening. Maintenance of the status quo may have been preferable to many potential participants.

Researcher role. The validity of the information gained was questionable given the duality of the principal investigators role as researcher and educator. Participants and key informants may have perceived either a conflict of interest or sensed an expected response and adjusted responses accordingly. Hopefully, the principal investigator was considered to be an unbiased individual helpful to those in need and this perception decreased the threat of observer-setting interaction affecting external validity.

Survey reliability and validity. Preliminary item analysis of survey results indicated that 32.5% of all responses were contradictory and 11.3% of all responses were neutral in nature. Contradictory responses occurred whenever students chose both positive and negative responses to the two survey items that dealt with the same stressor. Neutral responses occurred whenever students indicated that they had not thought about that stressor. However, an individual can hold opposing points of view on an issue. For example, I may consider myself ugly to some people, and I may consider myself beautiful to some people. I may have agreed with both items had they been on the survey. Both responses could be equally valid to me. Results were analyzed as provided by participants without any data correction procedure being undertaken. Readers are warned that the results of the analyses may be neither valid nor reliable, however.

Small sample size. There was a low rate of participation in this study. Sixteen dropouts from a total population of approximately 500 discontinued students chose to participate. The quota of 16 students who were selected for participation from the continuing population of approximately 700 students represents, proportionally, an even smaller sample group.

Comprehensive selection. Due to the small sample size, it was impossible to undertake a random selection of participants. All results had to be included in the

analyses of the data to discover any sort of common pattern among respondents. This lack of random selection means that the results of this study are not generalizable to a larger population.

Unavailability. A total of 285 students were unavailable to participate in the study. Telephone contact was attempted on three separate dates with each student who had provided a telephone number when enrolling at RDPC. Many numbers were "not in service" possibly implying transiency. Students who had provided addresses when enrolling at RDPC and still had telephone services (but were unavailable by telephone) were mailed surveys with return postage envelopes attached. None of these surveys were returned. This lack of participation means that this sample group can not be considered to be representative of the discontinued population of RDPC students.

Declined or reneged on participation. A total of 11 discontinued students declined participation in the study. A further 32 discontinued students reneged on participation. These 43 students represent approximately 10% of the total available population of approximately 500 discontinued students. Participation from this group may have facilitated a random selection process and/or validated results to a greater degree.

Type 1 error. Repeated statistical comparison of survey data results in a high risk of Type 1 error occurring. For this study, this means that one time out of twenty, responses that are true will be rejected as false. As there were 102 items to be statistically analyzed, it is probable that Type 1 errors have occurred.

Matching. Finding continuing students whose programs matched discontinuing students was extremely difficult. Most discontinuing students had changed programs several times, had incomplete programs of study, and had such unusual residual combinations of classes at the time of their discontinuation that it was impossible to make a match with continuing students' programs. At best, matches between two of four core area programs such as English, Mathematics, Social Studies, or Science were possible.

The analysis of matching pairs that had been planned originally was not undertaken due to this problem.

Results

Quantitative Surveys

Parameter. The general population of RDPC included 552 students who discontinued studies during the 1993-1994 school year. The school maintained an average population of approximately 1200 students implying that approximately 648 students remained in attendance from September, 1993 through June, 1994. Excluded from the study were any students who transferred into RDPC during this school year.

A total of 32 students participated in this study. Widely varying demographic and academic profiles were apparent among this sample group. Difficulties in contacting discontinued students resulted in small numbers of participants in the study. Statistics describing the unavailability of participants are provided. Refer to Appendix C to view item-by-item responses of the two groups of participants. Appendix D lists survey items by question number: this list will aid readers in matching statistical data with the specific stressor under scrutiny.

Demographic profile. In general terms, 21 males and 11 females participated in this study. Ages ranged between 14 to 20 for the discontinued males and between 16 to 34 for the discontinued females. Ages ranged between 16 to 20 for the inschool males and between 16 to 24 for the inschool females. Seven students came to the study from "00" (University Entry) programs. 17 students either were or had been registered in "01" (General Level) programs. Two students came to the study from "04" (Work Education) programs and six student either were or had been registered in "05" (School Initiated) programs. 16 students had discontinued school and 16 students remained in school. Refer to Table 1 for specific details.

Table 1

Demographic profile

Descriptor	Discontinued status				Totals
	Never ^a	Previously ^b	First-time ^c	Multiple ^d	
<u>Program</u>					
"00"	4	0	0	3	7
"01"	1	5	6	5	17
"04"	0	1	0	1	2
"05"	3	2	0	1	6
<u>Gender</u>					
female	3	3	2	3	11
male	5	5	4	7	21
<u>Age</u>					
14-16	0	0	1	0	1
16-18	3	2	1	3	9
18-20	5	2	0	6	13
20-22	0	3	3	0	6
24-26	0	1	0	0	1
32-34	0	0	1	1	2

Notes.

- ^a The total number of participants in this category was 8.
- ^b The total number of participants in this category was 8.
- ^c The total number of participants in this category was 6.
- ^d The total number of participants in this category was 10.

Dropout statistics. Table 2 demonstrates the unavailability of discontinued students. As contact was attempted, the status of potential participants was recorded. Many "unreachable" students may have moved away judging by the number of disconnected telephone numbers and lack of forwarding addresses. Students who left forwarding addresses were classified as "moved away". Subtracting from the official total of 552 dropouts those students who moved away, were previous graduates, were jailed, were in substance abuse treatment centres, and were deceased leaves a potential dropout statistic of 343 students. However, it remained unclear how many of these "disappeared" students were attending school elsewhere. Subtracting only the graduate students and the deceased student from the total leaves an actual dropout statistic of 509 students.

Mann Whitney U. Analysis was undertaken using the Mann Whitney U non-parametric rank-sum test. This test was used to compare the two populations because their distributions were not approximately normal. Preliminary analysis of the survey data indicated that the groups varied widely in demographic, socio-economic, and academic profile.

The Statview computer program used to perform the analysis generated Significance Probability (p -value) data which permits investigators to pick whatever level of significance ($\alpha = \text{alpha}$) seems most appropriate given the requirements of the study. To assist in data analysis, Khazanie (1990) noted that the p -value associated with the test of a hypothesis is the smallest α for which the observed data would call for rejection of the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis. If α is the stipulated level of significance of the test, then (a) reject the null hypothesis if the p -value is less than or equal to α , and (b) do not reject the null hypothesis if the p -value is greater than α . The null hypothesis for this test was that there is no difference in the type of stressor(s) faced by students who remained in school and students who left school early.

Table 2

Disposition of discontinued students

Status	n	%
Unreachable by telephone/mail	285	51.6
Moved away	147	26.6
Graduated previously	42	7.6
Reneged on participation	32	5.8
Participated in study	16	2.9
Jailed	16	2.9
Declined participation	11	1.9
Substance treatment centre	3	<1.0
Deceased	1	<1.0
Total	n = 552	100

Note. "Unreachable" students generally lacked telephone services and forwarding addresses. Contact by telephone was attempted with all students. Approximately half of the total possible were mailed surveys with return postage envelopes if it seemed possible that they were living in Thompson. "Moved away" designated students who no longer resided in Thompson. "Graduated previously" described students who had intended to return to school for upgrading. "Reneged on participation" meant that multiple contacts were made and participation was assured but did not occur. "Jailed" and "substance treatment centre" students were held in centres outside Thompson. The deceased student was a suicide.

The mean scores for all positively phrased survey items were calculated for each participant. The Mann Whitney U test was employed to compare the discontinued groups' results to the continuing groups' results. The p -value gained was 0.1092 which implies that the null hypothesis should not be rejected when $\alpha \leq .05$. The same procedure was undertaken with all negatively phrased survey items. The p -value gained was 0.2065 which implies that the null hypothesis should not be rejected when $\alpha \leq .05$. Mann Whitney U analysis suggests that there was no difference in the type of stressor(s) faced by students who remained in school and students who left school early. Refer to Appendix E for specific statistical data.

Given the large numbers of items included in the survey instrument used in this exploratory study of early school leaving, it seems possible that the survey may have measured many stressors that did not differentiate the continuing and discontinuing students, thereby masking the significance statistically, of a subset of stressors that do potentially differentiate the two groups. Therefore, post hoc analysis of the data was undertaken using the Mann Whitney U test with $\alpha \leq .05$ to identify educationally significant stressors that differentiate the continuing and discontinued student groups.

Statistically significant findings of two group post hoc analysis. Significant differences between the participating groups of students were found in a post hoc analysis of each survey item. Appendix F provides specific statistics from the ad hoc Mann Whitney U analysis. Table 3 provides raw data used in this analysis. Refer to Appendix G to view a ranking by p -value of each stressor and a mean ranking of the two groups. Using $\alpha \leq .05$ as the preferred level of significance, six stressors are identifiable.

Having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers was a stressor for discontinued students ($p = .015$). Never having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers was common among those students who stayed in school ($p = .017$). Being neither comfortable with nor a part of their peer group, family, or other associations was seen as problematic by discontinued students ($p = .018$). Teachers being

unable to meet their needs was a stressor for discontinued students ($p = .027$). Those who stayed in school reported believing that their behaviour was the same as that of other people ($p = .035$). Discontinued students typically believed that their ethnic background made things difficult for them ($p = .048$).

Qualitative Data

Regrouping. Initially, only two groups of students were considered for study. Inductive data analysis suggested that four categories of participant were emergent. Discontinuation from school was common among 24 of 32 participants. Eight of those 24 students had re-enrolled and were currently attending school: this meant that half of those students attending school had experienced discontinuation previously. Review of those students identified as discontinued indicated that 38% were experiencing discontinuation for the first time. It proved useful to categorize participants in terms of their experience(s) with discontinuation and regroup the students for analysis. Participants were grouped as (a) never having discontinued school, (b) having previously discontinued school, but were presently enrolled, (c) having discontinued school for the first time, or (d) having multiple discontinuations from school.

Each participant had three possible sources of information given the triangulation process undertaken during data collection. A total of 96 separate records were possible from interviews, archival records, or key informants. No contradictory information was discovered among these sources. The sources tended to corroborate one another with some supplementary data emerging. Table 4 provides specific information on sources of ethnographic information.

Never discontinued. Noteworthy with respect to this group was the fact that, while they had never discontinued school, all but two had faced and overcome major stressors in their lives. Stressors such as diabetes, chronic depression/paranoia, sexual abuse, cerebral palsy, substance abuse, and the horrors of civil war were viewed as hurdles crossed rather than impassible barriers. These stressors were viewed as past

challenges that had been mastered. All students in this group looked to the future confidently sure that they could overcome new challenges.

Describing themselves as winners, these students demonstrated a sense of control over their personal behaviours and circumstances. They felt that they set and met their own performance standards although all reported that high expectations were set for them by family members. All but one student described strong family involvement in their lives. Verbal encouragement was spoken of as being particularly useful to them in times of stress. Their families shared in problem-solving with them. Interestingly, the students described this process as initially intrusive, but ultimately helpful and welcome.

Successful at school, seemingly with minimal effort required, all were capable students with marks in the 60-80% range. This success required previous assistance, however. All but one of this group had been recipients of special services from Counsellors or Resource teachers at some point in their education. Three of the eight had been retained at least once in the primary grades. These students reported a sense of increasingly becoming able to cope with academia.

Life-planning and anticipating future rewards were themes common to all members of this group. All saw school as a means to an end and anticipated further schooling as necessary to meeting their goals. All were eager to enter the job market to achieve entry level experiences and advocated job experience training (co-operative education) as a desirable activity denied to them due to the rigid structure of their programs.

Table 3

Post hoc MWU two group analysis: Significant results.

Item	n ^a	Level of Agreement					p-Value
		Strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	Strongly agree	
I have had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.							.015
Discontinued	15	0	3	3	6	3	
Inschool	14	6	3	0	5	0	
I have never had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.							.017
Discontinued	14	3	7	2	2	0	
Inschool	14	2	2	1	3	6	
I am neither comfortable with nor a part of my peer-group, family, or other associations.							.018
Discontinued	15	0	7	3	5	0	
Inschool	16	5	8	2	0	1	
My teachers are unable to meet my needs.							.027
Discontinued	16	0	4	5	7	0	
Inschool	15	2	8	3	1	1	
I believe that my behaviour is the same as that of other people.							.035
Discontinued	16	6	5	3	2	0	
Inschool	16	1	6	2	7	0	
My ethnic background makes things difficult for me.							.048
Discontinued	15	1	3	6	4	1	
Inschool	16	3	5	8	0	0	

Notes.

^a The number of students who responded to each item on the survey is "n". A total of 16 is possible in each case.

The socio-economic status of these students ranged from being wards of the province to children of double-income upper-middle class parents. None reported the need for money as a pressing issue. All seemed consumed by the idea of getting on with life to the exclusion of satisfying present needs, wants, or desires. While all professed having little need for material goods, six of the eight worked at part-time jobs. One student had been promised a new truck upon graduation with honours. Only three of the eight took part in any extra-curricular or sporting activities.

School and work were the central foci of their existence. Even given the challenging nature of the stressors they described as being part of their lives, these participants described themselves as being bored with their lives. Most had never thought of doing anything other than attending school. They seemed to be following a scripted agenda in terms of their life-plan. Most described their life-plan in terms of their families' wishes for them. Neither joy nor happiness were mentioned by any of these individuals.

Previously discontinued. Eight attending students, who had discontinued school in previous years, appeared to be tremendously unhappy with themselves and their lives. Returning to school after absences ranging from a few months to four years, these students had a new-found sense of urgency, perhaps feeling that time was passing them by. They had become concerned that they might have missed out on their chance for a successful, happy life.

Desirous of new personas and bored with present lifestyles, these students had only recently starting looking to the future. Anticipating a future as bleak as their immediate past (when out of school), this group decided that their best option at a brighter future was through further education. Presenting themselves as individuals in a recovery phase, these individuals wanted and expected their circumstances to improve immediately. They tended to describe themselves as survivors of both a failed school system and family structure. Returning to school was an attempt to avoid a "losing"

situation in the out-of-school world. None saw it as ironic that their previous flight from school had been to avoid the same "losing" situation in the academic world. Conversely, they viewed themselves as winners embarking on a new adventure.

They described dysfunctional families in detail. They lacked family support, both emotionally and financially. Family members were critical of the students' situations but were themselves unable to influence and/or offer positive alternatives. Members tended to look upon each other as losers and expectations were that only negative happenings would occur regardless of efforts to improve. Most were reported as being surprised when anything good did occur. Poor parental and sibling role models abounded. Most parents lacked secondary school education and siblings were either older and school dropouts or younger and having difficulties at school. Parents tended to have the attitude that if school was not going to be attended, then a job needed to be secured. Students felt stressed whether they went to school or stayed home.

Multiple stressors were offered to rationalize the unexpectedly bad outcomes faced when members of this group quit school. They attributed their lack of success to problematic teachers, overly stringent and unfair school rules, family separations, early parenthood, bad families, epilepsy, and self-injurious behaviours. All of these participants refused to accept any responsibility for their present circumstances. While the participants acknowledged problematic pasts and wished for brighter futures, they largely ignored present stressors. Coping with stressors was facilitated by the act of returning to school. None from this group could describe any strategies beyond "taking control of the situation" and "doing something".

Table 4

Ethnographic information sources

Source	<u>Discontinued</u>				Total
	never	previously	first-time	multiple	
Interviews	6	5	4	5 ^a	20
Archival records	8 ^b	8	3 ^c	5 ^d	24
Key informants	7	8	5 ^e	8 ^f	28
Total participants (n)	8	8	6	10	32

Note. Survey data was gained from all participants. Therefore, "n" is the number of surveys completed. Inclusion of survey findings means that at least two sources of information were available concerning each participant.

^aInterview data was the sole source of information available on one student.

^bArchival records were the sole source of information available on one student.

^cArchival records were the sole source of information available on one student.

^dArchival records were the sole source of information available on one student.

^eKey informants were the sole source of information available on one student.

^fKey informants were the sole source of information available on three students.

All students seemed to be egocentric, caring and thinking only about themselves. None were able to describe how their situation might appear to a third party or how their behaviour might affect a third party. They had thought deeply about the stressors in their lives and felt that positive steps were being undertaken through their return to school. Mature facades were apparent as most felt especially wise and knowledgeable about discontinuation. All felt that discontinuation was a mistake rectified only through their own actions. None could describe how or why the quality of their life would be better for having returned to school, however. Returning to school seemed like an act of faith with payback expected to occur at some later time in some undefined way. Most described being out of school as incredibly boring. The increased level of socialization available at school was a motivating factor for exiting the dropout world.

Being marginally successful at school was common to this group. All but one participant was heavily involved with counsellors, resource teachers, administrators, addiction counsellors, educational assistants, and public health nurses at RDPC. Five of the eight had repeated grades more than once and all had grades ranging from 40-60%. All felt capable of doing better and had adopted a simplistic view of future improvement as being a function of working harder. All were violators of school rules with multiple suspensions from school for a wide range of misbehaviours including fighting, swearing, smoking, insubordination, substance intoxication, theft, uttering threats, non-attendance, and using explosives.

Antagonism towards rules, institutions, and authority figures was common. All members of this group avoided stressors by running from the problem(s) and thereby ran afoul of school attendance policies and family expectations. Resentment towards school staff and family members who challenged such misbehaviours seemed a logical outcome.

The members of this group characterized their drug use as heavy but recreational. Most were very open about this subject and demonstrated the same wise facade as they had concerning the nature of discontinuation from school. All felt that drug use was a

further waste of their time but indulged themselves to be sociable with peers. None described drug use as inhibiting them.

This group was the most interesting to study. They had all faced major stressors in their lives and were recovering. They were thoughtful individuals who were making personal choices on their own initiative. Perhaps they were a bit naive in their solutions, but they were trying. They were the most open group in terms of volunteering information and speculating upon their behavioural motivations. While they could be described neither as pleasure-seekers nor hard workers, they had learned that there is more to life than watching soap operas.

First-time discontinued. This group of students were living exclusively in the present. These participants perseverated on a single focus which tended to be the reason for their recent discontinuation from school. These students elaborated upon stressors that they were unable to cope with, including a need for socialization, racism, diabetes, jobs, being railroaded by administration, and the right to quit school at age 16. None of this group were able to see any pattern of behaviour which had led to their present situation. All were uncaring of future consequences resulting from an incomplete education. Anger about recent occurrences tended to be predominant.

Probing for information revealed that members of this group faced other unresolved stressors from previous years. These stressors included physical violence from family members, alleged beatings by teachers, alcoholism, bad attitudes, laziness, and being a slow learner. None of these stressors was initially mentioned as a current concern. Being unable to cope with these stressors was seen as unrelated to their present predicament. All felt that time would heal any wounds and that present stressors superceded any past problems in terms of coping. All felt that they had coped with the previous stressors adequately yet were unable to describe closure and still felt a need to provide specific details about the incident(s).

Feeling invulnerable and invincible, these students were all testing the limits of

family and school tolerance for misbehaviour. They felt alone in their struggle declaring that no-one could or would help them. Some felt betrayed in that those who hassled them at school were those who claimed they wanted to help. None were able to understand that sometimes help hurts. Parents were described as having supported or encouraged them in leaving school. None were identified, through transition planning, to RDPC as needing special supports when entering secondary school and none requested any intervention by specialists. One student received services after multiple involvements with administrators for misbehaviours. All were ultimately discontinued from school when they failed to attend any classes. Numerous suspensions for misbehaviour had occurred prior to discontinuation in most cases.

Viewing school as a job training site was common among this group who tended to lack any concept of school as a place facilitating personal improvement and growth. Medial and long-term goal setting was non-existent as was any life-planning. Students shared a vocational focus on life and tended to see the entry level job market as appealing. Little need was felt for further education as employment was available with existing levels of skills. The main benefit of school was that socialization was facilitated easily.

Archival searches found all to be poor students with a history of failed grades and social promotions. None had been recipients of interventions from specialists on more than a short term basis as all were considered to be capable students who were deliberately underperforming.

Pervasive among this group was that living for the here and now was what mattered. Living for the moment was imperative and doing it with a sense of style was critical. All viewed themselves as rebels fighting forces of oppression. How things appeared took precedence over how things were. "Shallow" described their personalities but a sense of unplumbed depth remained. It was difficult getting information from and about these individuals as people tended to react emotionally and most often negatively

to them. They frustrated others more than they frustrated themselves. While they lacked the presence of multiple stressors, they were not as carefree or careless as they would like others to think. They were defensive about their personal lives and aggressive about their public lives. Self-efficacy involved making themselves as happy as possible as quickly as possible.

Multiple discontinuances. Lacking the ability to control or interact within the general milieu were those students who saw themselves as hopeless and helpless victims and chose withdrawal as a primary means of coping with stressors. Practicing a form of environmental determinism was common to this group of participants. All saw the environment as unsuitable for them and felt pre-destined to fail. Their lack of success was attributed to a hostile and unhelpful environment. Participants either lacked the ability to recognize that multiple environments exist or refused to acknowledge their existence.

These students, who all felt estranged from both their peer groups and family constellations, commonly described inability to interact with other people. They described their families as being in such conflict that it was probably beneficial that members failed to communicate. Antagonisms and hostilities were at such levels that most of these participants wanted no further involvement with their family members. The students in this group reported poor role models and a lack of support from siblings and parents. Relationships with their peer groups seemed non-existent, as all described themselves as loners who needed no-one and were best left alone. However, loneliness was not spoken of as stressor. Conversely, some spoke of the need to avoid communication with others as it would lead only to further conflict. All those interviewed reported that everyone they came in contact with complained to them about their behaviour.

The lack of interpersonal skills was apparent at school as well. Each student had experienced major conflicts with teachers over the years. Multiple suspensions for

misbehaviours involving violence, psychotic acts, substance abuse, swearing, insubordination, and obstreperousness were common to these students. Some participants and key informants reported being embarrassed by the misbehaviours. These students all avoided taking responsibility for their misbehaviours. The participants had convinced themselves that they were merely victims of circumstance and were unlucky.

Fate played a big part in their rationales for lack of success and misbehaviour. Most individuals described living in a society where serendipity rules. They perceived a big, bad world of hurt out there that would strike them down should they venture forth. As a result, most seemed to be living in the past analyzing what went wrong years ago and avoiding the present and the future. A common theme was that each time they tried to take control something happened that prohibited their success and made their situation even worse. Such irrational beliefs made it difficult to want to take action to improve so most students tried to be as inactive and unobtrusive as possible. None saw themselves as lacking adequate skills or setting unrealistic expectations for their ventures into the world. Most seemed to possess unrealistic perceptions of themselves.

Each student had discontinued from school at least three times. All but two participants were poor students unable to achieve since primary grades with multiple specialist interventions proving ineffective. Addictions problems were noted as contributing to discontinuation from school for six of the ten students in this group. Dysfunction in society was prominent as well. Most students had multiple conflicts with police concerning criminal behaviour. Four students who were on probation/open custody described being actively involved in crime. For some, attendance at school was merely a condition set by the justice system when disposing of their crime(s) that was neither taken seriously nor a welcome intrusion into their lives.

Fear of failure, early parenthood, low self-esteem, poor self-concept, guilt over inadequacies and crimes, parental illness, poverty, running from home, psychiatric dysfunction, fear of cold weather, and fear of success were other stressors revealed as

common to members of this group. These participants had so many stressors that impacted on, and were compounded with, one another that they felt unable to even start addressing their problems. Most of these people saw avoiding stressors and minimizing conflicts through disengagement as the most viable coping mechanism available to them. This process seemed to have contributed to their problematic situations as they learned to be helpless, feel hopeless, and act ineffectively while their problems mounted.

Additional Post hoc Analysis

Rationale. Data obtained through ethnographic procedures had suggested that reclassification of the participants into four groups would be useful. The four groups that emerged from the original two groups were classified in terms of their experience(s) with discontinuation from RDPC. The groups included students who had (a) never discontinued school, (b) previously discontinued school but had re-enrolled, (c) had recently discontinued from school for the first-time, and had experience multiple discontinuations from school over the years. Refer to Appendix H to view item-by-item responses to survey items.

Kruskal-Wallis. Participants were grouped into four categories and survey results were re-analyzed using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test. This test was chosen due to the unequal number of participants in each of the four categories. Appendix I provides specific statistics from the Kruskal-Wallis four group analysis. Table 5 provides raw data used in this analysis.

The Statview computer program used to perform the analysis generated Significance Probability (p -value) data which permits investigators to pick whatever level of significance ($\alpha = \text{alpha}$) seems most appropriate given the requirements of the study. To assist in data analysis, Khazanie (1990) noted that the p -value associated with the test of a hypothesis is the smallest α for which the observed data would call for rejection of the null hypothesis in favour of the alternative hypothesis. If α is the stipulated level of significance of the test, then (a) reject the null hypothesis if the p -value is less than or

equal to α , and (b) do not reject the null hypothesis if the p -value is greater than α . The null hypothesis for this test was that there is no difference in the type of stressor(s) faced by students who remained in school and students who left school early.

Statistically significant findings of four group post hoc analysis. Significant differences between the groups of students were found. Refer to Appendix J to view a ranking by p -value of each stressor and a ranking of the means of each of the four groups. Using $\alpha \leq .05$ as the preferred level of significance, five stressors are identifiable.

Previously discontinued students were most likely to have reported that they were experiencing a shortage of money right now ($p = .013$). Students who had never discontinued school were least likely to have reported that they were experiencing a shortage of money right now. First-time discontinued students and students who experienced multiple discontinuations were equally likely to have reported experiencing a shortage of money right now.

Students with multiple discontinuation experience were most likely to have reported that they have had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers ($p = .019$). Students who had never discontinued school were least likely to have reported having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers. Previously discontinued students and first-time discontinued students were somewhat likely to have reported involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.

Previously discontinued students were most likely to have reported that they considered themselves to be poor financially ($p = .026$). Students who had never discontinued school were least likely to have reported that they considered themselves to be poor financially. Students who had experienced multiple discontinuations from school edged out students who were discontinued from school for the first time in the middle category when they reported that they considered themselves to be poor financially.

Table 5

Post hoc KW four group analysis: Significant results.

Item	n ^a	Level of Agreement					p-Value
		Strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	Strongly agree	
I am experiencing a shortage of money right now.							.013
Never (8)	3	4	0	1	0		
Previously (8)	0	0	0	3	5		
First-time (6)	1	3	0	0	2		
Multiple (10)	3	1	1	3	2		
I have had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.							.019
Never (8)	5	2	0	1	0		
Previously (8)	1	1	0	4	0		
First-time (6)	0	2	1	2	1		
Multiple (10)	0	1	2	4	2		
I consider myself to be poor financially.							.026
Never (8)	5	2	1	0	0		
Previously (8)	0	3	0	3	2		
First-time (6)	3	2	0	0	1		
Multiple (10)	2	2	1	4	1		
I have plenty of money right now.							.049
Never (8)	0	3	0	4	1		
Previously (8)	4	4	0	0	0		
First-time (6)	3	1	1	1	0		
Multiple (10)	4	3	1	1	1		
I am absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year.							.050
Never (8)	4	2	0	1	1		
Previously (8)	0	1	0	4	3		
First-time (6)	0	1	0	2	3		
Multiple (10)	0	2	0	5	3		

Notes.

^a The number of possible respondents in each group is "n".

Participants who had never been discontinued were most likely to have reported having plenty of money right now ($p = .049$). Previously discontinued students were least likely to have . Students who had experienced multiple discontinuations from school edged out students who were discontinued from school for the first time in the middle category when they reported having plenty of money right now.

Previously discontinued and first-time discontinued students weremost likely to have reported that they were absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year. Least likely to have reported that they were absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year were students who had never discontinued school. Those who experienced multiple discontinuations from school held the middle category exclusive to themselves when they reported that they were absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year .

In summary, students who were never discontinued from school were least likely to have reported (a) experiencing a shortage of money right now, (b) having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers, (c) considering themselves poor financially, and (d) being absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year. They were most likely to have reported having plenty of money right now.

Previously discontinued students were most likely to have reported (a) experiencing a shortage of money right now, (b) considering themselves to be poor financially, and (c) being absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year. Being absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year was a tie with first-time discontinued students.

Students who had discontinued from school for the first time were notable only when they tied with previously discontinued students in being most likely to report being absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year. They fell into the middle category between being the most likely and least likely to report issues as major stressors

in all other significant items.

Students who had experienced multiple discontinuations from school were notable only in that they were most likely to have reported having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers. They fell into the middle category between being the most likely and least likely to report issues as major stressors in all other significant items.

Educationally significant findings. Results between $.05 \geq p \leq .10$ may also have educational significance. Such results may be informative as to the general characteristics of the sample groups. Two stressors were identified as educationally significant within this range for p .

Participants who had experienced multiple discontinuations were most likely to report that they were neither comfortable with nor a part of their peer-group, family, or other associations ($p = .084$). Previously discontinued students slightly edged out students who had never been discontinued when they reported that they were least likely to be neither comfortable with nor a part of their peer-group, family, or other associations.

Previously discontinued and first-time discontinued students tied in being most likely to have reported that teachers are more concerned with controlling students than with teaching them ($p = .100$). Students who had never been discontinued from school were least likely to have reported that teachers are more concerned with controlling students than with teaching them.

Discussion

Mann Whitney U results

Insignificant findings. Analysis found no difference between the two groups of students which means that stressors affecting these participants were similar overall. It appears to be true that it makes no difference which stressors an individual faces but it

may matter how an individual copes with those stressors. This finding seems to be consistent with those studies that identify a lack of high quality support systems for students both at home and at school contributing to early school leaving (Batche, 1984; Catteral 1986b; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Frontier School Division, 1989; Gastright, 1987; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987; Neufeld, 1992; Lee, 1983).

It is important to note that post hoc analysis of individual survey items uncovered some statistically significant stressors. These stressors, in combination with ethnographic data, did help to clarify the situation at RDPC as pertains to early leaving of school.

Statistically significant stressors: post hoc MWU analysis

Contact with law enforcement officers. Having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers was found to be one of the best items for differentiating discontinued from continuing students at RDPC. The discriminating power of this item was reinforced by the opposing responses of the two groups of students. Discontinued students reported having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers while continuing students reported never having had contact with law enforcement officers.

Data from the records searches and key informant information supported the finding that discontinued students typically had multiple contacts with law enforcement officers concerning criminal behaviours related to themselves or their families.

Catteral (1986a), Flores (1986), Horton (1991), and Parkin (1986) all noted that contact with the justice system was characteristic of dropouts. Any form of contact with personnel from the justice or corrections systems was consistent with an individual being at risk, whether the contact was with police officers, court officials, corrections staff, or any combination of such individuals.

Liaison between education, justice, and corrections personnel seems necessary. Full disclosure of convicted and/or accused students' situations seems warranted given the high level of predictive ability this stressor may have. Programs focusing on

socialization skills may need to be implemented as students engaging in criminal activities may be unlikely to respond to, or immediately need, curriculums focused on the study of academics.

Uncomfortable with peers and families. Discontinued students reported feeling neither comfortable with nor a part of their peer-group, family, or any other association. Perhaps the experience of discontinuation from school contributes to a sense of isolation from others while continuing in school may lead to a sense of belonging in a peer group. Interview data from participants who experienced multiple discontinuations reinforced the sense that alienation from family and peers grows as students experience longer or frequent discontinuations from school. Similar findings were reported in other studies by Batche (1984), Catteral (1986a, 1986b), Davis (1990), Davis and Doss (1982), Flores (1986), King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989), Naylor (1987), and Neufeld (1992).

This stressor may have powerful discriminating abilities. However, it may be difficult to use as a predictor given that adolescents typically seem to describe both their family life and many peer relationships as troubled. Perhaps this stressor is best used as complementary to other stressors until the evaluator knows the situation very well and is able to objectively substantiate the claims made by a student.

Teachers unable to meet needs of students. Discontinued students reported that their teachers were unable to meet their needs. Issues the participants noted in interviews as most problematic included personality clashes, irrelevant curriculums, and the unavailability of individual tutoring. Records searches and key informants noted severe misbehaviours on the part of the students as being more likely reasons for problems. Several other studies found similar concerns (Batche, 1984; Catteral, 1986b; Coladarci, 1983; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Frontier School Division, 1989; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987; Stay in School Supplement, 1991).

Care should be taken before accepting this as a stressor when evaluating a

situation. It seems necessary that other participants in the situation should be required to provide their perspectives. Teachers, parents, and administrators may need to share insights with the evaluator to ensure that a fair perception of the circumstances is formed. In particular, it seems imperative that staff capable of providing assistance by way of special programming, tutoring, and counselling be involved whenever this stressor is claimed.

Students' behaviours the same as other students'. Continuing students reported their belief that their behaviour was the same as that of other people. Conversely, Catteral (1986a) and Coladarci (1983) reported that dropouts believed that their behaviour was the same as that of other people. The need to feel included in a larger group of peers may have been driving these responses.

Ethnographic data suggests that students who participated in this study became increasingly isolated the more times they discontinued from school. Discontinued students demonstrated behaviours that were similar among that group, but the students were too isolated from one another to recognize and acknowledge the similarities. Thus, they were unable to form a peer identity and felt that their individual situation was unique.

Continuing students in this study shared a peer identity. The longer they stayed in school, the stronger, and more positive, this identity became. Because of this difference in perception between continuing and discontinuing students, it seems critical that when intervening in a potential dropout situation, that personnel identify patterns of school leaving behaviour to the student, and develop, teach, and support alternative behaviours.

Ethnic background problematic. Discontinued students reported in the survey that their ethnic background made things difficult for them. In interviews with participants, this stressor was discussed in terms of an urban-rural dichotomy. Students who transferred from First Nations reserve schools felt they had to compete on an unequal and disadvantaged basis with students who had attended Thompson schools since

kindergarten. Coladarci (1983), Davis (1990), Frontier School Division (1989), Horton (1991), and Lee (1983) noted that ethnic background was problematic for First Nations students.

Participants who discussed this item talked about it almost as a foregone conclusion that First Nations' students were going to have problems staying in school. Students seemed to be describing stereotypical behaviour when they discussed this stressor. This stressor was mentioned frequently by non-First Nations' participants. It is unclear if First Nations students perceived this as a stressor or if non-First Nations participants made it a stressor on behalf of the First Nations' students.

Ethnographic Results

Lacking clear, statistically-driven generalizations that would permit easy identification of potential dropouts, it seems necessary that profiles of students who might be at risk of dropping out be created. This study offers four profiles of RDPC students and suggests that three of these profiled groups may experience discontinuation from school.

Four profiles of RDPC students. "Never discontinued" students presented as winners, setting and meeting high standards with high levels of family encouragement and support. Stressors were viewed as challenges to be met while implementing ambitious life plans that focused on the future reward. Willingness to receive help, sacrificing socialization opportunities, and working hard at present goals were other coping mechanisms utilized by this group.

"Previously discontinued" participants had recently developed a sense of time passing them by. The act of returning to school was their primary method of coping with stressors. They were forming better self-concepts and self-images in an effort to become winners. Hoping future stressors away, trying to ignore present stressors, and obviating past stressors were common coping techniques. This participants had performed intensive and extensive self-analysis and were actively making choices and taking action

on their own behalf.

"First-time discontinued" students acknowledged no past and no future choosing to live exclusively in the present. These individuals lacked positive coping mechanisms having unsuccessfully dealt with previous stressors. Expecting that passing time would resolve their stressors, students indulged themselves in emotions and misbehaviours. Denial, avoidance, projection, and transference were the prevalent means of coping with immediate stressors.

"Multiple discontinuances" characterized the participants who chose withdrawal and isolation as coping mechanisms. These students voluntarily chose to hide from what they perceived to be hostile milieus and environments. Coping involved non-engagement because engagement led only to further and worse failure. Prevalent behaviours included those associated with learnt helplessness, paranoia, addictive personalities, and criminal excitement and intents. Mental illness may become a feature common to this group in the near future if it was not present already. Stressors were so numerous and of such magnitude that trying to cope was overwhelming.

Statistically significant stressors: post hoc KW analysis

Shortage of money and being poor financially. Previously discontinued students noted, in the survey, that they were experiencing a shortage of money and considered themselves to be poor financially. During their interviews, none reported shortages of money or claimed poverty.

These students reported in interviews that they had returned to school to assist in finding employment. This desire for upgrading or developing employable skills is consistent with results gained in several other studies (Catteral, 1985; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski and Peart, 1989; Lee, 1983; Mann, 1986).

It remains unclear exactly what conditions constitute a shortage of money and poor financial status. Information regarding these concerns identified in the survey was

not made known in the interviews. It seems odd that the group that reported the highest level of concern in the survey, the previously discontinued students, were all able to attend school and were attending school, for the most part, to enable greater earning power upon graduation. Perhaps this stressor is either (a) an excuse used to rationalize early leaving of school, (b) more of a real concern the first time an individual drops out of school, or (c) a real concern for those who have experienced multiple discontinuations and have finally exhausted all funds that facilitate their attendance at school.

Involuntary contact with law enforcement officers. Participants who had experienced multiple discontinuances from school reported having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers. Also, previously discontinued students and first-time discontinued students reported having had significantly more contact with law enforcement than did students who had never been discontinued from school.

Catteral (1986a), Flores (1986), Horton (1991), and Parkin (1986) all noted that contact with the justice system was characteristic of dropouts. Any form of contact put an individual at risk, whether the contact was with police officers, court officials, corrections staff, or any combination of such individuals.

Given a perception of a high rate of criminal activity among youth in Thompson and of increasing levels of support for emotionally and/or behaviourally disturbed youth, it seems warranted that further research be devoted to determining suitable curriculums and service delivery systems for students who fight the law.

Having plenty of money. Students who had never been discontinued from school reported having plenty of money. This item seems consistent when contrasted with findings in other studies which suggest that many drop outs leave school due to financial difficulties and the need to find employment (Catteral, 1985; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Hahn, 1987; King, Warren, Michalski and Peart, 1989; Lee, 1983; Mann, 1986).

It remains unclear exactly what constitutes having plenty of money. Almost

exclusively, students reported in interviews that they attended school in order to gain a higher level of income in the future. Everyone who could find a job, had a job. Many students from high income families sacrificed their social and athletic interests in order to work at entry level jobs. More study is needed in this area to determine precisely what the students' goals for having employment are, what they need money for, and how much money is needed.

Absence from school. Absence from school of more than 10 days or 10 classes each year was typical of discontinued students. Previously discontinued and first-time discontinued students tied in their responses to this stressor. Students who experienced multiple discontinuations scored responses that trailed closely behind the other discontinued students' scores. Except for those students who were never discontinued, most discontinued participants' records, personal interviews, and interviews with key informants confirmed that regular attendance at school was problematic. Non-attendance was the reason officially cited most often for discontinuation from school. This finding was consistent with results of several other studies (Catteral, 1985a, 1986b; Davis, 1990; Davis and Doss, 1982; Flores, 1986; Gastright, 1987; Horton, 1991; King, Warren, Michalski and Peart, 1989; Naylor, 1987).

Large amounts of resources were expended at RDPC in continuing efforts to ensure attendance in classes. There has been no means devised to date to measure the effectiveness of the expenditures. It seems obvious from the survey results that the only group to attend classes consistently was the group who had never discontinued school. Perhaps aspects of the school day, curriculums taught, and pedagogy are organized and employed in a manner that is not optimal for other types of students. Perhaps energy should be expended in providing alternative venues for students rather than replicating or fine tuning existing procedures.

Educationally significant stressors: post hoc KW analysis

Uncomfortable with peers and family. Students who had experienced multiple discontinuations from school reported as being neither comfortable with nor a part of their peer-group, family, or other association. Participants discontinued for the first time reported the same perception but to a lesser degree. Interview data from participants who experienced multiple discontinuations identified a sense of the increasing isolation from family, peers, and school personnel. Similar findings were reported in other studies by Batche (1984), Catteral (1986a, 1986b), Davis (1990), Davis and Doss (1982), Flores (1986), King, Warren, Michalski, and Peart (1989), Naylor (1987), and Neufeld (1992).

It may prove beneficial to provide inservice training to school staff focusing on learning how adolescents socialize and how to foster, nurture, and mentor such activity. Given that adolescents and youth generally report problematic interpersonal relationships, it may be worthwhile to encourage peer support groups within the school.

Teachers controlling rather than teaching. Teachers being more concerned with controlling students than with teaching them was of equal concern to the previously discontinued and first-time discontinued groups. This stressor was of major concern to participants when interviewed. This topic was most common among those students who were closest chronologically with the discontinuation event. Davis (1990) found this to be a major stressor for students also.

Most participants seemed unhappy with the material that was being taught to them. Most were aware of provincial curriculum guidelines but wanted specific training that had future economic rewards inherently obvious. Perhaps more time need be devoted to explain the ultimate goals and worth of curriculum materials being studied in classes. Students were unable to understand the difference between education and training.

Contributions to knowledge and further research

Extension of existing information. The 1991 Stay In School study was the only previous study to attempt to use qualitative research methods at RDPC. This study extended that data by providing (a) new descriptive statistics, (b) an analysis that discriminated four groups of students experiencing school leaving stressors, (c) insight into the needs, wants, and desires of students who registered at RDPC, and (d) an indication of which stressors that cause early school leaving are active at RDPC. Also, this study provided a comprehensive review of those stressors that possibly contribute to the dropout phenomenon.

Further research. Extremes in perceptions were identified through this study. Some stressors were problematic for various groups depending on how the groups are constituted. Students had similar and dissimilar coping mechanisms and provided useful suggestions for remediation.

Further research could focus on the stressors identified as statistically significant. Why is contact with law enforcement officers such a stressor? How do money issues specifically affect RDPC students? How should programs be structured so that teachers are perceived as meeting students' needs and being less controlling of the students? What role can the school system play in making students feel more comfortable with their peers and their own behaviours? Does absenteeism play a significant role in student achievement at RDPC? How does ethnic background affect achievement at RDPC? These are all possible research questions that could be addressed in future studies.

It is hoped that future researchers may continue to be motivated to further study why students stay in school. Approximately 75% of the participants in this study had experienced discontinuation from school. What do these students want from school? What compels them to return after experiencing, in some cases, multiple failures? Studying dropouts in isolation of those who stay in school seems fundamentally unsound.

Other uses of the data. Data collected for this study could be useful for other

purposes. For instance, descriptive statistics indicated that while 10.6% of all dropouts (n = 552) seemed to meet criteria for such classification, 26.6% transferred schools, 7.6% had graduated previously, 2.9% were jailed, <2% were either in treatment centres or dead, and 51.6% could be reached by neither telephone nor mail. Such data might suggest a transiency rate of up to 78.2% among those students who discontinued school. If such a rate were to exist, should school policies change to meet the needs of transients rather than dropouts?

Another use of the data was to discover that >50% of all students who dropout of RDPC do so within the first month of the semesters. Refer to Table 6 for specific details. A dropout prevention program would have to identify, contact, and provide services within 20 days of the start of classes in each semester to affect any change. At RDPC, dropout reclamation might be a better strategy to undertake, given the suspected high transiency rate and fast moving nature of the dropout population.

Participants suggestions for improvements

Basing their suggestions on their own personal experiences at RDPC, input helpful to the general school population was solicited from participants during their interviews. The impromptu responses gained determined if the participants had identified generalizable solutions or were limited to focusing on personal situations. All students had engaged in wishful thinking in relation to the school and family and were able to state what changes were needed and why such changes would make a difference. Responses varied between and among the groups of students. Discontinued students were as likely to make useful suggestions concerning how to stay in school as were those participants who were in school. These suggestions were combined for brevity.

R.D. Parker Collegiate. Students were dissatisfied with the status quo and desired changes in program delivery, teaching methodology, teacher behaviour, administrative procedures, and student funding. Most participants advocated fine tuning of existing practices usually requiring extension of services.

A lack of optional methods of program delivery was noted by participants. Weekend school, night classes, off campus programs, and behavioural classes were cited as programs that might have made attending RDPC a better experience. Such innovations were viewed as a radical but needed departure from the traditional delivery model in place at the school where students attended classes weekdays from 9:00 am to 12:00 noon and 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm. Scheduling was an issue for some who desired greater flexibility. Earlier, later, and noon hour classes to be created making it possible for students to attend from 7:30 am to 1:00 pm and/or 12:00 noon to 5:30 pm were suggested. It was hoped that such scheduling would make it possible to attend mornings and/or afternoons exclusively or create a desirable combination of classes centring around the noon hour. Some had attended an off campus class established through the local Stay In School committee and felt that more off campus classes focusing on particular needs of small groups of students would be helpful.

Teaching study skills, providing more tutoring by instructional staff, hiring more First Nations teachers, cancelling classes rather than substituting teachers, and adopting a curriculum inquiry instructional paradigm were identified as desired changes in teaching methodology. Most students claimed to have poor study skills and tended to rely on rote drill as a preferred study method. These students felt they had to study too hard to get results, whether they proved favourable or unfavourable. Students wanted more individual time with their teachers. Working individually with staff was seen as a passport to success as it was thought that teachers could help given enough time to facilitate change. Employing more First Nations teachers was considered a necessity by all students either to serve as positive role models or to be able to relate better with First Nations students. Substitute teachers were perceived as ineffectual and a waste of valuable time. Participants felt that time would be better spent studying than working with someone who was unfamiliar with the students and subject(s). Two participants were very familiar with teaching methods having parents who were teachers and stated

that curriculum inquiry was a method superior to traditional teaching of curriculum. Their point of view was supported by most other participants who felt that students should be participants in their learning by having the right to choose at least some of the material to be studied.

Most students wanted teachers to be more assertive in terms of what they taught in class yet be less controlling in terms of student behaviours. Teachers were portrayed as engaging in practices designed to busily channel students into activities to keep them active at whatever task(s) the teacher thought society demanded of them: this was seen as an effort to control. Students wanted teachers to teach whatever the students needed rather than what they felt compelled to teach by the curriculum: this was seen as assertiveness. Also, teachers were seen as unable to effectively manage problematic issues pertaining directly to individuals. Students described being referred to administration or specialists for assistance when they would have appreciated assistance from their teachers. Knowing more about the individual needs of students was considered necessary to empower teachers to take charge of situations. Dropouts wanted staff to provide verbal encouragement for efforts regardless of results, rather than continue to focus on, pursue, and foster a competition for marks.

Table 6

RDPC monthly dropout pattern

Paired months	Discontinued ^a	Combined statistics		Monthly Rate ^b
		Frequency	Relative frequency	
September	222	298	.54	40
February	76			14
October	44	374	.68	8
March	32			6
November	47	470	.86	9
April	49			9
December	24	529	.96	4
May	35			6
January	18	552	1.00	3
June	5			1

Notes. Months were paired to indicate months of the two semesters that correlate with one another.

^a"N" is 552 students.

^bMonthly rates are percentages of the total number of discontinued students.

Administrative procedures were questioned. Students wanted greater flexibility in scheduling thus enabling easier access to part-time student status. Abolition of the disciplinary aspects of the attendance policy was recommended. While the participants could see a need to track attendance, they felt that trying to enforce attendance through suspension from school was futile, absurd, and an attempt to control students. Some wanted the ability to challenge exams for credit without having completed the coursework. Participants felt that they had either repeated some classes so many times that they felt competent to challenge the exam or that they had a particular aptitude for a subject and could successfully pass an examination. Dropouts noted a need for a discontinuation package of information pertaining to procedures they would have to follow to gain welfare, access to job training, their rights concerning appeals to stay in school, how to access specialists from either the school or Community Services, and what people to contact who might prove useful in the future should they need help.

Students had interesting ideas about funding. Some felt that RDPC should act like a college or university and grant scholarships to exceptional individuals. Such individuals might be especially proficient at sports or academics or might be financially disadvantaged through misadventure or family dysfunction and thereby be worthy of financial support. Further, these individuals felt that long term monetary grants should be made available to the best students with financial incentives made available to all graduates. None elaborated upon how these funding arrangements might be achieved or managed.

Personal items. Sharing a desire for self-efficacy, these students needed to be perceived as winners by themselves and their family. Lacking a foundation for this perception was not a problem for those who experienced chronic failures. Self-deception was viewed as a necessary skill, if one were to attempt to function. A need to feel in control of their personal agendas, specific behaviours, and the general milieu was common. Empowering themselves as a preparation for an unpredictable future was

thematic among the participants. Liking themselves was seen as central to wish fulfillment. All participants hoped to like themselves better as an outcome of attending school. Sometimes winning was seen simply as being able to avoid participating in losing situations. Winning could also mean outperforming peers. Interestingly, minimizing and limiting drug use to extra-curricular activities was equated with successfully managing a need for self-medication. Students felt like winners if they avoided use of drugs for other than recreational purposes. Making existing rules work to ones personal benefit was advocated. It was felt that winners play by, win by, and then make the rules. Not running afoul of the rules was equally important. Those who had legal problems tended to advocate that students should avoid becoming offenders.

Having a sense of time was seen as critical to being a successful person. Undertaking life planning was considered essential if one were to achieve. Anticipating future rewards was common to those who felt time passing them by or thought they were using their time wisely by attending school. A feeling of desperation was identified in those who had yet to perform any life planning. Those participants lacked both a sense of time and measurable objectives. Participants agreed that setting and meeting sequential standards in meeting goals was necessary if growth were to be measured. Development of a measuring system to identify personal growth over time was seen as essential. Interestingly, the more successful participants focused on measurements of extrinsic items such as wealth and social position while the less successful participants described measurements of intrinsic items such as happiness and good health as most useful. While verbalization of an all or nothing approach to future satisfaction was common, setting small goals that could be achieved given sufficient time was perceived as a valuable strategy in lifeplanning.

Lacking verbal encouragement from family members was tantamount to failure. Participants could understand and even welcome emotional outbursts from family members when experiencing problems but described a need for support framed on verbal

interplay. Talking with persons other than family members was largely discounted. Families who thought over alternatives and consequences generally met with eventual success and reported increased abilities to cope with stressors. Happy and successful individuals reported that life was better when they were involved in multiple endeavours. The more complex their lives the better they spoke and tended to cope. Those who perseverated verbally on single issues regardless of their magnitude tended to be less successful at coping. Learning how and when to disengage and withdraw from unending, pointless verbal conflict was a recommendation. Constant bickering was viewed as unhelpful and unhealthy. Participants generally wanted to remain engaged with the stressor but wanted to stop verbalizing negatively about it. Reiterating an all or nothing type of thinking, participants described a system which permits no comebacks. Individuals have one opportunity to engage with stressors through thinking, talking, taking action, and hoping for the best. Success at life was seen as a linear process rather than a cyclic phenomenon which implied failure. Talking was seen as essential to success.

Being in control emotionally was important. The ability to be stable emotionally was considered necessary to coping with stressors. While not equated with success, being emotionally stable was seen as fundamental to those who could be successful. Most participants seemed to feel that emotions and school were incompatible or at least not useful in combination. Having people like them was of lesser importance to participants than having relationships that were affective and effective. The prevailing attitude was to "look out for number one". While all reported victimization of one form or another, the common advice was to not be a victim. Acceptance of responsibility was another item discussed by all participants. Someone was always responsible for stressors. Some participants chose to externalize that responsibility to others while internalizing responsibility occurred with other participants. Placing blame for unresolved stressors was typical. Those who chose to acknowledge their responsibility were seen as being

more successful in general. Participants described needs to integrate rather than segregate interpersonally. The sense of being alone was equated with being lonely and was felt to be a major stressor.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Answers to specific research questions

1. Discontinuing school was a common phenomena among the students who participated in this study. Three of every four students had experiences with early school leaving.

The data for this study suggests that at least 10.6% of the total RDPC population discontinued school. At least 26.6% of all students who discontinued studies at RDPC moved away from Thompson. A further 51.6% of the discontinued students were "unreachable" by telephone and/or mail and it is possible that many of those students moved away from Thompson also. It is impossible to define the dropout rate lacking knowledge of the "missing" students' whereabouts and status concerning attendance at school. Further investigation would be required on the status of the "unreachable" students to determine the actual dropout rate.

RDPC must be considered to be an "at risk" school. If one were to believe that if one student drops out another is at risk of dropping out, then at least 21.2% of all students were "at risk" in 1993-1994. Further, if transiency is a major risk factor for dropping out, then between 26.6% and 78.2% of all "missing" students may have dropped out in 1993-1994.

2. Attending school was considered primarily an economic activity. Students considered education as a means to attaining a more financially profitable future. School was viewed as a training ground wherin specific marketable skills should be taught. Students varied only in their sense of immediacy. More successful students were prepared to spend many more years in post-secondary institutions before they entered the workforce while less successful students were prepared to spend only a matter of weeks

or months training for their future employment.

In addition to pre-employment training, some students considered school to be a remedy for their personal problems. Some felt that just the act of returning to school made them a better person and thereby solved some personal crises. Some attended school because it was a conventional activity and they lacked alternatives.

3. Existing systems at RDPC do not work for many students who are at risk of early leaving of school. By the end of the first month of Semester 1 (September) and Semester 2 (February), 54% of all students who would discontinue school in 1993-1994 had done so. By mid-term up to 85% of all potential discontinuances had occurred. Leaving RDPC is not a slow and gradual process. Dropouts do not linger and permit staff time to adapt to their needs. Adaptation needs to occur in advance of the students' arrival.

Restructuring of program delivery systems needs to be considered. Non-traditional hours of operation and classroom sites, mid-semester starts to classes, revision of attendance and examination policies, and teaching content "demanded" by the students might prove useful in retaining potential dropouts.

4. There were some inconsistencies between data obtained in the survey and data obtained in interviews and records searches. Survey data identified money issues among discontinued groups of students as problematic while interview data suggested that employment issues were of concern. Perhaps students associated the need for employment with the need for money and assumed that financial hardship was understood whenever needing a job was discussed. Also, the survey data identified contact with law enforcement officers as problematic among discontinued groups of students while interview data suggested only that these groups tended to have school-based disciplinary problems.

There were consistencies between data obtained in the survey and data obtained in interviews and records searches, however. Discontinued groups of student identified

attendance, problems with teachers, and socialization with peers and family as problematic issues in both the quantitative and qualitative parts of this study.

One survey finding that seems anomalous is that continuing students believed that their behaviour was the same as that of other people. This issue was discussed by continuing students in interviews and the consensus was that these individuals recognized themselves as special. Perhaps these students want to be recognized as a distinct group rather than as individuals.

5. Criteria for identifying and/or profiling potential dropouts could be established by combining statistically significant stressors from both the two group and four group post hoc analyses with the anecdotal descriptors of the attributes of the four groups of students found to be operative at RDPC in 1993-1994. Such criteria would lack validity and reliability due to the limitations of the design and methodology of the study but might serve as a crude guide to identify those students at risk of early leaving of school.

6. Consistent with other studies noted in the literature review, multiple stressors were apparent. The presence of stressors was not directly related to either staying in school or leaving school. Ability to cope with stressors determined whether students stayed in school or discontinued school.

Statistically significant differences between discontinued and non-discontinued groups of students were discovered through use of the non-parametric Mann Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests in post hoc analyses. This information may be useful to school personnel interested in profiling potential dropouts.

The Mann Whitney U two group analysis found that (a) dropouts report having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers, (b) continuing students report having never had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers, (c) dropouts report feeling neither comfortable with nor a part of their peer-group, family, or other associations, (d) dropouts report that their teachers are unable to meet their needs, (e) continuing students report believing that their behaviour is the same as that of other

people, and (f) dropouts report feeling that their ethnic background makes things difficult for them.

The Kruskal-Wallis four group analysis found that (a) previously discontinued students reported experiencing a shortage of money, (b) students involved in multiple discontinuations reported having had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers, (c) previously discontinued students reported considering themselves to be poor financially, (d) students who had never been discontinued reported having plenty of money, and (e) previously discontinued students and students who had discontinued for the first-time both reported being absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year.

8. Categorization of data is critical when dealing with dropouts. Changing from a two group to four group analysis added stressors (three different money issues and absenteeism) and removed stressors (ethnocentric personal behaviour and problematic ethnic background). Several stressors were found to be common to both post hoc analyses (having involuntary contact with law enforcement officers, being uncomfortable with their peer group, and concerns about teachers). Further categorization might find more stressors to be significant.

Categorizing students into four groups facilitated generalizations regarding stressors faced and coping mechanisms employed to be made. These groups may be useful to school personnel interested in profiling potential dropouts. Information collected by interviewing participants and key informants, incorporating data gathered in surveys and archival searches suggests that four groups of students were operative within RDPC in 1993-1994. The groups consisted of students who had (a) never experienced discontinuation from school, (b) previously experienced discontinuation from school but had re-enrolled, (c) been discontinued from school recently and for the first time, (d) experienced multiple discontinuations from school.

9. Better tracking of students is needed. Given the lack of information

concerning the whereabouts of discontinued students, their reasons for discontinuing school, and their status concerning attendance at school, it was impossible to evaluate the existing situation to justify any future interventions to either prevent early leaving of school or reclaim dropouts.

10. It was impossible, given the information available at RDPC, to differentiate between transient students who discontinued school and transient students who transferred to other schools in 1993-1994. However, it seems possible that transiency is a major stressor at RDPC.

Recommendations for changes

1. Poll the community to determine if sufficient demand exists to offer weekend or night school.

2. Explore the potential of offering up to three more periods per day scheduled (a) prior to 9:00am, (b) at noon hour, and (c) after 4:00pm at RDPC.

3. Investigate the possibility of providing "Restart" programs in core area subjects to begin at mid-term in an effort to reclaim some of those students who drop out prior to mid-term.

4. Offer a study skills/tutorial program as an accredited program in an elective format staffed by regular classroom teachers.

5. Empower RDPC teachers to teach one unit of study democratically decided upon by students in each subject area.

6. Create and provide to students a package of information pertaining to discontinuation from RDPC. Include information on re-enrollment in school, job training programs, job application procedures, access to counsellors, legal aid, financial support, and home study programs.

7. Train all specialist staff in the significant stressors that differentiate RDPC students as discovered through this study, and in the attributes of the four types of RDPC students characterized by this study.

8. Retain the current focus of attempting to prevent individuals and groups from dropping out of school but develop and include a new focus of attempting to reclaim individuals and groups who have dropped out of RDPC.

9. Engage students in life-planning as well as career planning. This should be full-spectrum planning from how to set goals, including implementing plans, to measuring success, and revising plans.

10. Continue to offer and support parent training programs.

11. Continue to offer comprehensive and integrated site-based support programs staffed by specialists through Student Services and Special Services at RDPC.

12. Maintain and expand programs and services in cooperation with Manitoba Mental Health, the Addictions Foundation of Manitoba, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Probation Department, and Brighter Futures.

13. Investigate the Migrant Student Record Transfer System as discussed by Flores (1986) and Lecompte and Goebel (1987) to determine if any benefits exist to assist in coping with the transiency problem evident at RDPC.

14. Intervene during the first two weeks of school with a dropout prevention program.

15. Explore the possibility of offering financial planning and support for students with various funding agencies.

16. Conduct further research to discover specific reasons why legal problems, money issues, poor socialization, absenteeism, teaching practices, and ethnic issues are such stressors at RDPC. Specific interventions may then be planned and undertaken.

17. Redo this study. Limit the survey items to those found to be significantly significant at $\alpha = .10$. Use the same criteria to discriminate four groups of students as identified in this study. Perform the same analysis using the Kruskal-Wallis test of variance. Collect more possible discriminators including financial status (current income), criminal status, and family constellation.

18. Employ more instructional and support staff who are of First Nations heritage.

19. Initiate collection of "severance information" from discontinuing students. Require that forwarding addresses, telephone numbers, and names of contact persons be provided.

References

- (Anonymous, 1991). Stay in school supplement: Tackling Canada's high drop-out rate. Social Development Overview, 1, 7-14.
- Batche, C. (1984). Indicators of effective programming for school to work transition skills among dropouts. Springfield, Illinois: Illinois State Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 235)
- Catteral, J.S. (1986a). A process model for dropping out of school: Implications for research and policy in an era of raised academic standards. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 137)
- Catteral, J.S. (1986b). School dropouts, policy prospects, policy issues. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 423)
- Catteral, J.S. (1985). On the social costs of dropping out of school. Stanford, California: Stanford Educational Policy Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 837)
- Coladarci, T. (1983). Highschool dropouts among native Americans. Journal of American Indian Education, Oct, 15-22.
- Davis, E.D. (1990). A study of Hispanic dropouts. (no place/no publisher identified). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 265)
- Davis, W.E. & Doss, D.A. (1982). Dropout interviews (Report No. AISD-ORE-82.16). Washington, DC: Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 233)
- Flores, M. et al. (1986). Secondary committee report. (no place listed). National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 515)
- Friedman, A.S. , Glickman, N. , & Utada, A. (1985). Does drug and alcohol use lead to failure to graduate from high school? Journal of Drug Education, 15, 353-364
- Frontier School Division. (1989). [Internal paper on dropout phenomena in Manitoba]. (no place/no publisher/no author identified).
- Gastright, J.F. (1987). Profile of students at risk. Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati Public Schools Evaluation Branch. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 465)
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school: prospects for the future. McGraw Hill: Toronto
- Hahn, A. (1987). Reaching out to America's dropouts: What to do? Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 256-263.

- Horton, K. (1991). Thompson stay in school initiative committee: Dropout study. Thompson, Manitoba: Canada Employment and Immigration Commission.
- Karp, E. (1988). The dropout phenomenon in Ontario secondary schools. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 425)
- Khazanie, R. (1990). Elementary statistics in a world of applications (3rd ed.). London: Scott, Foresman and Company
- King, A.J.C. , Warren, W.K. , Michalski, C. , Peart, M.J. (1989). Improving student retention in Ontario secondary schools. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 553)
- Lecompte, M.D. , & Goebel, S.D. (1987). Can bad data produce good program planning? Education and Urban Society, 19, 250-269.
- Lee, L.E. (1983). A report of the planning and research branch. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 133)
- Mann, D. (1986). Can we help dropouts: Thinking about the undoable. Teachers College Record, 37, 307-323.
- Naylor, M. (1987). Reducing the dropout rate through career and vocational education. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 282 094)
- Neufeld, G. R. (1992, March). Stay in school initiatives: Local prevention/intervention and implications. Keeping in Touch: Canadian CEC newsletter, 2-5.
- Parkin, M. (1989, March). Action research on dropouts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.
- Waitley, D. (1979). The Psychology of Winning. New York: Berkley Publishing

Appendix A

Selective synopsis of stressors

Stressor	Researcher	General Conclusions
Abuse	Coladarci (1983); Stay in School Supplement (1991)	Many dropouts have either witnessed or are victims of violence or other types of abuse.
Academic failure/ underachievement	Cattoral (1985, 1986a, 1986b); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986); Frontier School Division (1989); Gastright (1987); Hahn (1987); Horton (1991); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987)	Underachieving/failing students are likely to drop out of school. School grades are a powerful indicator of school longevity.
Alienation	Batche (1984); Cattoral (1986a, 1986b); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987); Neufeld (1992)	Isolation from peers, adults, and institutions is indicative of a potential dropout. Students who fail to integrate socially are at high risk.
"At risk" labelling as self-fulfilling prophecy	Cattoral (1986b); Davis (1990); Parkin (1989)	Early identification of problems by significant individuals fosters negative perceptions in all stakeholders increasing the possibility of the student leaving school prior to graduation.
Attendance	Cattoral (1986a, 1986b); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986); Gastright (1987); Horton (1991); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987)	Absenteeism, truancy, and skipping classes are associated with early school leaving. Poor attendance patterns are considered a prime indicator of at risk students.
Attitude/ discipline/ misbehaviour	Cattoral (1986b); Coladarci (1983); Davis (1990); Flores (1986); Hahn (1987); Horton (1991); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Neufeld (1992)	Most dropouts have poor attitudes towards school and learning, a record of disciplinary interventions by the school, and misbehave in a multiplicity of situations.
Bad teachers/ methodologies	Batche (1984); Cattoral (1986a); Davis (1990); Flores (1986); Frontier School Division (1989); Hahn (1987)	Dropouts have multiple complaints about educational personnel, methods, and systems. Greater flexibility, responsiveness, and outcomes based management is desired.
Choice of educational program	Frontier School Division (1989); Hahn (1987); Horton (1991); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987)	Greater variety in programs is needed. Most students tend to exit from general level programs enrolling high numbers of students.
Chronic failures	Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986)	Dropouts have a history which might include multiple retentions, social promotions, transitory lifestyles, language difficulties, socio-economic problems, or interrupted educational experiences.
Counselling/ resource supports	Batche (1984); Cattoral (1986b); Flores (1986); Frontier School Division (1989); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Lee (1983)	The quality of specialist supports is more important than the quantity of those supports. Sites with high dropout rates need more supports. Dropouts need advocates.

Appendix A

Selective synopsis of stressors

Stressor	Researcher	General Conclusions
Curriculums of control rather than instruction	Davis (1990)	A significant number of dropouts view curriculum as a method for society to control rather than a method for personal growth.
Dislike school/ teachers	Coladarci (1983); Davis (1990); Flores (1986); Gastright (1987); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Lee (1983); Neufeld (1992)	Dropouts dislike institutions, intransigent policies, and inhumane teachers. Dropouts feel a need for greater freedoms. They demonstrate nonconformist attitudes.
Dropout reclamation programs	Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Lecompte & Goebel (1987); Parkin (1989)	Services for dropout reclamation are virtually non-existent due to an over-emphasis on prevention programs.
Employment	Catteral (1985); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Lee (1983); Mann (1986)	The need or desire for employment is a primary factor influencing school longevity. Dropouts tend to gain immediate but low level employment with no chance for advancement.
Ethnic background	Coladarci (1983); Davis (1990); Frontier School Division (1989); Horton (1991); Lee (1983)	Aboriginal students are two to three times more likely to discontinue school than Caucasian students. Social, cultural, and economic barriers prohibit success.
Family problems	Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Hahn (1987); Neufeld (1992)	Poor interpersonal relationships among family members escalates and compounds the possibility of early school leaving.
Family structure	Catteral (1986b); Davis (1990); Frontier School Division (1989); Gastright (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987)	Poor decision-making and parenting skills of the parents results in bad modelling which facilitates discontinuation of school. The need for money can be a decisive factor.
Gender	Hahn (1987); Horton (1991); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989)	Males discontinue school at a rate twice as high as that of females.
Inadequate goals/ aspirations	Catteral (1986a); Davis & Doss (1982)	Most dropouts lack clear or challenging goals. They tend to desire immediate but short-term rewards found in the menial job market.
Intelligence quotient/ achievement test scores	Catteral (1986a, 1986b); Davis (1990); Flores (1986); Hahn (1987)	Most dropouts rank in the first or second quartile of standardized achievement tests.
Irrelevant curriculum	Batche (1984); Coladarci (1983); Davis (1990); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Stay in School Supplement (1991)	Dropouts tend to find little relevance in curricula except that which is directly related to job market skills.
Language problems	Batche (1984); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986); Frontier School Division (1989); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987); Neufeld (1992); Stay in School Supplement (1991)	Students using English as a second language in schools whose language of instruction is English are more susceptible to dropout.

Appendix A

Selective synopsis of stressors

Stressor	Researcher	General Conclusions
Legal problems	Catteral (1986a); Flores (1986); Horton (1991); Parkin (1989)	Students on probation are at extreme risk to dropout. Criminal behaviour has become an acceptable reason for quitting school.
Low self-esteem/ self-concept	Batche (1984); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Hahn (1987); Neufeld (1992)	Discontinued students have internalized multiple failures, perceive themselves as losers, and feel justified in quitting school.
Nature of discontinuation	Catteral (1986a); Parkin (1989)	An individual's value system becomes the issue in evaluating dropout rationales: dropping out may not be deviant behaviour.
Parents education levels	Catteral (1986a); Davis (1990); Flores (1986); Hahn (1987); Neufeld (1992)	Many dropouts parents have low educational levels providing poor models to imitate.
Peer-related issues	Catteral (1986a); Coladarci (1983)	Lack of social allegiances heavily impacts success in school. Many dropouts emulate their peers.
Place of residence	Naylor (1987)	Many dropouts live in substandard housing.
Pregnancy/ marriage/ child-care	Coladarci (1983); Davis (1990); Gastright (1987); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Mann (1986); Neufeld (1992)	Females tend to cite rationales involving these stressors.
Retention	Catteral (1986a, 1986b); Flores (1986); Gastright (1987); Hahn (1987); Horton (1991); Neufeld (1992)	Retention in early grade levels is a primary indicator of eventual early leaving of school.
School environment	Batche (1984); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Goodlad (1984); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987)	Students tend to discontinue from traditional core subjects at a high rate. Schools with a multiplicity of problems tend to have high dropout rates.
Study skills/ work habits	Batche (1984); Frontier School Division (1989); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989)	Students who lack study skills and/or have poor work habits tend to dropout.
Substance abuse	Catteral (1986a); Coladarci (1983); Friedman, Glickman, & Utada (1985); Neufeld (1992)	It is unclear whether substance use correlates with early school leaving.
Teacher/ administration/ parent/ student cooperation	Batche (1984); Coladarci (1983); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986); Lee (1983); Naylor (1987); Stay in School Supplement (1991)	Students generally found adults to be uncooperative. Varying expectations and needs may make cooperation an unlikely event.
Teacher/school policies	Batche (1984); Catteral (1986b); Coladarci (1983); Davis (1990); Davis & Doss (1982); Flores (1986); Frontier School Division (1989); Hahn (1987); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Naylor (1987); Stay in School Supplement (1991)	Dropouts view policies as restrictive and unhelpful. They see change as a slow frustrating process. Policies generally worked against them.

Appendix A

Selective synopsis of stressors

Stressor	Researcher	General Conclusions
Timing of discontinuation	Davis (1990)	Junior High, age 16, and the year prior to graduation are periods of highest risk as students transition from one system.
Transiency	Flores (1986); Horton (1991); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989)	Many transient students have never completed a full year of studies and fail to achieve attainment of curriculum.
Transition planning	Catteral (1986a); Flores (1986); Frontier School Division (1989); King, Warren, Michalski, & Peart (1989); Lecompte & Goebel (1987); Naylor (1987); Stay in School Supplement (1991)	The move from Junior High to Senior High is a critical one. It is crucial to attain, process, and implement information concerning those students considered to be at risk of quitting school.
Undiagnosed learning disabilities	Catteral (1986a); Flores (1986); Hahn (1987); Neufeld (1992)	If dropouts generally have low intelligence quotients/achievement scores, it is hypothesized that many possess undiagnosed learning disabilities.

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Thank you for consenting to take part in this study. This survey is intended to discover how you react to stressors that may cause people to leave school before graduation. Results of this study will be shared next year upon completion of the project.

You have a copy of the survey in front of you: please do not respond to any item until told to do so.

The item may be read aloud to you and explained if you have any questions. Please take a moment to think before answering. It is important that you be honest in your responses.

There are 5 possible answers to each question. You are asked to circle the one number that best describes your feelings:

1 means that you strongly disagree

2 means that you disagree

3 means that you had not thought about this as a stressor before now

4 means that you agree

5 means that you strongly agree

If you do not want to respond to a question, you may leave the answer section blank and go on to the next question.

We will review your responses together and you will be asked to describe how you deal with those stressors that affect you. Also, you may be asked to explain how the school system could help solve your problems. Please answer as completely as possible.

	1	2	3	4	5
	strongly disagree	disagree	had not thought about	agree	strongly agree
1. I complete tests and assignments well.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have a hard time learning things that most other people learn easily.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. The school curriculum meets my needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
4. My teachers are able to meet my needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
5. I like the school's focus on academics.....	1	2	3	4	5
6. The process of registration and placement is acceptable.....	1	2	3	4	5
7. I have lived in the same house or apartment for more than 5 years.....	1	2	3	4	5
8. English is the language I speak best.....	1	2	3	4	5
9. I am aware of my strengths and weaknesses.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. I consider myself to be well-off financially.....	1	2	3	4	5
11. I feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.....	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am a smart person.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. I have not spoken with authorities to plan my future.....	1	2	3	4	5
14. I will not be married, nor have a baby, within a year.....	1	2	3	4	5
15. I am unimportant to society.....	1	2	3	4	5
16. I believe that my behaviour is the same as that of other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. Other people control my successes and failures in life.....	1	2	3	4	5
18. My family life is more important than success in school.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. Members of my family do not get along well with each other.....	1	2	3	4	5
20. No-one offers me supports or incentives to stay in school.....	1	2	3	4	5
21. I dislike taking on new tasks.....	1	2	3	4	5
22. I have plenty of money right now.....	1	2	3	4	5
23. My use of alcohol/drugs is not a cause of concern.....	1	2	3	4	5
24. I am not a smart person.....	1	2	3	4	5
25. I have retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.....	1	2	3	4	5
26. My study skills and work habits are better than most student's.....	1	2	3	4	5
27. I will be married, or have a baby, or both within a year.....	1	2	3	4	5
28. I am important to society.....	1	2	3	4	5
29. I think RDPC is a safe, nurturing place.....	1	2	3	4	5
30. School documents are neither accurate nor readily accessible.....	1	2	3	4	5
31. People dislike working with me because I tend to be unsuccessful.....	1	2	3	4	5
32. I believe that my behaviour sets me apart from other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
33. I would do better in school if I were female.....	1	2	3	4	5

1 2 3 4 5
strongly disagree disagree had not thought about agree strongly agree

	1	2	3	4	5
	strongly disagree	disagree	had not thought about	agree	strongly agree
34. When I fail, it is because I did not really try hard.....	1	2	3	4	5
35. I like myself.....	1	2	3	4	5
36. I have never retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.....	1	2	3	4	5
37. My study skills and work habits are not as good as most student's.....	1	2	3	4	5
38. I have never had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.....	1	2	3	4	5
39. My teachers are unable to meet my needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
40. The process of registration and placement is unacceptable.....	1	2	3	4	5
41. Most tasks that I complete are easy to do.....	1	2	3	4	5
42. People enjoy working with me because I tend to be successful.....	1	2	3	4	5
43. I am experiencing a shortage of money right now.....	1	2	3	4	5
44. My use of alcohol/drugs is a cause of concern.....	1	2	3	4	5
45. I consider myself to be poor financially.....	1	2	3	4	5
46. I do not feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.....	1	2	3	4	5
47. Our teachers use satisfactory instructional methods.....	1	2	3	4	5
48. Special Services has tested my ability and achievement levels.....	1	2	3	4	5
49. Teachers are more concerned with controlling students than with teaching them.....	1	2	3	4	5
50. Most teachers like me and I like them.....	1	2	3	4	5
51. I learn things easily that most other people have a hard time learning.....	1	2	3	4	5
52. The school curriculum does not meet my needs.....	1	2	3	4	5
53. I would do better in school if I were male.....	1	2	3	4	5
54. I have had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.....	1	2	3	4	5
55. Success in school is more important than my family life.....	1	2	3	4	5
56. I have not been abused in some way.....	1	2	3	4	5
57. I control my successes and failures in life.....	1	2	3	4	5
58. Special Services has not tested my ability and achievement levels.....	1	2	3	4	5
59. Teachers are more concerned with teaching students than with controlling them.....	1	2	3	4	5
60. Most teachers dislike me and I dislike them.....	1	2	3	4	5
61. I like the school's focus on socialization.....	1	2	3	4	5
62. I enjoy taking on new tasks.....	1	2	3	4	5
63. Most tasks that I do not complete are too hard to do.....	1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	had not thought about	agree	strongly agree

	1	2	3	4	5
	strongly disagree	disagree	had not thought about	agree	strongly agree
64. I am absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year.....	1	2	3	4	5
65. I have been abused in some way.....	1	2	3	4	5
66. I dislike myself.....	1	2	3	4	5
67. Members of my family get along well with each other.....	1	2	3	4	5
68. When I succeed it is because I tried hard.....	1	2	3	4	5
69. English is not the language I speak best.....	1	2	3	4	5
70. I am unaware of my strengths and weaknesses.....	1	2	3	4	5
71. I work at tasks until they are completed successfully.....	1	2	3	4	5
72. Many adults complain to me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.....	1	2	3	4	5
73. I feel lucky when I am successful.....	1	2	3	4	5
74. I dislike the school's focus on academics.....	1	2	3	4	5
75. My parent(s)/guardian(s) have completed high school.....	1	2	3	4	5
76. School documents are both accurate and readily accessible.....	1	2	3	4	5
77. I do not work at tasks until they are completed successfully.....	1	2	3	4	5
78. Many adults compliment me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.....	1	2	3	4	5
79. I feel unlucky when I am unsuccessful.....	1	2	3	4	5
80. I am absent from school less than 10 days or 10 classes each year.....	1	2	3	4	5
81. Working with a Counsellor or Resource teacher would help me.....	1	2	3	4	5
82. My parents, teachers, administrators, and I cooperate and work as a team to my benefit.....	1	2	3	4	5
83. I feel good when I am at school.....	1	2	3	4	5
84. I complete tests and assignments poorly.....	1	2	3	4	5
85. My ethnic background makes things easy for me.....	1	2	3	4	5
86. I am comfortable with and a part of my peer-group, family, and other associations.....	1	2	3	4	5
87. I think about myself as a winner.....	1	2	3	4	5
88. I dislike the school's focus on socialization.....	1	2	3	4	5
89. Adequate information about school policies and procedures is not available.	1	2	3	4	5
90. My parent(s)/guardian(s) have not completed high school.....	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
	strongly disagree	disagree	had not thought about	agree	strongly agree

	1	2	3	4	5
	strongly disagree	disagree	had not thought about	agree	strongly agree
91. Working with a Counsellor or Resource teacher would not help me.....	1	2	3	4	5
92. My parents, teachers, administrators, and I neither cooperate nor work as a team to my benefit.....	1	2	3	4	5
93. I feel bad when I am at school.....	1	2	3	4	5
94. My ethnic background makes things difficult for me.....	1	2	3	4	5
95. I am neither comfortable with nor a part of my peer-group, family, or other associations.....	1	2	3	4	5
96. I think about myself as a loser.....	1	2	3	4	5
97. Our teachers use unsatisfactory instructional methods.....	1	2	3	4	5
98. Groups other than my family offer me supports and incentives to stay in school.	1	2	3	4	5
99. I have spoken with authorities to plan my future.....	1	2	3	4	5
100. I have lived in the same house or apartment for less than 5 years.....	1	2	3	4	5
101. Adequate information about school policies and procedures is available.....	1	2	3	4	5
102. I think RDPC is an unsafe, punishing place.....	1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree	disagree	had not thought about	agree	strongly agree

Appendix C

Frequency Distribution for Q#1
Split By: Status

1	2	2
2	8	3
3	2	2
4	8	0
5	0	1
Total	31	15

Total Count DISCONTINUED Count INSCHOOL Count

Frequency Distribution for Q#2
Split By: Status

1	7	4
2	9	4
3	5	4
4	7	2
5	4	2
Total	32	16

Total Count DISCONTINUED Count INSCHOOL Count

Frequency Distribution for Q#3
Split By: Status

1	5	3
2	5	2
3	8	7
4	12	3
5	2	1
Total	32	16

Total Count DISCONTINUED Count INSCHOOL Count

Frequency Distribution for Q#4
Split By: Status

1	3	1
2	4	3
3	8	6
4	15	6
5	2	0
Total	32	18

Total Count DISCONTINUED Count INSCHOOL Count

Frequency Distribution for Q#5
Split By: Status

1	3	0
2	6	5
3	8	5
4	11	5
5	3	0
Total	31	15

Total Count DISCONTINUED Count INSCHOOL Count

Frequency Distribution for Q#6**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	2	3
2	4	3	1
3	2	2	0
4	14	5	9
5	4	1	3
Total	29	13	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#7**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	11	5	6
2	1	0	1
4	1	1	0
5	18	9	9
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#8**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	0	2
2	1	1	0
4	4	2	2
5	25	13	12
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#9**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
2	3	2	1
3	3	1	2
4	12	6	6
5	13	7	6
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#10**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	6	2	4
2	8	4	4
3	7	6	1
4	7	3	4
5	4	1	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#11**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	2	2
2	10	4	6
3	5	3	2
4	10	5	5
5	3	2	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#12**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	5	3	2
3	6	6	0
4	13	3	10
5	6	3	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#13**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	6	4	2
3	5	3	2
4	16	7	9
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#14**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	2	0
2	2	1	1
3	5	3	2
4	5	1	4
5	17	8	9
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#15**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	9	5	4
2	9	5	4
3	8	2	6
4	3	2	1
5	3	2	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#16**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	7	6	1
2	11	5	6
3	5	3	2
4	9	2	7
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#17**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	13	6	7
2	10	3	7
3	5	3	2
4	2	2	0
5	1	1	0
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#18**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	2	1
2	4	2	2
3	12	6	6
4	8	3	5
5	5	3	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#19**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	9	4	5
2	8	3	5
3	1	1	0
4	7	4	3
5	7	4	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#20**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	9	5	4
2	13	3	10
3	4	3	1
4	4	3	1
5	2	2	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#21**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	8	6	2
2	15	6	9
3	4	3	1
4	4	0	4
5	1	1	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#22**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	11	7	4
2	11	4	7
3	2	2	0
4	6	2	4
5	2	1	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#23**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	3	0
2	3	3	0
3	5	1	4
4	7	2	5
5	12	5	7
Total	30	14	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#24**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	17	7	10
2	7	4	3
3	4	4	0
4	4	1	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#25**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	3	2	1
3	1	1	0
4	13	5	8
5	13	7	6
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#26**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	8	5	3
2	12	6	6
3	6	5	1
4	6	0	6
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#27**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	19	8	11
2	4	2	2
3	4	2	2
4	2	1	1
5	2	2	0
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#28**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	2	1	1
3	12	6	6
4	12	6	6
5	4	2	2
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#29**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	7	3	4
2	8	4	4
3	5	3	2
4	9	4	5
5	3	2	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#30**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	4	2	2
3	19	9	10
4	6	4	2
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#31**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	8	3	5
2	14	8	6
3	5	2	3
4	4	2	2
5	1	1	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#32**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	2	3
2	4	0	4
3	7	5	2
4	9	4	5
5	7	5	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#33**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	13	5	8
2	2	1	1
3	9	6	3
4	3	2	1
5	4	1	3
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#34**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	4	3	1
3	2	1	1
4	9	5	4
5	14	6	8
Total	30	15	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#35**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	3	1	2
3	2	2	0
4	13	7	6
5	13	6	7
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#36**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	13	6	7
2	9	5	4
3	2	2	0
4	4	1	3
5	4	2	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#37**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	0	2
2	10	5	5
3	3	3	0
4	11	5	6
5	6	3	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#38**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	3	2
2	9	7	2
3	3	2	1
4	5	2	3
5	6	0	6
Total	28	14	14

Frequency Distribution for Q#39**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	0	2
2	12	4	8
3	8	5	3
4	8	7	1
5	1	0	1
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#40**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	1	3
2	6	2	4
3	8	6	2
4	11	6	5
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#41**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	8	4	4
3	5	3	2
4	15	7	8
5	3	2	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#42**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	3	0	3
3	15	10	5
4	12	5	7
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#43**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	7	4	3
2	8	4	4
3	1	1	0
4	7	3	4
5	9	4	5
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#44**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	15	8	7
2	9	4	5
3	3	0	3
4	4	3	1
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#45**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	10	5	5
2	9	4	5
3	2	1	1
4	7	4	3
5	4	2	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#46**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	2	1
2	9	5	4
3	2	2	0
4	12	6	6
5	5	1	4
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#47**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	4	2	2
3	12	7	5
4	11	5	6
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#48**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	3	2
2	10	6	4
3	5	2	3
4	8	4	4
5	2	0	2
Total	30	15	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#49**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	2	2
2	10	5	5
3	4	2	2
4	8	3	5
5	6	4	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#50**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	4	2	2
3	5	3	2
4	18	7	11
5	4	4	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#51**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	1	3
2	7	3	4
3	8	6	2
4	9	4	5
5	4	2	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#52**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	12	8	4
3	10	5	5
4	6	2	4
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#53**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	9	3	6
2	6	3	3
3	12	8	4
4	1	0	1
5	1	1	0
Total	29	15	14

Frequency Distribution for Q#54**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	6	0	6
2	6	3	3
3	3	3	0
4	11	6	5
5	3	3	0
Total	29	15	14

Frequency Distribution for Q#55**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	7	4	3
2	7	4	3
3	8	6	2
4	7	1	6
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#56**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	6	3	3
2	6	3	3
4	5	1	4
5	15	9	6
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#57**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
2	3	2	1
3	4	3	1
4	18	8	10
5	7	3	4
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#58**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	0	3
2	7	4	3
3	5	2	3
4	12	8	4
5	5	2	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#59**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	1	2
2	12	5	7
3	6	4	2
4	10	5	5
5	1	1	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#60**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	8	5	3
2	13	7	6
3	6	3	3
4	3	1	2
Total	30	16	14

Frequency Distribution for Q#61**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	6	5	1
3	10	2	8
4	12	7	5
5	1	0	1
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#62**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	1	0
2	2	1	1
3	6	3	3
4	16	8	8
5	6	2	4
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#63**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	1	2
2	16	11	5
3	1	0	1
4	9	2	7
5	2	1	1
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#64**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	0	4
2	6	3	3
4	12	7	5
5	10	6	4
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#65**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	14	7	7
2	7	4	3
4	5	0	5
5	6	5	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#66**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	14	7	7
2	11	5	6
3	3	3	0
4	2	1	1
5	1	0	1
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#67**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	6	3	3
2	6	3	3
3	2	2	0
4	12	6	6
5	6	2	4
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#68**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
2	2	2	0
3	2	1	1
4	19	10	9
5	9	3	6
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#69**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	23	12	11
2	7	3	4
5	1	0	1
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#70**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	4	1
2	10	4	6
3	9	3	6
4	6	3	3
5	2	2	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#71
Split By: Status

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	8	3	5
3	3	2	1
4	16	10	6
5	3	0	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#72
Split By: Status

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	2	1
2	10	3	7
3	3	3	0
4	10	6	4
5	6	2	4
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#73
Split By: Status

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	7	2	5
3	4	3	1
4	14	7	7
5	6	4	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#74
Split By: Status

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	0	2
2	10	5	5
3	10	5	5
4	8	5	3
5	1	0	1
6	1	1	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#75
Split By: Status

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	6	3	3
2	13	7	6
3	2	2	0
4	6	2	4
5	5	2	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#76**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	7	5	2
3	14	7	7
4	4	2	2
5	3	1	2
Total	29	15	14

Frequency Distribution for Q#77**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	2	2
2	14	8	6
3	2	1	1
4	9	5	4
5	2	0	2
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#78**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	2	1
2	7	4	3
3	1	0	1
4	18	9	9
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#79**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	1	2
2	19	8	11
3	4	3	1
4	2	2	0
5	4	2	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#80**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	6	2	4
2	10	6	4
3	1	1	0
4	9	5	4
5	5	1	4
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#81**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	3	2	1
3	10	5	5
4	10	4	6
5	6	3	3
Total	30	14	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#82**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	6	3	3
2	10	4	6
3	6	5	1
4	5	2	3
5	4	1	3
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#83**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	2	1	1
2	5	3	2
3	7	2	5
4	12	7	5
5	6	3	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#84**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	1	3
2	11	7	4
3	4	3	1
4	8	4	4
5	4	1	3
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#85**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	9	4	5
2	7	3	4
3	15	8	7
4	1	1	0
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#86**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	1	2
2	4	3	1
3	5	4	1
4	14	6	8
5	5	1	4
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#87**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	1	2
2	7	5	2
3	7	2	5
4	10	6	4
5	5	2	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#88**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	3	2	1
2	7	4	3
3	14	6	8
4	5	2	3
5	2	2	0
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#89**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	7	2	5
2	13	6	7
3	5	3	2
4	5	4	1
5	2	1	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#90**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	7	3	4
2	6	2	4
3	2	2	0
4	11	6	5
5	6	3	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#91**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	2	3
2	10	4	6
3	8	5	3
4	6	3	3
5	3	2	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#92**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	0	5
2	10	6	4
3	5	4	1
4	9	5	4
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#93**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	1	4
2	14	7	7
3	5	3	2
4	6	4	2
5	2	1	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q# 94**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	1	3
2	8	3	5
3	14	6	8
4	4	4	0
5	1	1	0
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q# 95**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	0	5
2	15	7	8
3	5	3	2
4	5	5	0
5	1	0	1
Total	31	15	16

Frequency Distribution for Q# 96**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	15	8	7
2	12	6	6
3	2	1	1
4	2	1	1
5	1	0	1
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#97**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	1	4
2	9	5	4
3	12	8	4
4	4	2	2
5	1	0	1
Total	31	16	15

Frequency Distribution for Q#98**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	4	1	3
2	10	7	3
3	2	1	1
4	12	5	7
5	4	2	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#99**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	5	2	3
2	15	8	7
3	5	4	1
4	4	2	2
5	3	0	3
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#100**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	9	5	4
2	9	5	4
4	6	2	4
5	8	4	4
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#101**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	1	0	1
2	7	6	1
3	5	3	2
4	16	6	10
5	3	1	2
Total	32	16	16

Frequency Distribution for Q#102**Split By: Status**

	Total Count	DISCONTINUED Count	INSCHOOL Count
1	9	4	5
2	11	4	7
3	5	5	0
4	3	2	1
5	4	1	3
Total	32	16	16

Appendix D

Stressors listed by question number (Q#)

Question #	Stressor
001	I complete tests and assignments well.
002	I have a hard time learning things that most other people learn easily.
003	The school curriculum meets my needs.
004	My teachers are able to meet my needs.
005	I like the school's focus on academics.
006	The process of registration and placement is acceptable.
007	I have lived in the same house or apartment for more than 5 years.
008	English is the language I speak best.
009	I am aware of my strengths and weaknesses.
010	I consider myself to be well-off financially.
011	I feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.
012	I am a smart person.
013	I have not spoken with authorities to plan my future.
014	I will not be married, nor have a baby, within a year.
015	I am unimportant to society.
016	I believe that my behaviour is the same as that of other people.
017	Other people control my successes and failures in life.
018	My family life is more important than success in school.
019	Members of my family do not get along well with each other.
020	No-one offers me supports or incentives to stay in school.
021	I dislike taking on new tasks.
022	I have plenty of money right now.
023	My use of alcohol/drugs is not a cause of concern.
024	I am not a smart person.
025	I have retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.
026	My study skills and work habits are better than most student's.
027	I will be married, or have a baby, or both within a year.
028	I am important to society.
029	I think RDPC is a safe, nurturing place.
030	School documents are neither accurate nor readily accessible.
031	People dislike working with me because I tend to be unsuccessful.
032	I believe that my behaviour sets me apart from other people.
033	I would do better in school if I were female.
034	When I fail, it is because I did not really try hard.
035	I like myself.
036	I have never retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.

Appendix D

Stressors listed by question number (Q#)

Question # Stressor

- 037 **My study skills and work habits are not as good as most student's.**
- 038 **I have never had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.**
- 039 **My teachers are unable to meet my needs.**
- 040 **The process of registration and placement is unacceptable.**
- 041 **Most tasks that I complete are easy to do.**
- 042 **People enjoy working with me because I tend to be successful.**
- 043 **I am experiencing a shortage of money right now.**
- 044 **My use of alcohol/drugs is a cause of concern.**
- 045 **I consider myself to be poor financially.**
- 046 **I do not feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.**
- 047 **Our teachers use satisfactory instructional methods.**
- 048 **Special Services has tested my ability and achievement levels.**
- 049 **Teachers are more concerned with controlling students than with teaching them.**
- 050 **Most teachers like me and I like them.**
- 051 **I learn things easily that most other people have a hard time learning.**
- 052 **The school curriculum does not meet my needs.**
- 053 **I would do better in school if I were male.**
- 054 **I have had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.**
- 055 **Success in school is more important than my family life.**
- 056 **I have not been abused in some way.**
- 057 **I control my successes and failures in life.**
- 058 **Special Services has not tested my ability and achievement levels.**
- 059 **Teachers are more concerned with teaching students than with controlling them.**
- 060 **Most teachers dislike me and I dislike them.**
- 061 **I like the school's focus on socialization.**
- 062 **I enjoy taking on new tasks.**
- 063 **Most tasks that I do not complete are too hard to do.**
- 064 **I am absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year.**
- 065 **I have been abused in some way.**
- 066 **I dislike myself.**
- 067 **Members of my family get along well with each other.**
- 068 **When I succeed it is because I tried hard.**
- 069 **English is not the language I speak best.**
- 070 **I am unaware of my strengths and weaknesses.**
- 071 **I work at tasks until they are completed successfully.**
- 072 **Many adults complain to me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.**
- 073 **I feel lucky when I am successful.**

Appendix D

Stressors listed by question number (Q#)

Question #	Stressor
074	I dislike the school's focus on academics.
075	My parent(s)/guardian(s) have completed high school.
076	School documents are both accurate and readily accessible.
077	I do not work at tasks until they are completed successfully.
078	Many adults compliment me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.
079	I feel unlucky when I am unsuccessful.
080	I am absent from school less than 10 days or 10 classes each year.
081	Working with a Counsellor or Resource Teacher would help me.
082	My parents, teachers, administrators, and I cooperate and work as a team to my benefit.
083	I feel good when I am at school.
084	I complete tests and assignments poorly.
085	My ethnic background makes things easy for me.
086	I am comfortable with and a part of my peer-group, family, and other associations.
087	I think about myself as a winner.
088	I dislike the school's focus on socialization.
089	Adequate information about school policies and procedures is not available.
090	My parent(s)/guardian(s) have not completed high school.
091	Working with a Counsellor or Resource teacher would not help me.
092	My parents, teachers, administrators, and I neither cooperate nor work as a team to my benefit.
093	I feel bad when I am at school.
094	My ethnic background makes things difficult for me.
095	I am neither comfortable with nor a part of my peer-group, family, or other associations.
096	I think about myself as a loser.
097	Our teachers use unsatisfactory instructional methods.
098	Groups other than my family offer me supports and incentives to stay in school.
099	I have spoken with authorities to plan my future.
100	I have lived in the same house or apartment for less than 5 years.
101	Adequate information about school policies and procedures is available.
102	I think RDPC is an unsafe, punishing place.

Appendix E

Mann-Whitney U for + TOTAL
Grouping Variable: Status

U	86
U Prime	170
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.1092
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.1091
# Ties	2

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for + TOTAL
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	222	14
INSCHOOL	16	306	19

Mann-Whitney U for - TOTAL
Grouping Variable: Status

U	94
U Prime	162
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2067
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2065
# Ties	6

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for - TOTAL
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	298	19
INSCHOOL	16	230	14

Mann-Whitney U for Q#1
Grouping Variable: Status

U	98
U Prime	142
Z-Value	-9E-1
P-Value	0.3738
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.3162
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#1
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	218	14
INSCHOOL	16	278	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#2
Grouping Variable: Status

U	115
U Prime	141
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6242
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6156
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#2
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	251	16
INSCHOOL	16	277	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#3
Grouping Variable: Status

U	96
U Prime	160
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2206
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2027
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#3
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	232	14
INSCHOOL	16	296	19

Mann-Whitney U for Q#4
Grouping Variable: Status

U	90
U Prime	166
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1468
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.1217
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#4
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	226	14
INSCHOOL	16	302	19

Mann-Whitney U for Q#5
Grouping Variable: Status

U	95
U Prime	145
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.3230
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.3055
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#5
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	215	14
INSCHOOL	16	281	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#6
Grouping Variable: Status

U	78
U Prime	130
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2635
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2327
# Ties	5

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#7
Grouping Variable: Status

U	114
U Prime	126
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8279
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8031
# Ties	2

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#8
Grouping Variable: Status

U	118
U Prime	138
Z-Value	-4E-1
P-Value	0.7063
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6017
# Ties	3

Mann-Whitney U for Q#9
Grouping Variable: Status

U	117
U Prime	123
Z-Value	-1E-1
P-Value	0.9056
Tied Z-Value	-1E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8987
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#10
Grouping Variable: Status

U	126
U Prime	130
Z-Value	-6E-2
P-Value	0.9549
Tied Z-Value	-6E-2
Tied P-Value	0.9539
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#6
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	13	170	13
INSCHOOL	16	266	17

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#7
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	246	16
INSCHOOL	16	250	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#8
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	274	17
INSCHOOL	16	254	16

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#9
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	259	16
INSCHOOL	15	237	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#10
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	262	16
INSCHOOL	16	266	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#11
Grouping Variable: Status

U	114
U Prime	142
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.5847
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5716
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#11
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	278	17
INSCHOOL	16	250	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#12
Grouping Variable: Status

U	92
U Prime	164
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1748
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1564
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#12
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	228	14
INSCHOOL	16	300	19

Mann-Whitney U for Q#13
Grouping Variable: Status

U	102
U Prime	154
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.3271
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2919
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#13
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	238	15
INSCHOOL	16	290	18

Mann-Whitney U for Q#14
Grouping Variable: Status

U	104
U Prime	136
Z-Value	-7E-1
P-Value	0.5143
Tied Z-Value	-7E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4733
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#14
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	224	15
INSCHOOL	16	272	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#15
Grouping Variable: Status

U	122
U Prime	134
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8211
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8155
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#15
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	258	16
INSCHOOL	16	270	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#16
Grouping Variable: Status

U	72
U Prime	184
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.0348
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.0281
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#16
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	208	13
INSCHOOL	16	320	20

Mann-Whitney U for Q#17
Grouping Variable: Status

U	94
U Prime	146
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.3135
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2851
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#17
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	266	18
INSCHOOL	16	230	14

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#18
Grouping Variable: Status

U	120
U Prime	136
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7774
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7689
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#18
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	256	16
INSCHOOL	16	272	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#19
Grouping Variable: Status

U	110
U Prime	146
Z-Value	-7E-1
P-Value	0.4856
Tied Z-Value	-7E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4725
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#19
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	282	18
INSCHOOL	16	246	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#20
Grouping Variable: Status

U	97
U Prime	159
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2427
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2200
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#20
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	295	18
INSCHOOL	16	233	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#21
Grouping Variable: Status

U	96
U Prime	180
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2206
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1912
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#21
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	232	14
INSCHOOL	16	296	19

Mann-Whitney U for Q#22
Grouping Variable: Status

U	108
U Prime	148
Z-Value	-8E-1
P-Value	0.4397
Tied Z-Value	-8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4186
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#22
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	244	15
INSCHOOL	16	284	18

Mann-Whitney U for Q#23
Grouping Variable: Status

U	78
U Prime	146
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1515
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1344
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#23
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	14	182	13
INSCHOOL	16	282	18

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#24
Grouping Variable: Status

U	108
U Prime	148
Z-Value	-7E-1
P-Value	0.4624
Tied Z-Value	-8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4217
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#24
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	284	18
INSCHOOL	16	244	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#25
Grouping Variable: Status

U	126
U Prime	130
Z-Value	-6E-2
P-Value	0.9549
Tied Z-Value	-6E-2
Tied P-Value	0.9515
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#25
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	262	16
INSCHOOL	16	266	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#26
Grouping Variable: Status

U	91
U Prime	165
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1632
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1458
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#26
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	227	14
INSCHOOL	16	301	19

Mann-Whitney U for Q#27
Grouping Variable: Status

U	96
U Prime	144
Z-Value	-9E-1
P-Value	0.3529
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2884
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#27
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	264	18
INSCHOOL	16	232	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#28
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	128
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7669
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7523
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#28
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	248	16
INSCHOOL	16	248	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#29
Grouping Variable: Status

U	118
U Prime	138
Z-Value	-4E-1
P-Value	0.7063
Tied Z-Value	-4E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6987
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#29
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	274	17
INSCHOOL	16	254	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#30
Grouping Variable: Status

U	108
U Prime	132
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6212
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5711
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#30
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	268	17
INSCHOOL	15	228	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#31
Grouping Variable: Status

U	114
U Prime	142
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.5847
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5637
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#31
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	278	17
INSCHOOL	16	250	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#32
Grouping Variable: Status

U	92
U Prime	164
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1748
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1643
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#32
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	300	19
INSCHOOL	16	228	14

Mann-Whitney U for Q#33
Grouping Variable: Status

U	109
U Prime	131
Z-Value	-4E-1
P-Value	0.6837
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6466
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#33
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	251	17
INSCHOOL	16	245	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#34
Grouping Variable: Status

U	98
U Prime	127
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5476
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5190
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#34
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	218	15
INSCHOOL	15	247	16

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#35
Grouping Variable: Status

U	125
U Prime	131
Z-Value	-1E-1
P-Value	0.9100
Tied Z-Value	-1E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9033
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#35
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	261	16
INSCHOOL	16	267	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#36
Grouping Variable: Status

U	126
U Prime	130
Z-Value	-9E-2
P-Value	0.9249
Tied Z-Value	-1E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9212
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#36
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	266	17
INSCHOOL	16	262	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#37
Grouping Variable: Status

U	119
U Prime	137
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7345
Tied Z-Value	-4E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7239
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#37
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	273	17
INSCHOOL	16	255	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#38
Grouping Variable: Status

U	46
U Prime	150
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.0169
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.0140
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#38
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	14	151	11
INSCHOOL	14	255	18

4 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#39
Grouping Variable: Status

U	64
U Prime	176
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.0269
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.0202
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#39
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	312	20
INSCHOOL	15	184	12

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#40
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	144
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5591
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5458
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#40
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	280	17
INSCHOOL	16	248	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#41
Grouping Variable: Status

U	118
U Prime	138
Z-Value	-4E-1
P-Value	0.7063
Tied Z-Value	-4E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6874
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#41
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	274	17
INSCHOOL	16	254	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#42
Grouping Variable: Status

U	128
U Prime	128
Z-Value	0
P-Value	>0.9999
Tied Z-Value	0
Tied P-Value	>0.9999
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#42
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	264	16
INSCHOOL	16	264	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#43
Grouping Variable: Status

U	114
U Prime	142
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.5977
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5867
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#43
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	250	16
INSCHOOL	16	278	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#44
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	128
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7669
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7492
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#44
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	232	16
INSCHOOL	16	264	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#45
Grouping Variable: Status

U	123
U Prime	133
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8505
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8455
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#45
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	269	17
INSCHOOL	16	259	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#46
Grouping Variable: Status

U	87
U Prime	153
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1921
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1722
# Ties	5

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#47
Grouping Variable: Status

U	113
U Prime	143
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5718
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5522
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney U for Q#48
Grouping Variable: Status

U	86
U Prime	139
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2717
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2558
# Ties	5

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#49
Grouping Variable: Status

U	121
U Prime	135
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7919
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7860
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney U for Q#50
Grouping Variable: Status

U	102
U Prime	154
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.3365
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2871
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#46
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	223	14
INSCHOOL	15	273	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#47
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	249	16
INSCHOOL	16	279	17

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#48
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	206	14
INSCHOOL	15	259	17

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#49
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	271	17
INSCHOOL	16	257	16

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#50
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	290	18
INSCHOOL	16	238	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#51
Grouping Variable: Status

U	116
U Prime	140
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6376
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6286
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#51
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	276	17
INSCHOOL	16	252	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#52
Grouping Variable: Status

U	100
U Prime	156
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.3000
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2773
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#52
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	236	15
INSCHOOL	16	292	18

Mann-Whitney U for Q#53
Grouping Variable: Status

U	76
U Prime	134
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2136
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1877
# Ties	3

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#53
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	254	17
INSCHOOL	14	182	13

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#54
Grouping Variable: Status

U	50
U Prime	160
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.0154
Tied Z-Value	-3
Tied P-Value	0.0118
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#54
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	280	19
INSCHOOL	14	154	11

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#55
Grouping Variable: Status

U	92
U Prime	164
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1748
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1646
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#55
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	228	14
INSCHOOL	16	300	19

Mann-Whitney U for Q#56
Grouping Variable: Status

U	113
U Prime	143
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5718
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5469
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#56
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	279	17
INSCHOOL	16	249	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#57
Grouping Variable: Status

U	104
U Prime	152
Z-Value	-9E-1
P-Value	0.3558
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.3048
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#57
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	240	15
INSCHOOL	16	288	18

Mann-Whitney U for Q#58
Grouping Variable: Status

U	106
U Prime	150
Z-Value	-8E-1
P-Value	0.4070
Tied Z-Value	-9E-1
Tied P-Value	0.3897
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#58
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	286	18
INSCHOOL	16	242	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#59
Grouping Variable: Status

U	104
U Prime	152
Z-Value	-9E-1
P-Value	0.3657
Tied Z-Value	-9E-1
Tied P-Value	0.3431
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#59
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	288	18
INSCHOOL	16	240	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#60
Grouping Variable: Status

U	94
U Prime	130
Z-Value	-7E-1
P-Value	0.4543
Tied Z-Value	-8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4281
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#60
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	230	14
INSCHOOL	14	235	17

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#61
Grouping Variable: Status

U	108
U Prime	132
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6212
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6028
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#62
Grouping Variable: Status

U	100
U Prime	140
Z-Value	-8E-1
P-Value	0.4292
Tied Z-Value	-9E-1
Tied P-Value	0.3908
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#63
Grouping Variable: Status

U	89
U Prime	151
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2204
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1806
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#64
Grouping Variable: Status

U	89
U Prime	167
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1416
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.1232
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney U for Q#65
Grouping Variable: Status

U	120
U Prime	136
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7630
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7501
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#61
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	228	15
INSCHOOL	16	268	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#62
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	220	15
INSCHOOL	16	276	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#63
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	209	14
INSCHOOL	16	287	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#64
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	303	19
INSCHOOL	16	225	14

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#65
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	272	17
INSCHOOL	16	256	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#66
Grouping Variable: Status

U	113
U Prime	127
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7820
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7658
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#67
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	144
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5465
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5314
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney U for Q#68
Grouping Variable: Status

U	94
U Prime	162
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2067
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1498
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney U for Q#69
Grouping Variable: Status

U	105
U Prime	135
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5532
Tied Z-Value	-8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4365
# Ties	2

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#70
Grouping Variable: Status

U	124
U Prime	132
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8653
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8610
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#66
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	263	16
INSCHOOL	15	233	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#67
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	248	16
INSCHOOL	16	280	18

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#68
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	230	14
INSCHOOL	16	298	19

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#69
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	225	15
INSCHOOL	16	271	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#70
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	260	16
INSCHOOL	16	268	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#71
Grouping Variable: Status

U	124
U Prime	132
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8802
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8707
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#71
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	260	16
INSCHOOL	16	268	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#72
Grouping Variable: Status

U	126
U Prime	130
Z-Value	-6E-2
P-Value	0.9549
Tied Z-Value	-6E-2
Tied P-Value	0.9533
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#72
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	262	16
INSCHOOL	16	266	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#73
Grouping Variable: Status

U	96
U Prime	160
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2278
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2031
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#73
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	296	18
INSCHOOL	16	232	14

Mann-Whitney U for Q#74
Grouping Variable: Status

U	102
U Prime	154
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.3365
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.3174
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#74
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	290	18
INSCHOOL	16	238	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#75
Grouping Variable: Status

U	116
U Prime	140
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6376
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6227
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#75
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	252	16
INSCHOOL	16	276	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#76
Grouping Variable: Status

U	90
U Prime	120
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5268
Tied Z-Value	-7E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4976
# Ties	4

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#77
Grouping Variable: Status

U	106
U Prime	134
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5665
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5416
# Ties	5

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#78
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	144
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5340
Tied Z-Value	-7E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4898
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney U for Q#79
Grouping Variable: Status

U	96
U Prime	160
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2351
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1807
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney U for Q#80
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	128
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7518
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7432
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#76
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	210	14
INSCHOOL	14	224	16

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#77
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	242	15
INSCHOOL	15	254	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#78
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	248	15
INSCHOOL	16	280	18

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#79
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	296	18
INSCHOOL	16	232	15

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#80
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	232	15
INSCHOOL	16	264	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#81
Grouping Variable: Status

U	109
U Prime	115
Z-Value	-1E-1
P-Value	0.9008
Tied Z-Value	-1E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8964
# Ties	4

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#82
Grouping Variable: Status

U	114
U Prime	128
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7972
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7917
# Ties	5

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#83
Grouping Variable: Status

U	122
U Prime	134
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8065
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7992
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney U for Q#84
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	128
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7669
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7589
# Ties	5

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#85
Grouping Variable: Status

U	109
U Prime	147
Z-Value	-7E-1
P-Value	0.4739
Tied Z-Value	-8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4414
# Ties	3

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#81
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	14	214	15
INSCHOOL	16	251	16

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#82
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	234	16
INSCHOOL	16	262	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#83
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	270	17
INSCHOOL	16	258	16

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#84
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	248	16
INSCHOOL	15	248	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#85
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	283	18
INSCHOOL	16	245	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#86
Grouping Variable: Status

U	84
U Prime	156
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.1605
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1385
# Ties	5

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#87
Grouping Variable: Status

U	124
U Prime	132
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8802
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8767
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney U for Q#88
Grouping Variable: Status

U	116
U Prime	124
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8744
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8670
# Ties	5

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#89
Grouping Variable: Status

U	88
U Prime	168
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.1269
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.1106
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney U for Q#90
Grouping Variable: Status

U	116
U Prime	140
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6376
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6264
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#86
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	204	14
INSCHOOL	16	292	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#87
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	260	16
INSCHOOL	16	268	17

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#88
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	252	16
INSCHOOL	15	244	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#89
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	304	19
INSCHOOL	16	224	14

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#90
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	276	17
INSCHOOL	16	252	16

Mann-Whitney U for Q#91
Grouping Variable: Status

U	105
U Prime	151
Z-Value	-9E-1
P-Value	0.3860
Tied Z-Value	-9E-1
Tied P-Value	0.3722
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#91
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	287	18
INSCHOOL	16	241	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#92
Grouping Variable: Status

U	101
U Prime	155
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.3089
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.2938
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#92
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	291	18
INSCHOOL	16	237	15

Mann-Whitney U for Q#93
Grouping Variable: Status

U	94
U Prime	162
Z-Value	-1
P-Value	0.2000
Tied Z-Value	-1
Tied P-Value	0.1774
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#93
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	298	19
INSCHOOL	16	230	14

Mann-Whitney U for Q# 94
Grouping Variable: Status

U	70
U Prime	170
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.0481
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.0359
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q# 94
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	290	19
INSCHOOL	16	206	13

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q# 95
Grouping Variable: Status

U	60
U Prime	180
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.0177
Tied Z-Value	-3
Tied P-Value	0.0112
# Ties	4

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q# 95
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	15	300	20
INSCHOOL	16	196	12

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q# 96
Grouping Variable: Status

U	116
U Prime	140
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6511
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6226
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q# 96
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	252	16
INSCHOOL	16	276	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#97
Grouping Variable: Status

U	102
U Prime	138
Z-Value	-7E-1
P-Value	0.4768
Tied Z-Value	-7E-1
Tied P-Value	0.4563
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#97
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	274	17
INSCHOOL	15	222	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Mann-Whitney U for Q#98
Grouping Variable: Status

U	122
U Prime	134
Z-Value	-2E-1
P-Value	0.8211
Tied Z-Value	-2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8130
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#98
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	258	16
INSCHOOL	16	270	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#99
Grouping Variable: Status

U	121
U Prime	135
Z-Value	-3E-1
P-Value	0.7919
Tied Z-Value	-3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.7794
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#99
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	257	16
INSCHOOL	16	271	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#100
Grouping Variable: Status

U	116
U Prime	140
Z-Value	-5E-1
P-Value	0.6511
Tied Z-Value	-5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.6398
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#100
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	252	16
INSCHOOL	16	276	17

Mann-Whitney U for Q#101
Grouping Variable: Status

U	87
U Prime	169
Z-Value	-2
P-Value	0.1223
Tied Z-Value	-2
Tied P-Value	0.0958
# Ties	4

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#101
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	223	14
INSCHOOL	16	305	19

Mann-Whitney U for Q#102
Grouping Variable: Status

U	112
U Prime	144
Z-Value	-6E-1
P-Value	0.5591
Tied Z-Value	-6E-1
Tied P-Value	0.5450
# Ties	5

Mann-Whitney Rank Info for Q#102
Grouping Variable: Status

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
DISCONTINUED	16	280	17
INSCHOOL	16	248	16

Appendix G

Two group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Stressor	Mean rank		
		Discontinued	Inschool	Question #
0.015	I have had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.	19	11	054
0.017	I have never had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.	11	18	038
0.018	I am neither comfortable with nor a part of my peer-group, family, or other associations.	20	12	095
0.027	My teachers are unable to meet my needs.	20	12	039
0.035	I believe that my behaviour is the same as that of other people.	13	20	016
0.048	My ethnic background makes things difficult for me.	19	13	094
0.122	Adequate information about school policies and procedures is available.	14	19	101
0.127	Adequate information about school policies and procedures is not available.	19	14	089
0.142	I am absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year.	19	14	064
0.149	My teachers are able to meet my needs.	14	19	004
0.152	My use of alcohol/drugs is not a cause of concern.	13	18	023
0.161	I am comfortable with and a part of my peer-group, family, and other associations.	14	18	086
0.163	My study skills and work habits are better than most student's.	14	19	026
0.175	I am a smart person.	14	19	012
0.175	I believe that my behaviour sets me apart from other people.	19	19	032
0.175	Success in school is more important than my family life.	14	19	055
0.192	I do not feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.	14	18	046
0.200	I feel bad when I am at school.	19	14	093
0.207	When I succeed it is because I tried hard.	14	19	068
0.214	I would do better in school if I were male.	17	13	053
0.220	Most tasks that I do not complete are too hard to do.	14	18	063
0.221	The school curriculum meets my needs.	14	19	003
0.221	I dislike taking on new tasks.	14	19	021
0.228	I feel lucky when I am successful.	18	14	073
0.235	I feel unlucky when I am unsuccessful.	18	15	079
0.243	No-one offers me supports or incentives to stay in school.	18	15	020
0.264	The process of registration and placement is acceptable.	13	17	006
0.272	Special Services has tested my ability and achievement levels.	14	17	048
0.300	The school curriculum does not meet my needs.	15	18	052
0.309	My parents, teachers, administrators, and I neither cooperate nor work as a team to my benefit.	18	15	092

Appendix G

Two group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Stressor	Mean rank		
		Discontinued	Inschool	Question #
0.314	Other people control my successes and failures in life.	18	14	017
0.323	I like the school's focus on academics.	14	18	005
0.327	I have not spoken with authorities to plan my future.	15	18	013
0.337	Most teachers like me and I like them.	18	15	050
0.337	I dislike the school's focus on academics.	18	15	074
0.353	I will be married, or have a baby, or both within a year.	18	15	027
0.356	I control my successes and failures in life.	15	18	057
0.366	Teachers are more concerned with teaching students than with controlling them.	18	15	059
0.374	I complete tests and assignments well.	14	17	001
0.386	Working with a Counsellor or Resource teacher would not help me.	18	15	091
0.407	Special Services has not tested my ability and achievement levels.	18	15	058
0.429	I enjoy taking on new tasks.	15	17	062
0.440	I have plenty of money right now.	15	18	022
0.454	Most teachers dislike me and I dislike them.	14	17	060
0.462	I am not a smart person.	18	15	024
0.474	My ethnic background makes things easy for me.	18	15	085
0.477	Our teachers use unsatisfactory instructional methods.	17	15	097
0.486	Members of my family do not get along well with each other.	18	15	019
0.514	I will not be married, nor have a baby, within a year.	15	17	014
0.527	School documents are both accurate and readily accessible.	14	16	076
0.534	Many adults compliment me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.	15	18	078
0.547	Members of my family get along well with each other.	16	18	067
0.548	When I fail, it is because I did not really try hard.	15	16	034
0.553	English is not the language I speak best.	15	17	069
0.559	The process of registration and placement is unacceptable.	17	16	040
0.559	I think RDPC is an unsafe, punishing place.	17	16	102
0.567	I do not work at tasks until they are completed successfully.	15	17	077
0.572	Our teachers use satisfactory instructional methods.	16	17	047
0.572	I have not been abused in some way.	17	16	056
0.585	I feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.	17	16	011
0.585	People dislike working with me because I tend to be unsuccessful.	17	16	031
0.598	I am experiencing a shortage of money right now.	16	17	043

Appendix G

Two group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Stressor	Mean rank		
		Discontinued	Inschool	Question #
0.621	School documents are neither accurate nor readily accessible.	17	15	030
0.621	I like the school's focus on socialization.	15	17	061
0.624	I have a hard time learning things that most other people learn easily.	16	17	002
0.638	My parent(s)/guardian(s) have completed high school.	16	17	075
0.638	I learn things easily that most other people have a hard time learning.	17	16	051
0.638	My parent(s)/guardian(s) have not completed high school.	17	16	090
0.651	I think about myself as a loser.	16	17	096
0.651	I have lived in the same house or apartment for less than 5 years.	16	17	100
0.664	I would do better in school if I were female.	17	15	033
0.706	English is the language I speak best.	17	16	008
0.706	I think RDPC is a safe, nurturing place.	17	16	029
0.706	Most tasks that I complete are easy to do.	17	16	041
0.735	My study skills and work habits are not as good as most student's.	17	16	037
0.752	I am absent from school less than 10 days or 10 classes each year.	15	16	080
0.763	I have been abused in some way.	17	16	065
0.767	I complete tests and assignments poorly.	16	16	084
0.767	My use of alcohol/drugs is a cause of concern.	16	16	044
0.767	I am important to society.	16	16	028
0.777	My family life is more important than success in school.	16	17	018
0.782	I dislike myself.	16	16	066
0.792	Teachers are more concerned with controlling students than with teaching them.	17	16	049
0.792	I have spoken with authorities to plan my future.	16	17	099
0.797	My parents, teachers, administrators, and I cooperate and work as a team to my benefit.	16	16	082
0.807	I feel good when I am at school.	17	16	083
0.821	I am unimportant to society.	16	17	015
0.821	Groups other than my family offer me supports and incentives to stay in school.	16	17	098
0.828	I have lived in the same house or apartment for more than 5 years.	16	16	007
0.851	I consider myself to be poor financially.	17	16	045
0.865	I am unaware of my strengths and weaknesses.	16	17	070
0.874	I dislike the school's focus on socialization.	16	16	088

Appendix G

Two group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Stressor	Mean rank		
		Discontinued	Inschool	Question #
0.880	I work at tasks until they are completed successfully.	16	17	071
0.880	I think about myself as a winner.	16	17	087
0.901	Working with a Counsellor or Resource Teacher would help me.	15	16	081
0.906	I am aware of my strengths and weaknesses.	16	16	009
0.910	I like myself.	16	17	035
0.925	I have never retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.	17	16	036
0.955	I have retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.	16	17	025
0.955	I consider myself to be well-off financially.	16	17	010
0.955	Many adults complain to me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.	16	17	072
0.999	People enjoy working with me because I tend to be successful.	16	16	042

Appendix H

Frequency Distribution for Q#1

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	0	0	2	0
2	8	3	2	1	2
3	2	0	0	0	2
4	18	5	5	2	6
5	1	0	1	0	0
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#2

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	7	1	2	1	3
2	9	3	2	1	3
3	5	0	1	2	2
4	7	2	3	0	2
5	4	2	0	2	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#3

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	1	1	2	1
2	5	1	2	1	1
3	8	0	1	2	5
4	12	6	3	1	2
5	2	0	1	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#4

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	1	1	0
2	4	1	0	2	1
3	8	2	0	2	4
4	15	3	6	1	5
5	2	1	1	0	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#5

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	2	0	0
2	6	1	0	1	4
3	8	1	2	3	2
4	11	4	2	1	4
5	3	1	2	0	0
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#6

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	0	3	2	0
2	4	0	1	0	3
3	2	0	0	1	1
4	14	6	3	2	3
5	4	2	1	0	1
T...	29	8	8	5	8

Frequency Distribution for Q#7

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	11	2	4	0	5
2	1	0	1	0	0
4	1	0	0	0	1
5	18	6	3	5	4
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#8

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	1	0	0
2	1	0	0	1	0
4	4	2	0	0	2
5	25	5	7	5	8
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#9

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
2	3	0	1	0	2
3	3	0	2	0	1
4	12	3	3	4	2
5	13	4	2	2	5
T...	31	7	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#10

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	6	1	3	0	2
2	8	1	3	2	2
3	7	1	0	2	4
4	7	2	2	2	1
5	4	3	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#11
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	1	1	1	1
2	10	4	2	1	3
3	5	0	2	2	1
4	10	2	3	1	4
5	3	1	0	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#12
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	0	1	0	1
2	5	1	1	0	3
3	6	0	0	3	3
4	13	6	4	2	1
5	6	1	2	1	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#13
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	0	0	1
2	6	1	1	2	2
3	5	0	2	1	2
4	16	5	4	2	5
5	3	1	1	1	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#14
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	0	0	0	2
2	2	0	1	0	1
3	5	1	1	1	2
4	5	2	2	0	1
5	17	5	4	4	4
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#15
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	9	1	3	2	3
2	9	3	1	2	3
3	8	2	4	0	2
4	3	1	0	1	1
5	3	1	0	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#16

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	7	1	0	2	4
2	11	3	3	2	3
3	5	1	1	1	2
4	9	3	4	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#17

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	13	4	3	2	4
2	10	4	3	1	2
3	5	0	2	2	1
4	2	0	0	0	2
5	1	0	0	0	1
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#18

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	0	0	2
2	4	1	1	1	1
3	12	2	4	2	4
4	8	2	3	2	1
5	5	2	0	1	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#19

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	9	3	2	2	2
2	8	3	2	1	2
3	1	0	0	1	0
4	7	1	2	1	3
5	7	1	2	1	3
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#20

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	9	2	2	1	4
2	13	5	5	2	1
3	4	1	0	2	1
4	4	0	1	1	2
5	2	0	0	0	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#21

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	8	1	1	4	2
2	15	4	5	0	6
3	4	0	1	2	1
4	4	3	1	0	0
5	1	0	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#22

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	11	0	4	3	4
2	11	3	4	1	3
3	2	0	0	1	1
4	6	4	0	1	1
5	2	1	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#23

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	0	0	1	2
2	3	0	0	2	1
3	5	2	2	1	0
4	7	3	2	0	2
5	12	3	4	2	3
T...	30	8	8	6	8

Frequency Distribution for Q#24

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	17	4	6	3	4
2	7	3	0	1	3
3	4	0	0	1	3
4	4	1	2	1	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#25

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	0	1	0
2	3	1	0	0	2
3	1	0	0	0	1
4	13	3	5	1	4
5	13	3	3	4	3
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#26

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	8	2	1	2	3
2	12	2	4	2	4
3	6	1	0	2	3
4	6	3	3	0	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#27

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	19	6	5	3	5
2	4	2	0	1	1
3	4	0	2	0	2
4	2	0	1	0	1
5	2	0	0	1	1
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#28

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	1	0	0	0
2	2	1	0	0	1
3	12	2	4	3	3
4	12	4	2	2	4
5	4	0	2	0	2
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#29

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	7	1	3	2	1
2	8	2	2	3	1
3	5	1	1	0	3
4	9	3	2	1	3
5	3	1	0	0	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#30

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	0	1	0	1
2	4	1	1	0	2
3	19	6	4	4	5
4	6	0	2	2	2
T...	31	7	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#31

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	8	4	1	2	1
2	14	2	4	2	6
3	5	1	2	1	1
4	4	1	1	1	1
5	1	0	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#32

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	1	2	1	1
2	4	3	1	0	0
3	7	1	1	2	3
4	9	2	3	1	3
5	7	1	1	2	3
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#33

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	13	3	5	3	2
2	2	1	0	0	1
3	9	1	2	2	4
4	3	1	0	0	2
5	4	2	1	1	0
T...	31	8	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#34

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	0	1	0	0
2	4	1	0	0	3
3	2	0	1	1	0
4	9	3	1	1	4
5	14	3	5	4	2
T...	30	7	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#35

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	1	0	0	0
2	3	1	1	0	1
3	2	0	0	1	1
4	13	4	2	3	4
5	13	2	5	2	4
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#36
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	13	3	4	3	3
2	9	1	3	2	3
3	2	0	0	0	2
4	4	2	1	0	1
5	4	2	0	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#37
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	1	0	0
2	10	3	2	3	2
3	3	0	0	0	3
4	11	2	4	2	3
5	6	2	1	1	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#38
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	1	1	1	2
2	9	0	2	3	4
3	3	0	1	1	1
4	5	2	1	1	1
5	6	5	1	0	0
T...	28	8	6	6	8

Frequency Distribution for Q#39
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	2	0	0	0
2	12	3	5	1	3
3	8	1	2	2	3
4	8	1	0	3	4
5	1	1	0	0	0
T...	31	8	7	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#40
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	2	1	0	1
2	6	3	1	0	2
3	8	1	1	3	3
4	11	2	3	3	3
5	3	0	2	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#41
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	0	1	0	0
2	8	2	2	1	3
3	5	1	1	2	1
4	15	4	4	3	4
5	3	1	0	0	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#42
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	0	0	1
2	3	1	2	0	0
3	15	1	4	5	5
4	12	5	2	1	4
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#43
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	7	3	0	1	3
2	8	4	0	3	1
3	1	0	0	0	1
4	7	1	3	0	3
5	9	0	5	2	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#44
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	15	4	3	3	5
2	9	2	3	2	2
3	3	2	1	0	0
4	4	0	1	1	2
T...	31	8	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#45
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	10	5	0	3	2
2	9	2	3	2	2
3	2	1	0	0	1
4	7	0	3	0	4
5	4	0	2	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#46
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	0	1	1
2	9	3	1	2	3
3	2	0	0	1	1
4	12	3	3	2	4
5	5	1	3	0	1
T...	31	8	7	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#47
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	0	1	0
2	4	0	2	0	2
3	12	2	3	4	3
4	11	4	2	1	4
5	3	1	1	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#48
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	2	0	0	3
2	10	0	4	2	4
3	5	3	0	1	1
4	8	2	2	2	2
5	2	0	2	0	0
T...	30	7	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#49
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	2	0	0	2
2	10	4	1	2	3
3	4	0	2	1	1
4	8	2	3	0	3
5	6	0	2	3	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#50
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	1	0	0	0
2	4	1	1	0	2
3	5	1	1	2	1
4	18	5	6	4	3
5	4	0	0	0	4
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#51

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	3	0	0	1
2	7	1	3	2	1
3	8	1	1	2	4
4	9	2	3	1	3
5	4	1	1	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#52

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	1	0	0	0
2	12	2	2	2	6
3	10	3	2	3	2
4	6	1	3	1	1
5	3	1	1	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#53

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	9	4	2	2	1
2	6	1	2	0	3
3	12	2	2	2	6
4	1	0	1	0	0
5	1	0	0	1	0
T...	29	7	7	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#54

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	6	5	1	0	0
2	6	2	1	2	1
3	3	0	0	1	2
4	11	1	4	2	4
5	3	0	0	1	2
T...	29	8	6	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#55

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	7	2	1	2	2
2	7	1	2	3	1
3	8	2	0	1	5
4	7	2	4	0	1
5	3	1	1	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#56
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	6	2	1	1	2
2	6	0	3	0	3
4	5	2	2	0	1
5	15	4	2	5	4
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#57
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
2	3	0	1	0	2
3	4	0	1	3	0
4	18	6	4	3	5
5	7	2	2	0	3
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#58
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	2	0	0
2	7	1	2	3	1
3	5	3	0	0	2
4	12	1	3	3	5
5	5	2	1	0	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#59
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	1	0	1
2	12	3	4	2	3
3	6	0	2	4	0
4	10	4	1	0	5
5	1	0	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#60
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	8	3	0	2	3
2	13	3	3	3	4
3	6	1	2	1	2
4	3	0	2	0	1
T...	30	7	7	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#61
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	0	0	1
2	6	0	1	3	2
3	10	3	5	0	2
4	12	4	1	2	5
5	1	0	1	0	0
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#62
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	0	0	1	0
2	2	1	0	0	1
3	6	0	3	2	1
4	16	6	2	2	6
5	6	1	3	0	2
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#63
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	1	1	0
2	16	2	3	4	7
3	1	1	0	0	0
4	9	4	3	1	1
5	2	0	1	0	1
T...	31	8	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#64
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	4	0	0	0
2	6	2	1	1	2
4	12	1	4	2	5
5	10	1	3	3	3
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#65
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	14	4	3	4	3
2	7	2	1	1	3
4	5	1	4	0	0
5	6	1	0	1	4
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#66
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	14	3	4	3	4
2	11	3	3	2	3
3	3	0	0	1	2
4	2	0	1	0	1
5	1	1	0	0	0
T...	31	7	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#67
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	6	1	2	1	2
2	6	1	2	0	3
3	2	0	0	2	0
4	12	3	3	2	4
5	6	3	1	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#68
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
2	2	0	0	1	1
3	2	0	1	1	0
4	19	5	4	3	7
5	9	3	3	1	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#69
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	23	4	7	4	8
2	7	3	1	1	2
5	1	1	0	0	0
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#70
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	1	0	0	4
2	10	5	1	3	1
3	9	1	5	1	2
4	6	1	2	1	2
5	2	0	0	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#71
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	0	0	1
2	8	2	3	1	2
3	3	0	1	2	0
4	16	4	2	3	7
5	3	1	2	0	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#72
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	0	0	2
2	10	4	3	1	2
3	3	0	0	3	0
4	10	1	3	2	4
5	6	2	2	0	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#73
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	0	1	0	0
2	7	1	4	1	1
3	4	1	0	1	2
4	14	5	2	4	3
5	6	1	1	0	4
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#74
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	2	0	0	0
2	10	2	3	1	4
3	10	3	2	3	2
4	8	0	3	2	3
5	1	1	0	0	0
6	1	0	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#75
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	6	1	2	1	2
2	13	3	3	4	3
3	2	0	0	0	2
4	6	1	3	0	2
5	5	3	0	1	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#76
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	1	0	0	0
2	7	1	1	1	4
3	14	4	3	3	4
4	4	1	1	1	1
5	3	1	1	0	1
T...	29	8	6	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#77
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	0	2	1	1
2	14	4	2	3	5
3	2	1	0	0	1
4	9	1	3	2	3
5	2	2	0	0	0
T...	31	8	7	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#78
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	0	0	2
2	7	1	2	2	2
3	1	1	0	0	0
4	18	4	5	4	5
5	3	1	1	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#79
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	0	2	0	1
2	19	5	6	4	4
3	4	1	0	1	2
4	2	0	0	1	1
5	4	2	0	0	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#80
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	6	2	2	1	1
2	10	1	3	1	5
3	1	0	0	1	0
4	9	2	2	2	3
5	5	3	1	1	0
T...	31	8	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#81

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	1	0	0	0
2	3	1	0	1	1
3	10	2	3	2	3
4	10	4	2	0	4
5	6	0	3	1	2
T...	30	8	8	4	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#82

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	6	1	2	2	1
2	10	3	3	1	3
3	6	1	0	2	3
4	5	2	1	0	2
5	4	1	2	1	0
T...	31	8	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#83

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	2	1	0	0	1
2	5	1	1	2	1
3	7	2	3	0	2
4	12	3	2	3	4
5	6	1	2	1	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#84

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	1	2	1	0
2	11	3	1	2	5
3	4	0	1	1	2
4	8	3	1	2	2
5	4	1	2	0	1
T...	31	8	7	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#85

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	9	2	3	3	1
2	7	2	2	0	3
3	15	4	3	3	5
4	1	0	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#86

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	2	0	0	1
2	4	1	0	0	3
3	5	1	0	2	2
4	14	2	6	3	3
5	5	2	2	0	1
T...	31	8	8	5	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#87

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	2	0	0	1
2	7	0	2	0	5
3	7	2	3	1	1
4	10	3	1	3	3
5	5	1	2	2	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#88

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	3	1	0	2	0
2	7	3	0	0	4
3	14	4	4	3	3
4	5	0	3	1	1
5	2	0	0	0	2
T...	31	8	7	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#89

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	7	2	3	1	1
2	13	4	3	2	4
3	5	1	1	1	2
4	5	0	1	2	2
5	2	1	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#90

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	7	2	2	2	1
2	6	3	1	1	1
3	2	0	0	0	2
4	11	2	3	2	4
5	6	1	2	1	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#91

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	1	2	0	2
2	10	3	3	1	3
3	8	1	2	1	4
4	6	2	1	2	1
5	3	1	0	2	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#92

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	3	2	0	0
2	10	2	2	2	4
3	5	1	0	2	2
4	9	1	3	2	3
5	3	1	1	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#93

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	1	3	0	1
2	14	5	2	3	4
3	5	0	2	0	3
4	6	1	1	3	1
5	2	1	0	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#94

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	1	2	0	1
2	8	4	1	1	2
3	14	3	5	4	2
4	4	0	0	0	4
5	1	0	0	1	0
T...	31	8	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#95

Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	3	2	0	0
2	15	3	5	4	3
3	5	1	1	1	2
4	5	0	0	1	4
5	1	1	0	0	0
T...	31	8	8	6	9

Frequency Distribution for Q#96
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	15	3	4	5	3
2	12	3	3	1	5
3	2	1	0	0	1
4	2	0	1	0	1
5	1	1	0	0	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#97
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	2	2	0	1
2	9	4	0	0	5
3	12	1	3	5	3
4	4	0	2	1	1
5	1	1	0	0	0
T...	31	8	7	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#98
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	4	2	1	1	0
2	10	1	2	3	4
3	2	1	0	1	0
4	12	4	3	1	4
5	4	0	2	0	2
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#99
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	5	1	2	1	1
2	15	3	4	2	6
3	5	1	0	2	2
4	4	1	1	1	1
5	3	2	1	0	0
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#100
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	9	3	1	3	2
2	9	3	1	2	3
4	6	0	4	1	1
5	8	2	2	0	4
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#101
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	1	1	0	0	0
2	7	0	1	3	3
3	5	2	0	1	2
4	16	5	5	2	4
5	3	0	2	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Frequency Distribution for Q#102
Split By: Group

	Total ...	Never discontinued...	Previously discontinue...	First-time discontinue...	Multiple discontinuation...
1	9	2	3	1	3
2	11	5	2	1	3
3	5	0	0	2	3
4	3	0	1	2	0
5	4	1	2	0	1
T...	32	8	8	6	10

Appendix I

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#1
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	3
P-Value	0.4408
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3306

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#1
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	127	16
Previously discontinued	8	152	19
First-time discontinued	5	52	10
Multiple discontinuations	10	165	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#2
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.5715
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5508

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#2
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	151	19
Previously discontinued	8	126	16
First-time discontinued	6	115	19
Multiple discontinuations	10	136	14

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#3
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3
P-Value	0.4072
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3710

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#3
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	158	20
Previously discontinued	8	138	17
First-time discontinued	6	68	11
Multiple discontinuations	10	164	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#4
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	5
P-Value	0.1543
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.1130

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#4
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	131	16
Previously discontinued	8	172	21
First-time discontinued	6	59	10
Multiple discontinuations	10	166	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#5
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.7855
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7769

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#5
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	144	18
Previously discontinued	8	137	17
First-time discontinued	5	70	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	145	14

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#6
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	6
P-Value	0.1285
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.0910

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#7
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	2
H	5
P-Value	0.1800
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.0923

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#8
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	3
H	7E-1
P-Value	0.8639
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7013

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#9
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.4964
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4318

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#10
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	5
P-Value	0.1760
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1597

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#6
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	166	21
Previously discontinued	8	100	12
First-time discontinued	5	54	11
Multiple discontinuations	8	116	14

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#7
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	147	18
Previously discontinued	8	104	13
First-time discontinued	5	112	22
Multiple discontinuations	10	133	13

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#8
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	112	14
Previously discontinued	8	142	18
First-time discontinued	6	103	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	171	17

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#9
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	7	138	20
Previously discontinued	8	100	12
First-time discontinued	6	100	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	159	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#10
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	174	22
Previously discontinued	8	92	12
First-time discontinued	6	107	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	156	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#11
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	4E-1
P-Value	0.9451
H corrected for ties	4E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9396

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#11
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	120	15
Previously discontinued	8	129	16
First-time discontinued	6	102	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	177	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#12
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3
P-Value	0.4529
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4128

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#12
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	154	19
Previously discontinued	8	146	18
First-time discontinued	6	101	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	127	13

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#13
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.7773
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7359

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#13
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	146	18
Previously discontinued	8	144	18
First-time discontinued	6	96	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	142	14

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#14
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3
P-Value	0.4087
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3213

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#14
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	146	18
Previously discontinued	8	126	16
First-time discontinued	5	99	20
Multiple discontinuations	10	124	12

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#15
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	8E-1
P-Value	0.8546
H corrected for ties	8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8425

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#15
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	151	19
Previously discontinued	8	119	15
First-time discontinued	6	97	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	161	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#16
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	5
P-Value	0.1763
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1481

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#16
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	148	18
Previously discontinued	8	172	22
First-time discontinued	6	83	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	125	12

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#17
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.6583
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6138

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#17
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	102	13
Previously discontinued	8	128	16
First-time discontinued	5	84	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	181	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#18
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	7E-1
P-Value	0.8706
H corrected for ties	8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8572

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#18
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	142	18
Previously discontinued	8	130	16
First-time discontinued	6	110	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	147	15

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#19
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.6185
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5949

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#19
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	106	13
Previously discontinued	8	139	17
First-time discontinued	6	92	15
Multiple discontinuations	10	190	19

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#20
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.7004
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6669

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#20
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	114	14
Previously discontinued	8	118	15
First-time discontinued	6	114	19
Multiple discontinuations	10	180	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#21
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	3
P-Value	0.4438
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3839

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#21
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	157	20
Previously discontinued	8	140	17
First-time discontinued	6	69	12
Multiple discontinuations	10	162	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#22
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	8
P-Value	0.0491
H corrected for ties	9
Tied P-Value	0.0350

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#22
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	192	24
Previously discontinued	8	92	12
First-time discontinued	6	86	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	158	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#23
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.4967
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4579

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#23
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	136	17
Previously discontinued	8	146	18
First-time discontinued	6	70	12
Multiple discontinuations	8	112	14

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#24
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	7E-1
P-Value	0.8745
H corrected for ties	8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8422

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#24
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	130	16
Previously discontinued	8	115	14
First-time discontinued	6	105	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	178	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#25
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.6773
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6242

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#25
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	122	15
Previously discontinued	8	143	18
First-time discontinued	6	118	20
Multiple discontinuations	10	144	14

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#26
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5838
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5487

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#26
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	150	19
Previously discontinued	8	151	19
First-time discontinued	6	85	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	142	14

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#27
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.6783
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5762

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#27
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	103	13
Previously discontinued	8	130	16
First-time discontinued	5	82	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	182	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#28
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	1
P-Value	0.7346
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.6945

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#28
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	108	14
Previously discontinued	8	140	18
First-time discontinued	5	72	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	176	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#29
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	6
P-Value	0.1360
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.1192

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#29
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	151	19
Previously discontinued	8	103	13
First-time discontinued	6	68	11
Multiple discontinuations	10	206	21

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#30
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.6416
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5306

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#30
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	7	100	14
Previously discontinued	8	127	16
First-time discontinued	6	121	20
Multiple discontinuations	10	148	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#31
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5875
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5520

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#31
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	104	13
Previously discontinued	8	146	18
First-time discontinued	6	94	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	184	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#32
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.5808
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5603

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#32
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	110	14
Previously discontinued	8	118	15
First-time discontinued	6	108	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	192	19

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#33
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.6827
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6446

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#33
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	140	18
Previously discontinued	8	104	13
First-time discontinued	6	90	15
Multiple discontinuations	9	160	18

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#34
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	3
P-Value	0.4315
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3670

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#34
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	7	110	16
Previously discontinued	8	137	17
First-time discontinued	6	112	19
Multiple discontinuations	9	106	12

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#35
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.6007
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5408

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#35
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	108	14
Previously discontinued	8	159	20
First-time discontinued	6	96	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	164	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#36
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.5868
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5567

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#36
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	153	19
Previously discontinued	8	108	14
First-time discontinued	6	88	15
Multiple discontinuations	10	179	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#37
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3E-1
P-Value	0.9513
H corrected for ties	4E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9455

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#37
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	125	16
Previously discontinued	8	130	16
First-time discontinued	6	94	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	179	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#38
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	8
P-Value	0.0378
H corrected for ties	9
Tied P-Value	0.0304

4 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#38
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	170	21
Previously discontinued	6	84	14
First-time discontinued	6	69	12
Multiple discontinuations	8	82	10

4 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#39
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	5
P-Value	0.1552
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.1235

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#39
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	104	13
Previously discontinued	7	80	11
First-time discontinued	6	125	21
Multiple discontinuations	10	187	19

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#40
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	4
P-Value	0.2593
H corrected for ties	4
Tied P-Value	0.2310

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#40
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	90	11
Previously discontinued	8	158	20
First-time discontinued	6	116	19
Multiple discontinuations	10	164	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#41
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	9E-1
P-Value	0.8156
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7839

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#41
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	142	18
Previously discontinued	8	112	14
First-time discontinued	6	96	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	178	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#42
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	1
P-Value	0.7540
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7015

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#42
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	151	19
Previously discontinued	8	113	14
First-time discontinued	6	92	15
Multiple discontinuations	10	172	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#43
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	11
P-Value	0.0126
H corrected for ties	12
Tied P-Value	0.0092

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#43
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	78	10
Previously discontinued	8	200	25
First-time discontinued	6	94	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	156	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#44
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	3E-1
P-Value	0.9855
H corrected for ties	3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9573

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#44
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	124	16
Previously discontinued	8	140	17
First-time discontinued	6	94	16
Multiple discontinuations	9	139	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#45
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	9
P-Value	0.0258
H corrected for ties	10
Tied P-Value	0.0191

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#45
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	78	10
Previously discontinued	8	181	23
First-time discontinued	6	77	13
Multiple discontinuations	10	192	19

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#46
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	5
P-Value	0.1835
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1507

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#46
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	116	15
Previously discontinued	7	156	22
First-time discontinued	6	72	12
Multiple discontinuations	10	150	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#47
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.6053
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5643

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#47
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	154	19
Previously discontinued	8	126	16
First-time discontinued	6	76	13
Multiple discontinuations	10	174	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#48
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3
P-Value	0.3703
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3396

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#48
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	7	109	16
Previously discontinued	8	150	19
First-time discontinued	5	88	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	118	12

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#49
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	6
P-Value	0.1002
H corrected for ties	7
Tied P-Value	0.0852

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#49
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	88	11
Previously discontinued	8	169	21
First-time discontinued	6	124	21
Multiple discontinuations	10	147	15

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#50
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.6129
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5280

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#50
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	110	14
Previously discontinued	8	128	16
First-time discontinued	6	94	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	196	20

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#51
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.8045
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7916

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#51
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	110	14
Previously discontinued	8	142	18
First-time discontinued	6	102	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	175	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#52
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5558
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5152

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#52
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	129	16
Previously discontinued	8	162	20
First-time discontinued	6	97	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	140	14

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#53
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	3
H	2
P-Value	0.4772
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4247

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#53
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	7	76	11
Previously discontinued	7	106	15
First-time discontinued	5	82	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	172	17

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#54
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	10
P-Value	0.0185
H corrected for ties	11
Tied P-Value	0.0129

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#54
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	58	7
Previously discontinued	6	97	16
First-time discontinued	6	103	17
Multiple discontinuations	9	178	20

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#55
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	4
P-Value	0.2374
H corrected for ties	4
Tied P-Value	0.2176

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#55
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	139	17
Previously discontinued	8	161	20
First-time discontinued	6	60	10
Multiple discontinuations	10	168	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#56
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.4770
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4190

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#56
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	137	17
Previously discontinued	8	112	14
First-time discontinued	6	128	21
Multiple discontinuations	10	150	15

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#57
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	3
P-Value	0.3866
H corrected for ties	4
Tied P-Value	0.2902

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#57
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	157	20
Previously discontinued	8	132	16
First-time discontinued	6	66	11
Multiple discontinuations	10	174	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#58
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.5075
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4747

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#58
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	130	16
Previously discontinued	8	112	14
First-time discontinued	6	86	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	200	20

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#59
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5176
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.4757

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#59
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	136	17
Previously discontinued	8	104	13
First-time discontinued	6	93	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	195	20

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#60
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	5
P-Value	0.1608
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.1228

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#60
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	7	83	12
Previously discontinued	7	152	22
First-time discontinued	6	78	13
Multiple discontinuations	10	152	15

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#61
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	7E-1
P-Value	0.8657
H corrected for ties	8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8468

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#62
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	3
P-Value	0.4258
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3500

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#63
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5864
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5219

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#64
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	8
P-Value	0.0503
H corrected for ties	9
Tied P-Value	0.0354

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#65
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5489
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5011

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#61
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	140	18
Previously discontinued	8	128	16
First-time discontinued	5	66	13
Multiple discontinuations	10	162	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#62
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	136	17
Previously discontinued	8	140	18
First-time discontinued	5	49	10
Multiple discontinuations	10	171	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#63
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	145	18
Previously discontinued	8	142	18
First-time discontinued	6	73	12
Multiple discontinuations	9	136	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#64
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	69	9
Previously discontinued	8	156	20
First-time discontinued	6	123	20
Multiple discontinuations	10	180	18

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#65
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	120	15
Previously discontinued	8	135	17
First-time discontinued	6	78	13
Multiple discontinuations	10	194	19

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#66
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	4E-1
P-Value	0.9383
H corrected for ties	5E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9221

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#67
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.5600
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5280

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#68
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5582
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4417

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#69
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	2
H	2
P-Value	0.5385
H corrected for ties	4
Tied P-Value	0.2919

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#70
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3
P-Value	0.3435
H corrected for ties	4
Tied P-Value	0.3141

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#66
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	7	114	16
Previously discontinued	8	120	15
First-time discontinued	6	90	15
Multiple discontinuations	10	174	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#67
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	163	20
Previously discontinued	8	117	15
First-time discontinued	6	101	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	147	15

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#68
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	154	19
Previously discontinued	8	144	18
First-time discontinued	6	75	12
Multiple discontinuations	10	156	16

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#69
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	160	20
Previously discontinued	8	111	14
First-time discontinued	5	75	15
Multiple discontinuations	10	150	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#70
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	103	13
Previously discontinued	8	166	21
First-time discontinued	6	110	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	149	15

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#71
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	6E-2
P-Value	0.9982
H corrected for ties	7E-2
Tied P-Value	0.9953

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#71
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	132	16
Previously discontinued	8	136	17
First-time discontinued	6	95	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	165	16

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#72
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	8E-1
P-Value	0.8579
H corrected for ties	8E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8445

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#72
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	116	15
Previously discontinued	8	149	19
First-time discontinued	6	96	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	166	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#73
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	4
P-Value	0.2235
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1812

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#73
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	142	18
Previously discontinued	8	90	11
First-time discontinued	6	94	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	202	20

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#74
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.5880
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5656

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#74
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	102	13
Previously discontinued	8	137	17
First-time discontinued	6	113	19
Multiple discontinuations	10	176	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#75
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.6925
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6620

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#75
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	157	20
Previously discontinued	8	120	15
First-time discontinued	6	86	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	166	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#76
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	8E-1
P-Value	0.8530
H corrected for ties	9E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8250

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#77
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.7590
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7214

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#78
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	6E-1
P-Value	0.9040
H corrected for ties	7E-1
Tied P-Value	0.8734

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#79
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	5
P-Value	0.1806
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.1019

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#80
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	2
P-Value	0.6762
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6507

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#76
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	120	15
Previously discontinued	6	104	17
First-time discontinued	5	76	15
Multiple discontinuations	10	134	13

3 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#77
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	152	19
Previously discontinued	7	103	15
First-time discontinued	6	87	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	154	15

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#78
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	133	17
Previously discontinued	8	148	18
First-time discontinued	6	96	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	152	15

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#79
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	150	19
Previously discontinued	8	82	10
First-time discontinued	6	104	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	192	19

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#80
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	150	19
Previously discontinued	8	114	14
First-time discontinued	6	105	18
Multiple discontinuations	9	127	14

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#81
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	3
P-Value	0.4638
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4246

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#81
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	101	13
Previously discontinued	8	150	19
First-time discontinued	4	50	12
Multiple discontinuations	10	164	16

2 cases were omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#82
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3E-1
P-Value	0.9563
H corrected for ties	3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9561

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#82
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	137	17
Previously discontinued	8	126	16
First-time discontinued	6	87	14
Multiple discontinuations	9	146	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#83
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3E-1
P-Value	0.9563
H corrected for ties	3E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9548

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#83
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	120	15
Previously discontinued	8	138	17
First-time discontinued	6	101	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	170	17

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#84
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2E-1
P-Value	0.9756
H corrected for ties	2E-1
Tied P-Value	0.9730

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#84
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	132	17
Previously discontinued	7	115	16
First-time discontinued	6	87	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	162	16

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#85
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	3
H	2
P-Value	0.5682
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5378

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#85
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	132	16
Previously discontinued	8	113	14
First-time discontinued	6	87	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	196	20

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#86
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	5
P-Value	0.1759
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.1381

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#87
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	6
P-Value	0.1142
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.0981

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#88
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	5
P-Value	0.1806
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1402

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#89
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.4771
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.4388

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#90
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.7037
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6815

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#86
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	116	15
Previously discontinued	8	175	22
First-time discontinued	5	78	16
Multiple discontinuations	10	126	13

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#87
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	130	16
Previously discontinued	8	138	17
First-time discontinued	6	142	24
Multiple discontinuations	10	118	12

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#88
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	93	12
Previously discontinued	7	151	22
First-time discontinued	6	84	14
Multiple discontinuations	10	168	17

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#89
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	118	15
Previously discontinued	8	105	13
First-time discontinued	6	111	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	194	19

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#90
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	111	14
Previously discontinued	8	140	18
First-time discontinued	6	90	15
Multiple discontinuations	10	186	19

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#91
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	6
P-Value	0.1189
H corrected for ties	6
Tied P-Value	0.1021

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#91
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	138	17
Previously discontinued	8	103	13
First-time discontinued	6	145	24
Multiple discontinuations	10	142	14

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#92
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.6489
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.6254

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#92
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	104	13
Previously discontinued	8	133	17
First-time discontinued	6	107	18
Multiple discontinuations	10	184	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#93
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	2
P-Value	0.5510
H corrected for ties	2
Tied P-Value	0.5065

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#93
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	124	16
Previously discontinued	8	106	13
First-time discontinued	6	120	20
Multiple discontinuations	10	178	18

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q# 94
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	4
P-Value	0.2501
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.2011

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q# 94
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	95	12
Previously discontinued	8	111	14
First-time discontinued	6	118	20
Multiple discontinuations	9	172	19

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q# 95
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	7
P-Value	0.0841
H corrected for ties	8
Tied P-Value	0.0552

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q# 95
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	102	13
Previously discontinued	8	94	12
First-time discontinued	6	103	17
Multiple discontinuations	9	197	22

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#96
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	4
P-Value	0.2783
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.2073

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#97
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	4
P-Value	0.2126
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1770

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#98
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	3
P-Value	0.3880
H corrected for ties	3
Tied P-Value	0.3462

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#99
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.7509
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7144

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#100
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	5
P-Value	0.2063
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1800

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#96
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	149	19
Previously discontinued	8	127	16
First-time discontinued	6	62	10
Multiple discontinuations	10	190	19

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#97
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	98	12
Previously discontinued	7	124	18
First-time discontinued	6	131	22
Multiple discontinuations	10	143	14

One case was omitted due to missing values.

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#98
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	120	15
Previously discontinued	8	150	19
First-time discontinued	6	69	12
Multiple discontinuations	10	189	19

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#99
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	154	19
Previously discontinued	8	116	15
First-time discontinued	6	102	17
Multiple discontinuations	10	154	15

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#100
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	114	14
Previously discontinued	8	162	20
First-time discontinued	6	64	11
Multiple discontinuations	10	188	19

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#101
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	4
H	4
P-Value	0.2204
H corrected for ties	5
Tied P-Value	0.1629

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#101
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	130	16
Previously discontinued	8	174	22
First-time discontinued	6	69	12
Multiple discontinuations	10	154	15

Kruskal-Wallis Test for Q#102
Grouping Variable: Group

DF	3
# Groups	4
# Ties	5
H	1
P-Value	0.7392
H corrected for ties	1
Tied P-Value	0.7172

Kruskal-Wallis Rank Info for Q#102
Grouping Variable: Group

	Count	Sum Ranks	Mean Rank
Never discontinued	8	116	14
Previously discontinued	8	133	17
First-time discontinued	6	120	20
Multiple discontinuations	10	160	16

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.013	043	I am experiencing a shortage of money right now.	Never discontinued	10
			Previously discontinued	25
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.019	054	I have had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.	Never discontinued	7
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	20
0.026	045	I consider myself to be poor financially.	Never discontinued	10
			Previously discontinued	23
			First-time discontinued	13
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.049	022	I have plenty of money right now.	Never discontinued	24
			Previously discontinued	12
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.050	064	I am absent from school more than 10 days or 10 classes each year.	Never discontinued	9
			Previously discontinued	20
			First-time discontinued	20
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.084	095	I am neither comfortable with nor a part of my peer-group, family, or other associations.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	12
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	22
0.100	049	Teachers are more concerned with controlling students than with teaching them.	Never discontinued	11
			Previously discontinued	21
			First-time discontinued	21
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.114	087	I think about myself as a winner.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	24
			Multiple discontinuations	12
0.119	091	Working with a Counsellor or Resource teacher would not help me.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	13
			First-time discontinued	24
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.129	006	The process of registration and placement is acceptable.	Never discontinued	21
			Previously discontinued	12
			First-time discontinued	11
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.136	029	I think RDPC is a safe, nurturing place.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	13
			First-time discontinued	11
			Multiple discontinuations	21

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.138	038	I have never had involuntary contact with law enforcement officers.	Never discontinued	21
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	10
0.154	004	My teachers are able to meet my needs.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	21
			First-time discontinued	10
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.155	039	My teachers are unable to meet my needs.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	11
			First-time discontinued	21
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.161	060	Most teachers dislike me and I dislike them.	Never discontinued	12
			Previously discontinued	22
			First-time discontinued	13
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.172	002	I have a hard time learning things that most other people learn easily.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	19
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.176	086	I am comfortable with and a part of my peer-group, family, and other associations.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	22
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	13
0.176	010	I consider myself to be well-off financially.	Never discontinued	22
			Previously discontinued	12
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.176	016	I believe that my behaviour is the same as that of other people.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	22
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	12
0.180	007	I have lived in the same house or apartment for more than 5 years.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	13
			First-time discontinued	22
			Multiple discontinuations	13
0.181	088	I dislike the school's focus on socialization.	Never discontinued	12
			Previously discontinued	22
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.181	079	I feel unlucky when I am unsuccessful.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	10
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	19

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.184	046	I do not feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	22
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.206	100	I have lived in the same house or apartment for less than 5 years.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	20
			First-time discontinued	11
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.213	097	Our teachers use unsatisfactory instructional methods.	Never discontinued	12
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	22
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.220	101	Adequate information about school policies and procedures is available.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	22
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.224	073	I feel lucky when I am successful.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	11
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	20
0.237	055	Success in school is more important than my family life.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	20
			First-time discontinued	10
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.250	094	My ethnic background makes things difficult for me.	Never discontinued	12
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	20
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.259	040	The process of registration and placement is unacceptable.	Never discontinued	11
			Previously discontinued	20
			First-time discontinued	19
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.278	096	I think about myself as a loser.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	10
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.344	070	I am unaware of my strengths and weaknesses.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	21
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.370	048	Special Services has tested my ability and achievement levels.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	19
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	12

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.387	057	I control my successes and failures in life.	Never discontinued	20
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	11
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.388	098	Groups other than my family offer me supports and incentives to stay in school.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	19
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.407	003	The school curriculum meets my needs.	Never discontinued	20
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	11
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.409	014	I will not be married, nor have a baby, within a year.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	20
			Multiple discontinuations	12
0.426	062	I enjoy taking on new tasks.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	10
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.432	034	When I fail, it is because I did not really try hard.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	19
			Multiple discontinuations	12
0.441	001	I complete tests and assignments well.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	19
			First-time discontinued	10
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.444	021	I dislike taking on new tasks.	Never discontinued	20
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.453	012	I am a smart person.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	13
0.464	081	Working with a Counsellor or Resource Teacher would help me.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	19
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.477	056	I have not been abused in some way.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	21
			Multiple discontinuations	15

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.477	089	Adequate information about school policies and procedures is not available.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	13
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.477	053	I would do better in school if I were male.	Never discontinued	11
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.496	009	I am aware of my strengths and weaknesses.	Never discontinued	20
			Previously discontinued	12
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.497	023	My use of alcohol/drugs is not a cause of concern.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.508	058	Special Services has not tested my ability and achievement levels.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	20
0.518	059	Teachers are more concerned with teaching students than with controlling them.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	13
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	20
0.539	069	English is not the language I speak best.	Never discontinued	20
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.549	065	I have been abused in some way.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	13
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.551	093	I feel bad when I am at school.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	13
			First-time discontinued	20
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.556	052	The school curriculum does not meet my needs.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	20
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.558	068	When I succeed it is because I tried hard.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	16

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.560	067	Members of my family get along well with each other.	Never discontinued	20
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.581	032	I believe that my behaviour sets me apart from other people.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.584	026	My study skills and work habits are better than most student's.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	19
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.596	063	Most tasks that I do not complete are too hard to do.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	12
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.597	036	I have never retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.598	031	People dislike working with me because I tend to be unsuccessful.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.598	074	I dislike the school's focus on academics.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	19
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.598	085	My ethnic background makes things easy for me.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	20
0.601	035	I like myself.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	20
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.605	047	Our teachers use satisfactory instructional methods.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	13
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.613	050	Most teachers like me and I like them.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	20

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.619	019	Members of my family do not get along well with each other.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	19
0.642	030	School documents are neither accurate nor readily accessible.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	20
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.649	092	My parents, teachers, administrators, and I neither cooperate nor work as a team to my benefit.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.658	017	Other people control my successes and failures in life.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.676	080	I am absent from school less than 10 days or 10 classes each year.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.677	025	I have retaken subjects, been retained at grade level, or discontinued subjects at some point.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	20
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.678	027	I will be married, or have a baby, or both within a year.	Never discontinued	13
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.683	033	I would do better in school if I were female.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	13
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.693	075	My parent(s)/guardian(s) have completed high school.	Never discontinued	20
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.700	020	No-one offers me supports or incentives to stay in school.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	19
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.704	090	My parent(s)/guardian(s) have not completed high school.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	19

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.735	028	I am important to society.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.739	102	I think RDPC is an unsafe, punishing place.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	20
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.751	099	I have spoken with authorities to plan my future.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.754	042	People enjoy working with me because I tend to be successful.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.759	077	I do not work at tasks until they are completed successfully.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.777	013	I have not spoken with authorities to plan my future.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.796	005	I like the school's focus on academics.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	14
0.805	051	I learn things easily that most other people have a hard time learning.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.816	041	Most tasks that I complete are easy to do.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.853	076	School documents are both accurate and readily accessible.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	13
0.855	015	I am unimportant to society.	Never discontinued	19
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	16

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.858	072	Many adults complain to me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	19
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.864	008	English is the language I speak best.	Never discontinued	14
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.866	061	I like the school's focus on socialization.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	13
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.871	018	My family life is more important than success in school.	Never discontinued	18
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.875	024	I am not a smart person.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	14
			First-time discontinued	18
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.904	078	Many adults compliment me about my behaviour, attitude, or self-discipline frequently.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	18
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.936	066	I dislike myself.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	15
			First-time discontinued	15
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.945	011	I feel influenced by others to behave in certain ways.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.951	037	My study skills and work habits are not as good as most student's.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	18
0.959	083	I feel good when I am at school.	Never discontinued	15
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	17
			Multiple discontinuations	17
0.959	082	My parents, teachers, administrators, and I cooperate and work as a team to my benefit.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	16

Appendix J

Four group analysis: significance of stressors

P-Value	Question #	Stressor	Group	Mean rank
0.966	044	My use of alcohol/drugs is a cause of concern.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	15
0.976	084	I complete tests and assignments poorly.	Never discontinued	17
			Previously discontinued	16
			First-time discontinued	14
			Multiple discontinuations	16
0.996	071	I work at tasks until they are completed successfully.	Never discontinued	16
			Previously discontinued	17
			First-time discontinued	16
			Multiple discontinuations	16