

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTING AS PERCEIVED
BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
IN THE AREAS OF ACADEMICS
AND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

By

BARRY ROSS WEATHERS

Bachelor of Science in Agriculture

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1982

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December 1988

Young and ...

Thesis
1988
W36ae
cop. 2

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTING AS PERCEIVED
BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS
IN THE AREAS OF ACADEMICS
AND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Thesis Approved

Wesley Holley

Thesis Advisor

James D. White

Eddy Finley

Norman N. Durham

Dean of Graduate College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I.	INTRODUCTION..... 1
	Statement of Problem..... 4
	Purpose..... 4
	Objectives..... 5
	Assumptions and Limitations..... 5
	Definitions..... 6
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... 7
	Introduction..... 7
	Sociocultural Patterns..... 8
	Financial Adequacy..... 10
	Developmental Tasks..... 11
	Role Models for Adolescents..... 12
	Academic Achievement..... 13
	The School's Role..... 15
	Summary of Literature..... 15
III.	METHODOLOGY..... 17
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA..... 21
V.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 100
	Summary..... 100
	Findings..... 104
	Conclusions..... 109
	Recommendations..... 113
	BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 115
	APPENDIX 117

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The 1980's have brought about some dramatic changes in many family units. Family units were once thought to be comprised of a father, a mother, and children. In the early portion of the twentieth century this was the normal situation. Also, at the turn of the century the father was the mainstay of the family's economic base. The husband and wife may not have traveled more than a few miles from their birthplace to raise a family of their own. However, since World War II these family units have become more mobile and more susceptible to rapid change.

Today's society, characterized as it is by change, mobility, and isolation, has lost much of its traditional ability to hold out a safety net for its members in the form of community, church and extended family support networks. (Ourth, 1982, pg. 33)

These changes have increased tensions for adults and children alike. The most alarming and dramatic change has been the dissolution of the family unit through divorce. Since 1960 the American public has seen a rapid rise in the number of divorces.

In 1960 sixteen percent of the families in America were single-parent families, by 1980 this figure had risen to 26.5 percent. This high figure has a direct correlation to the fact that 9.6 percent of the population lives below the poverty level and forty percent of the 9.6

percent are single-parent families. (Spencer, 1982, p. 3)

"Ninety percent of these single parent families are headed by mothers and the remaining ten percent by fathers."

(Bureau of Census 1982) These changes in marital status often affect the children of the adults involved. Adults are commonly considered a stabilizing influence in the lives of most adolescents. So, when the adults lives are violently disrupted by divorce, death, or separation, the children are often there to receive whatever shockwaves are manifested. Often-times these children experience direct as well as residual effects of divorce and/or single-parenting. The shock waves often pour through the students school behavior, academic performance, and involvement in extra-curricular activities. According to Mitchell Lazarus,

There is no more traumatic event in a child's life than the loss of a parent, whether by separation, or divorce, or by death. Any major disruption in family life brings with it the potential for stress, anxiety, or depression especially among young children, who are not equipped to understand complex emotion and motivations of grownups they have so trustingly depended on all of their lives. It would be wishful thinking to assume the confusion, insecurity and even guilt that children often feel when their parents part won't sometimes spill into their school lives. (Lazarus, 1980, pg. 31)

The study of the effects of divorce on children becomes more pertinent in certain areas where the divorce rate reaches or exceeds the fifty percent level.

The effects of divorce on children often times depends on the age and developmental stage. According to Erikson additional stressors in the development process can result in the development of a low self-image. If the separation or divorce occurs prior to resolution of identity during adolescence, any number of problems can arise depending upon developmental stage. The five states which we are most concerned with are; trust versus mistrust, autonomy versus shame and doubt, initiative versus guilt, industry versus inferiority, identity versus identity confusion.

Each stage become a crisis because of incipient growth and awareness in a new part function go together with a shift in instinctual energy and yet cause a specific vulnerability. (Erikson, 1968, pg. 95)

During each of the developmental stages a child must pass through and resolve the tasks individually. However, with the aid of the family unit support, the child is able to develop a more positive self-image. As the child passes through these stages there are many decisions to be made and if the family unit is in the process of dissolution, the support base for the child will not be present to adequately resolve the tasks.

Crucial to adolescent development is the gradual process of separation from parental authority and the strengthening of personal autonomy. The key word is "gradual", since separation is a lengthy process not an event. Those youngsters for whom separation becomes an event for instance, through death of a parent, divorce that denies contact with non-custodial parent, running away, and other traumas, are at considerable risk of becoming one of the dreadful statistics. (Lipsitz, 1983, p. 10).

The effects of divorce on children in the school system deserves closer look. It is obvious that there are some definite observable effects of divorce on children in schools. However, insignificant the effects may seem to the adults, the child may not view it as such. The reduction of support base in the family unit may also cause the child to alter previously established habits in academics and extra-curricular activities. These two items will be the basis for research undertaken by this study. We will also look at some specific factors associated with why the student has had a reduction in performance of academics and activities.

Problem Statement

Many adolescents have their lives dramatically changed by divorce of their parents. This disruption of lifestyle often leads to a change in academic standing and the level of involvement in extra-curricular activities.

Purpose

This study was to determine if there was in fact a quantifiable difference between those students living with two parents and those living with a single-parent, as it impacts on extracurricular activities and academic performance.

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Determine the percent of students in the school system living in single-parent families, from the sample.
2. Compare the level of academic performance between students with two-parent and one-parent families.
3. Compare the level of involvement by number of activities participated in, by students with two-biological parents and those with single-parents.
4. Compare the barriers to involvement in extra-curricular activities as perceived by the student in a two-parent family unit and a single-parent family unit.

Assumptions and Limitations

It was assumed that high school students will respond to the survey as honestly as possible. It was further assumed that the students will be able to identify the barriers to participation in extra-curricular activities. The study was limited to high school students in a major urban high school grades 9 through 12. The basic assumption to this study was that, the sample used was representative of the entire student population.

Definitions

The following definitions are used to delineate the basic concepts of the study. They are as follows:

Two-Parent Family is husband and wife and their children living together in a dwelling unit without the presence of other adults.

Single-parent Family consists of one parent and dependent children living in the same household. Literature on the family uses both one-parent and single parent to describe the parent with custody of children heading a family.

Extra-Curricular Activities are those activities outside regular curriculum of the school.

Sociocultural Pattern are the patterns or trends that tend to present themselves in a particular society.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Single-parent families have increased rapidly during the past two and a half decades. This rapid change has altered the perception and view of the family unit. The change in family structure due to the absence of one parent is believed to be directly related to socio-cultural patterns, financial adequacy, developmental tasks of youth, role modeling of adolescents, academic achievement, delinquency, and the schools role in the community.

This review of literature can be divided into two sections the first section of this review basically deals with the effects and trends of divorce. The subsequent sections relate how divorce affects the children involved as they progress toward adulthood. The review of literature lays down the background for this study. Single-parent families as a result of divorce or separation will be the focus of this review of literature. About 90 percent of all single-parent families are headed by the mother, the remaining 10 percent are led by the father.

Several studies of the effects of divorce have been conducted, the effects of divorce on children has been done indirectly. This study hopes to add a little light on a

foggy area, and hopefully initiate other studies in this vitally important area.

Sociocultural Patterns

Patterns in modern day society deserve a close observation to determine the direction of modern American culture. Some of the most alarming statistics come from the area of family life and family units. To be more precise divorce rates and the number of single-parent families has risen to an all-time high of 26.5 percent in 1982. Between 1970 and 1980 the number of divorces increased by 111 percent nationwide with particular areas of the nation even higher. More than one million children experience divorce in any given year. In 1960 87.5 percent of all children lived with two parents, by 1978 this had fallen to 77.7 at the current rate of 1990 only seventy percent of nation's children will live with two parents. Yes, this might be considered a crisis, quite often with divorce comes the disruption of daily life. Many times a move to another city or to another school system is associated with the dissolution of the parents marriage.

Perhaps the separation has brought with it a move away from the child's familiar neighborhood and friends; perhaps it has brought with it sudden and severe economic constraints; perhaps it has added new and daily responsibilities for the child's or perhaps the child feels torn between mother and father. (Ourth, 1982, pg. 40)

These additional changes can magnify the stress developed by the separation.

However, not all of the effects of divorce are negative. Occasionally, the end result is a more positive environment. This is resultant from a situation where the one or both parents are abusive, either physically, mentally, or verbally to each other or to the children.

It is easy to sense a crisis in these trends, easy to fall back on the old stereo types of the "broken home". But to do that is to brand single-parents and their children with the perjorative label "disadvantaged" ignoring the many stable, and nurturing families that are headed by one-parent alone and many children are from such homes who do well in school and grow in independence and resiliency.

This type of single-parent household appears to be in the minority. The number of children with deep seeded emotional problems arising from divorce is hard to determine. These problems are often reflected in anger, anxiety, confusion, and depression. These are symptoms which may be carried into the subsequent remarriage of a parent.

Remarriage is a very real probability for the resulting parents. Parents look for the companionship of a new mate.

Remarriage will be a reality for many families, for about three-fourths of all divorced women and about five-sixths of divorced men remarry. However, there is evidence that the remarriage rate is declining for divorced persons. Nevertheless, the average time between becoming a single-parent and remarriage is 4.5 years. While these years may be perceived as short by the adult, they may constitute a substantial period of time in the life of a child. (Rowland, 1983, Pg. 1)

Financial Adequacy

One of the major resultant effects is the lowering of income. As was early stated, approximately ninety percent of all single-parent homes are headed by women. In 1980 the average income for a single-parent household was \$10,120. In a complete family unit with the father as the principal wage earner the average income was \$20,470, while when both father and mother were employed the median income was \$27,750. Many families income is a patchwork of earned income and transfer payments. Only about one-third of all formerly married women receive welfare assistance. About one-third of all female headed households receive child support payments. The median income for women with the combined resources above still was only a mere \$14,300 in 1978. Women in the work force often earn less than a man in an equivalent occupation. The reduction of income can precipitate many changes. The most significant change would be that of lifestyle. The family unit may be forced to move from a much lower rent area, with fewer amenities. Along with this reduction in amenities the family may have less to spend on extra-curricular activities at school, band instrument, athletic equipment, or vocational projects. If the child is old enough often times they will seek a menial job to substitute their own needs. Many teenagers will work in fast-food restaurants, or in another low-wage, tedious, and often dangerous job. These jobs often are dead-ends and numerous hours of work can lead to

lowered grades, and greater occupational deviance. However, it does suggest that many adolescents are accepting the work ethic and dispelling the devil may care attitude.

Developmental Tasks

During maturation there are several developmental tasks to be accomplished. Erikson, Piaget and others have suggested that this is a continual process with each step resolving a particular task then progressing onto the next step. Each of the tasks produces a given amount of anxiety and stress, with the resolution developing the individuals personality. With additional stress factors the resolution can be quite difficult. To be moving through the continuum without additional stressor can still result in a confused, isolationist. So, with the stress of a divorce a young person can develop a very poor self-image.

Self-image is extremely important. A person that has a poor self-image will not be as productive as the person that possesses a positive self-image. The person with a poor self-image will never have confidence, will seldom trust others and will develop a guilt sensation. Studies suggest that marital disruptions often hinder the development of a positive self-image.

Disturbances in self-esteem can be exacerbated when many changes occur at once, for instance, the onset of menstruation, a geographic move, and changing schools. It is difficult for adolescents to cope with internal and external

disruptions simultaneously. (Lipsitz, 1983, pg. 9)

The additional negative stimuli makes the process of developing a positive self-image much more difficult. For many young people, adolescence is a tough time with the development of self-image. The stimuli added by the dissolution of a family support group may be the type stress that causes this normally confusing time in life to be more than some individuals can handle. There are those that have the resiliency to actually reinforce their self-image.

Modeling as Role Models

As young people grow and develop, they learn through modeling. Modeling their own action after significant individuals involved with during their lives. The absence of one parent may have varied effects on children. With the presence of a female headed family unit, a young boy may appear to develop more feminine characteristics, with no male role model to pattern after. Also, on standard achievement test they respond in a more feminine manner, at a young age. Research suggests that children may be affected by the loss or limited availability of their father. The research, however, does not support the traditional interpretation that the loss of a father figure leads to antisocial behavior or feminization. "What they do suggest is that marital disruption is associated with life changes and stresses which make adequate parenting

more difficult for divorced mothers and growing up more difficult for children." Growing up is tough enough without the added stress of a single-parent.

The parent in one-parent families is usually perceived to be filling the dual role of mother and father in everyday life. In reality, this may not be possible. It is probable that the role enacted is more closely aligned to the customary expectation for fathers and mothers. (Rowland, 1983, pg. 8)

In role modeling the amount of time and quality of time is often essential to the outcome of the resultant personality. Evidence does not prove this point either way. Many factors become more recognizable during adolescence, peer groups, additional input from typically stereotyped schools and textbooks.

Academic Achievement

Achievement in school is based on many factors, motivation, intelligence scores, cognitive development, and other intrinsic factors. These factors are affected by divorce through additional stress. Stress factors can be in the form of reduced study time as a result in the need for a job. Alternatively increased mobility may affect academic performance, moving to a new school often has adverse effects on academic achievement.

Many of the factors that negatively influence achievement may be more readily found in one-parent homes. It does not necessarily say that single-parentness is the problem. (Zakariya, 1982, pg. 36)

Single-parenting, however, is found to harbor many of the attributes that cause the reduction of achievement. Reduced income, increased stress, and a confused atmosphere are just a few of the factors. Separation often brings about sudden and dramatic changes, such as a move to a new neighborhood, or perhaps the child feels torn between mother and father. Each of the factors develop a sense of confusion and may take its toll on the child's academic performance. Occasionally after a period of time the non-custodial parent will move, without forewarning children. This is commonly handled by the children in feelings of rejection and abandonment all over again. This second round of bad feelings may be reflected in severe drop in performance. Academic performance is affected by many variables, emotions are just one category, but a very influential category.

It is not to say that children in two parent families are not more academically advanced. However, among a sample of secondary school students, thirty-four percent of the one-parent students were low achievers versus only twenty-two percent of the two-parent students. It does, however, indicate that two-parent families have a more conducive atmosphere for the student to live and work. This sample does not allow for the dropouts. Dropouts in a single-parent family outnumber those in two-parent families two to one. "Students rarely drop out of school prior to high school, they do in high school, leaving a more

homogeneous (and presumably higher achieving) population."
(Meyers, 1982, pg. 7)

The Schools Role

The school's role in divorce is to serve as an institution with continuity toward developing positive self image.

If the school is to meet its educational obligations to all students, it must be aware of the needs of the community. That does not suggest that the school should intervene in the community or larger society; nor does it suggest that the school must take on problems beyond its proper sphere of responsibility. That proper sphere of responsibility, the clear cut responsibility of the school, is the children.
(Ourth, 1982, pg. 38)

The school is merely a facilitator of education. It is possible for educators to detect the negative signs that occur with the disruption of family life. Many times if extra support and reassurance does not come from the school it may be that it will not come from anywhere else.

Summary of Literature

The literature has shown that the effects of divorce are very diverse. It affects those adults and children in each family. Often times, the children are innocent bystanders that receive the fallout or shock waves. Divorce can have severe impact upon the families economic standing, this can start a ripple effect. The first, there is the move to less expensive housing, oftentimes in a new school district. These behaviors may include anxiety, reclusion,

anger, confusion, even depression. All of these additional stressors may combine to alter the individuals self-image during personality development. These stressors may also have adverse effects on the students' academic performance.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The study was designed to be descriptive in nature and to obtain information from students, grades nine through twelve, in a large urban school. The information was the students perceptions concerning their self-reported grade point average and participation in extracurricular activities. These student perceptions were evaluated with reference to current family conditions and with regard to single parent versus two parent households.

The study was conducted in the Spring of 1987. Prior to conducting the study a carefully developed proposal was developed and a written request, (see appendix), to the school administration made to receive permission to administer the questionnaire to the student body. After careful review of the proposal by two different levels of the school administration, building level administration and the assistant superintendent in charge of secondary education, the study was approved (see appendix).

Careful considerations were required in order to assure total student anonymity. The questionnaires were designed with no coding, or other systems where students could be identified. The questionnaires would be compiled only by the researcher and would not be available to others

for additional investigation. After the completion of the study and a report made, using average responses and cumulated data the instruments would be destroyed.

Study Population

The population for this study was 3,600 students, a large urban high school. The high school was composed of students from the ninth through the twelfth grades. The student population was relatively even in its distribution with 950 freshmen, 925 sophomores, 875 juniors, and 850 seniors. Due to this even distribution and a desire to make references to the entire student population a sample of students was deemed appropriate for the study. A sample of 100 students per class would achieve the desired number to be representative and insure a .95 confidence level. As part of the agreement for securing the data from the students the selection of the students would be arranged by the schools administration. Detailed instructions were provided with the questionnaires to this administration so that individuals administering the questionnaires would provide the students with the same information (appendix).

A random selection of classes was done by the administration to insure that a sample of approximately 100 students per class (freshmans, sophomores, juniors and seniors) would be selected. The selection of the classes were not selected by any presupposed condition or criteria. The classes selected to represent the student population

were....Freshman Civics and Oklahoma History; Sophomore, Biology; Juniors, American History or current events; Seniors, Family Relations and/or Child Development.

Development Of The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was developed after a review of the literature. In the literature several items were identified as common denominators for student achievement. The instrument was to determine to what extent these factors were affected by the type of family unit in which the student lived. The survey was developed in two segments. The initial segment was to identify students with common backgrounds. These common points were to include age, sex, grade, and type of family unit. The second segment was to closely examine barriers identified in the review of literature. Determination was to be made to what extent these barriers limited the students participation in extra-curricular activities. Several other studies were examined and problem areas were ascertained. These areas identified included social development, financial adequacy, social patterns and available role models. We were not directly able to survey all of these areas. With careful question development it was possible to obtain information on financial adequacy, social patterns and available role models. We were not directly able to survey all of these areas. With careful question development it was possible to obtain information

on financial adequacy, social pattern, social developments. The survey was developed with real limits to each of the questions in the second portion. This was to obtain numerical values for the responses.

Real Limits

0-1.49.....	Not Limiting
1.50-2.49.....	Slightly Limiting
2.50-3.49.....	Moderately Limiting
3.50-4.49.....	Limited
4.50-5.00.....	Severely Limited

A sample survey was field tested on a group of students. These students were allowed to fill out the questionnaire. The same students were then asked to identify questions they did not understand. The surveys were then modified to correct ambiguities identified by the test group.

Tests were then prepared for the individual teachers in their respective disciplines to distribute. To assist these teachers with the administration of the survey, an instruction sheet was developed and accompanied each set of survey forms. The actual surveys were to be distributed during April and May of 1987. It was also requested that only Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday be used. This was to prevent Monday-morning blah's and Friday's anticipation of the weekend.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter was an examination of the composite data and information compiled concerning the objectives of this survey. The data was gathered to determine perception of urban students regarding their self-reported grade point average and participation in extra-curricular activities. These results were broken down by grade level, and by family status whether single-parent or two parent. These perceptions were taken from 258 students in an urban school system with over 3600 students in grades 9-12, in May of 1987. The initial segment of this two part survey established the number males and females, it also determined the number of students living in a two-parent member household and those living single-parent household and their respective percentages. It also dealt with grade point average as reported by the student on a four-point basis. The number of different activities participated in during the year and the average number of activities per student during the year were also calculated. The initial portion is then broken down by grade classification, (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior). The remainder of the survey proceeds to identify items which limit the students' participation in extra-curricular activities.

From these two segments a composite was derived on each variable.

The composite information in Table I, on the first segment of the survey identified a total of 258 student, 132 (51.2%) males and 126 (48.8%) females. In this composite of the male population a grade point average of 2.49 was calculated. They participated in a total of 312 activities for an average of 2.36 activities per student per year. The male population consisted of 80 members from a two-parent family for 60.6 percent of the males and 31 percent of total population regardless of gender survey. The average grade point of these males was 2.54 as perceived and reported by themselves. They participated in 181 activities for an average of 2.26 activities participated in during the year per male respondent..

There were 52 males from single-parent homes, for a 39.4 percent of the males and 20.2 percent of all students surveyed. The average grade point of the group was 2.45 as perceived by themselves. These male's participated in 131 activities for an average of 2.51 activities per student. The male population did not have a dramatic variation in either grade point or participation in extra-curricular activities when compared on two-parent versus single parent households.

The composite information for the female population illustrated that 126 girls comprised 48.8 percent of the individuals surveyed. The average girls responded had a

TABLE I

ACTIVITIES AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE BY GENDER AND PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

COMPOSITE		Total Number Surveyed	Per-cent of Total Surveyed in Class	Per-cent of Total in Gender Surveyed	Grade Point Average	Total Number of Activities	Average Number of Activities Participated in during the Year
Males	Two-Parent	80	31.008	60.61	2.54	181	2.26
	Single-Parent	52	20.155	39.39	2.45	131	2.51
Sub-Total		132	51.163	100.00	2.49	312	2.36
Females	Two-Parent	74	28.682	58.73	3.01	226	3.05
	Single-Parent	52	20.155	41.27	2.22	91	1.75
Sub-Total		126	48.837	100.00	2.62	317	2.52
TOTAL		258	100.00			629	2.44

2.62 grade point average. These same girls participated in a total of 317 activities with an average of 2.52 activities per girl per year.

The breakdown of the girls shows 74 were living in two-parent households for 28.7 percent of the total population regardless of gender and 58.7 percent of the 126 girls surveyed. Girls in a two-parent household had a 3.01 grade point average. These 74 females participated in a total of 226 extra curricular activities, for an average of 3.05 activities participated in during the year per student.

The 52 girls from single-parent families were 20.2 percent of the total represents surveyed and 41.3 percent of the total females responding. The girls in the survey from single-parent families reported lower grade point average of 2.22 per student. They participated in 91 activities for an average of 1.75 activities per student per year. These are the composite results of the respondents to the questionnaire a further breakdown by class will give you additional data in addressing the objectives of the study.

The first class to be studied is the freshman class in Table II. In the freshman class 94 students were surveyed; 41 or 43.62 percent were male and 53 or 56.38 percent were female. The male in two-parent families totaled 24 or 25.53 percent of all freshmen regardless of gender and 58.54 percent of all freshmen males surveyed. These

Freshman males had a 2.70 self reported grade point average. They participated in 72 extra-curricular activities for an average of 3.0 activities per respondent per year.

There were 17 freshman boys in the survey from a single-parent household. This represented 18.09 percent of the freshman class regardless of gender and 41.46 of the freshman males. The grade point average was 2.48 as perceived by the student. These males participated in 40 activities for an average of 2.76 activities per student per year.

In reviewing the data for freshman females the 28 girls were from two-parent families which comprised 29.79 percent of freshman surveyed and 52.8 percent of the freshman females. Their reported 3.17 grade point average was the highest in the freshman class. These freshman females participated in 85 activities for an average of 3.6 activities per student during the year.

The 25 females from single-parent households were 26.6 percent of the freshmen class regardless of gender and 47.17 percent of the total number of girls in the freshman class. These female respondents reported a lower average gradepoint of 2.54 per girl. They participated in 37 total activities and for average of 1.48 activities per student per year. (See Table II)

The sophomore class differed from the freshman in average gradepoint and activity participation. There were

TABLE II

ACTIVITIES AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF FRESHMEN BY PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

FRESHMAN		Total Number Surveyed	Per-cent of Total Surveyed in Class	Per-cent of Total in Gender Surveyed	Grade Point Average	Total Number of Activities	Average Number of Activities Participated in during the Year
Males	Two-Parent	24	25.53	58.54	2.70	72	3.00
	Single-Parent	17	18.09	41.46	2.48	40	2.35
Sub-Total		41	43.62	100.00	2.59	112	2.73
Females	Two-Parent	28	29.78	52.83	3.17	85	3.60
	Single-Parent	25	26.60	47.17	2.54	37	1.48
Sub-Total		53	56.38	100.00	2.85	122	2.30
TOTAL		94	100.00		2.72	234	

65 sophomores surveyed; 34 males for 52.31 percent and 31 females for 47.79 percent of all sophomores in the survey. Twenty-one of the males were from two-parent households. This represents 32.31 percent of the sophomores surveyed and 61.76 of the sophomores surveyed. These boys had a 2.42 grade point average. They also participated in 49 activities for an average of 2.33 extra-curricular activities per boy during the year.

Thirteen sophomore males were from single-parent homes. This was 20.00 percent of the total class, which was also 38.24 percent of the sophomore males surveyed. The boys from single-parent families earned a 2.40 grade point average. These boys from single-parent homes participated in 48 extra-curricular activities for an average of 3.69 activities per student per year.

There were 31 female sophomore respondents. This was 47.79 percent of the total class surveyed regardless of gender. In the survey 19 girls were from two-parent homes for 29.23 percent of the class and 61.29 percent of the females surveyed. Their grade point average was perceived as 2.71. These girls participated in 83 extra-curricular activities for an average of 4.37 activities per student per year.

The sample also consisted of 12 females from single-parent families. This represented 18.46 percent of the sophomore class surveyed and 38.71 of the females surveyed. These girls had a perceived grade point average of 2.14.

These girls participated in 30 extra-curricular activities for an average of 2.50 activities per student per year.

(See Table III)

The junior class surveyed group was comprised of 14 boys and 10 girls, for 58.33 percent male and 41.67 percent female. The class had an average grade point of 2.64. The class participated in a total of 52 extra-curricular activities for an average of 2.17 activities per student.

Surveyed were 14 males from the junior class, 9 of which were from two-parent families this was 37.50 percent of the class surveyed regardless of gender and 64.29 percent of the males surveyed. These males had a perceived grade point average of 2.73. A total of 14 extra-curricular activities were participated in by these males for an average of 1.55 activities per junior male.

There were 5 males from single-parent families surveyed for 20.83 percent of the junior class surveyed and 35.71 percent of the males surveyed. Single-parent males had a 2.72 self-perceived grade point average. They participated in 10 activities for an average of 2.0 activities per student per year.

There were 10 females surveyed in the junior class, five from two-parent households for a 20.83 percent of the junior class respondents class and 50.00 percent of the junior females surveyed. The grade point average was 3.41. This group participated in 18 extra-curricular activities for an average of 3.60 activities per student.

TABLE III
ACTIVITIES AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF SOPHOMORES BY PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

SOPHOMORES		Total Number Surveyed	Per-cent of Total Surveyed in Class	Per-cent of Total in Gender Surveyed	Grade Point Average	Total Number of Activities	Average Number of Activities Participated in during the Year
Males	Two-Parent	21	32.31	61.77	2.42	49	2.33
	Single-Parent	13	20.00	38.23	2.40	48	3.69
Sub-Total		34	52.31	100.00	2.41	97	2.84
Females	Two-Parent	19	29.23	61.29	2.71	83	4.37
	Single-Parent	12	18.46	38.71	2.14	30	2.50
Sub-Total		31	47.79	100.00	2.43	113	3.65
TOTAL		65	100.00		2.42	210	3.23

There were 5 female juniors from single-parent households, they comprised 20.83 percent of the junior class surveyed and 50 percent of the females surveyed. The average grade point was 1.70. These junior girls participated in 28 activities from an average of 2.80 activities per student per year. (See Table IV)

There was a total of 75 seniors surveyed. This senior population surveyed was 57.33 percent male and 42.67 percent female. The senior class had a self-perceived cumulative grade point of 2.42. They also collectively participated in 133 extra-curricular activities for an average of 1.77 activities per individual.

There were a total of 43 male seniors surveyed. This represents 57.34 percent of the seniors surveyed. These males had a cumulative grade point of 2.25. The males participated in 79 extra-curricular activities for an average of 1.84 activities per male senior per year. Twenty-six of the 43 males came from two-parent families. These 26 males comprised 34.67 percent of the senior class surveyed and 60.66 percent of the male seniors surveyed. The two-parent males perceived themselves to have a 2.29 grade point average. They participated in 46 extra-curricular activities for an average of 1.76 activities per student per year.

The remaining 17 males were from single-parent families. These 17 male seniors were 22.67 percent of the total seniors surveyed and 39.54 percent of the senior

TABLE IV
ACTIVITIES AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF JUNIORS BY PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

JUNIORS		Total Number Surveyed	Per-cent of Total Surveyed in Class	Per-cent of Total in Gender Surveyed	Grade Point Average	Total Number of Activities	Average Number of Activities Participated in during the Year
Males	Two-Parent	9	37.50	64.29	2.73	14	1.55
	Single-Parent	5	20.83	35.71	2.72	10	2.00
Sub-Total		14	58.34	100.00	2.725	24	1.71
Females	Two-Parent	5	20.83	50.00	3.41	18	3.60
	Single-Parent	5	20.83	50.00	1.70	10	2.00
Sub-Total		10	41.66	100.00	2.60	28	2.80
TOTAL		24	100.00		2.64	52	2.17

males. They perceived themselves to have a 2.20 grade point average. These students participated in 33 extra-curricular activities for an average of 1.94 activities per student.

Thirty-two female seniors were surveyed. This was 42.66 percent of the senior class surveyed. This portion of the class had an accumulative grade point of 2.59. Collectively they participated in 54 extra-curricular activities for an average of 1.88 activities per student. Twenty-one females were from two-parent families. They comprised 28.00 percent of the total number of seniors surveyed and 65.63 percent of the female seniors surveyed. These girls from two-parent families had a 2.76 grade point average. They participated in 40 extra-curricular activities for an average of 1.90 activities per student.

There were 11 females surveyed from single-parent homes. This was 14.66 percent of the senior population and 34.37 percent of the senior females surveyed. These 11 girls perceived their grade point to be 2.43. Each girl participated in an average of 1.27 activities or a total of 14 extra-curricular activities. (See Table V)

In the second portion of the survey, a number on factors that limited participation in extra-curricular activities were evaluated. These factors were considered of the basis as to what degree they limited a student's participation in extra-curricular activities. The scale was from 0 through 5. A student that did not respond to

TABLE V

ACTIVITIES AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE OF SENIORS BY PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

SENIORS		Total Number Surveyed	Per-cent of Total Surveyed in Class	Per-cent of Total in Gender Surveyed	Grade Point Average	Total Number of Activities	Average Number of Activities Participated in during the Year
Males	Two-Parent	26	34.67	60.47	2.29	46	1.76
	Single-Parent	17	22.67	39.53	2.20	33	1.94
Sub-Total		43	57.34	100.00	2.25	79	1.84
Females	Two-Parent	21	28.00	65.63	2.76	40	1.90
	Single-Parent	11	14.66	34.37	2.43	14	1.27
Sub-Total		32	42.66	100.00	2.59	54	1.88
TOTAL		75	100.00		2.42	133	1.77

the question was tabulated as a zero. A student that was not limited by a particular question received a score of one. Those that were severely limited scored a five. The average response was used to identify questions which were most limiting to a particular class. The averages will be used to identify which items need to be examined more closely for the differences of individual grade levels. The differences will be determined by sex of the individual and the type of family structure (two-parent or single-parent).

The questions were ranked by the average response on a reverse scale. The question having the highest average response having a rank of one. (For example question seventeen was ranked first by the freshmen and sophomore classes and second from the junior class and fifth by the senior class, for a total of 9 points). The top ten questions (See Table VI) that received the highest degree of limitation are as follows. First, the most limiting question was question #17. It states extra-curricular activities interfere with homework from school. Second most limiting was question 13, which stated student must be employed to earn spending money. The third most limiting was question 3 which stated parental work schedule conflicted with student activity schedule. Fourth most limiting was question 16, extra-curricular activity interfered with job schedule. Fifth most limiting was question number fourteen, it stated student was more

involved in conflicting activity. Sixth most limiting was question 15, it stated that the student had to participate in too many hours for too little recognition. Seventh most limiting was question number eight, which stated student had competition from other activities. The eighth most limiting question was number seven. It stated that the student was not closely associated with other members in club. Ninth most limiting question number two it stated, availability of financing to buy equipment and accessories was limiting. Tenth most limiting question was number one availability of transportation.

To examine the variation within each question, it is necessary to look at the individual question on the basis of single-parent versus two parent and male versus female for each grade level. Question seventeen will be examined first, because it had the highest incidence of limitation to all students.

Question seventeen was ranked as the most limiting factor by freshmen and sophomore, junior ranked it second most limiting, the seniors ranked it as the fifth most limiting factor. Question seventeen stated that the extra-curricular activities interfered with homework from school. Among the freshmen the group most severely limited were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.71. They were followed by the males and females from two parent families. Both had an average response of 2.46.

TABLE VI
FRESHMAN LIMITATION BY PARENT IN HOUSEHOLD

#	M2p 24	M1p 17	F2p 28	F1p 25	Ave.	Limit Factor
1	1.54	2.18	2.11	2.48	2.08 ⁸	SL
2	2.04	2.47	1.82	2.12	2.11 ⁷	SL
3	1.79	2.41	1.86	2.88	2.24 ⁴	SL
4	1.92	1.65	1.65	2.40	1.66 ¹⁷	SL
5	2.25	1.71	1.86	1.96	1.95 ⁹	SL
6	1.45	1.76	1.71	1.96	1.72 ¹⁶	SL
7	1.71	1.82	1.86	2.08	1.87 ¹²	SL
8	2.58	2.06	2.86	2.00	2.38 ²	SL
9	1.58	1.53	1.61	2.88	1.90 ¹⁰	SL
10	1.50	1.53	1.46	1.64	1.53 ¹⁹	SL
11	1.58	1.65	1.53	1.88	1.66 ¹⁸	SL
12	1.96	2.12	1.57	1.84	1.87 ¹¹	SL
13	1.75	2.24	2.36	2.20	2.14 ⁶	SL
14	1.58	2.12	2.54	2.48	2.18 ⁵	SL
15	2.00	2.24	2.57	2.12	2.25 ³	SL
16	1.79	1.59	2.00	2.23	1.90 ¹⁵	SL
17	2.46	2.71	2.46	2.32	2.49 ¹	SL
18	1.25	1.47	1.39	1.76	1.47 ²⁰	NL
19	1.42	2.12	1.75	1.84	1.78 ¹³	SL
20	1.58	1.94	1.64	1.92	1.77 ¹⁴	SL

M2P = Male Two-Parent

M1P = Male One-Parent

F2P = Female Two-Parent

F1P = Female One-Parent

- 0-1.49 - Not Limiting - NL
- 1.50-2.49 - Slightly Limiting - SL
- 2.50-3.49 - Moderately Limiting - ML
- 3.50-4.49 - Limited - L
- 4.49-5.00 - Limited Severely - LS

TABLE VII
SOPHOMORE LIMITATIONS BY PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

#	M2p 21	M1p 13	F2p 19	F1p 12	Ave.	Limit Factor
1	2.10	1.84	2.05	1.42	1.85 ⁵	SL
2	1.91	2.23	1.95	1.92	2.00 ³	SL
3	1.76	2.15	2.05	1.92	1.97 ⁴	SL
4	1.57	1.77	1.37	1.08	1.45 ¹⁵	NL
5	1.81	1.85	1.95	1.33	1.74 ⁹	SL
6	1.52	1.54	1.53	1.42	1.50 ¹³	SL
7	1.95	1.85	1.95	1.08	1.71 ¹¹	SL
8	1.76	1.62	2.05	1.00	1.61 ¹²	SL
9	1.43	1.62	1.42	.83	1.29 ¹⁹	NL
10	1.57	1.85	.84	1.00	1.27 ²⁰	NL
11	1.57	1.31	1.42	.67	1.33 ¹⁷	NL
12	1.76	1.69	2.53	1.00	1.75 ⁸	SL
13	2.00	2.00	1.68	2.50	2.05 ²	SL
14	2.14	1.46	1.95	1.33	1.72 ¹⁰	SL
15	1.81	2.00	1.68	1.67	1.79 ⁷	SL
16	1.57	2.46	1.68	1.50	1.80 ⁶	SL
17	2.19	2.85	1.89	2.00	2.23 ¹	SL
18	1.33	1.69	1.32	.91	1.31 ¹⁸	NL
19	1.48	.92	1.58	1.33	1.33 ¹⁶	NL
20	1.71	1.23	1.63	1.25	1.46 ¹⁴	NL

M2P = Male Two-Parent

M1P = Male One-Parent

F2P = Female Two-Parent

F1P = Female One-Parent

- 0-1.49 - Not Limiting - NL
- 1.50-2.49 - Slightly Limiting - SL
- 2.50-3.49 - Moderately Limiting - ML
- 3.50-4.49 - Limited - L
- 4.49-5.00 - Limited Severely - LS

TABLE VIII
 JUNIOR LIMITATIONS BY PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

#	M2p 9	M1p 5	F2p 5	F1p 5	Ave.	Limit Factor
1	2.22	1.40	1.60	2.40	1.91 ⁹	SL
2	2.22	1.04	1.60	3.00	2.06 ⁶	SL
3	2.44	1.88	1.88	3.60	2.45	SL
4	1.33	1.00	1.40	1.20	1.23 ²⁰	NL
5	1.56	2.00	1.20	1.40	1.54 ¹⁷	SL
6	1.78	1.80	1.80	2.60	1.99 ⁷	SL
7	1.67	2.00	1.40	2.20	1.74 ¹¹	SL
8	1.56	2.40	1.80	3.20	2.24 ⁵	SL
9	1.67	1.40	2.20	1.60	1.72 ¹²	SL
10	1.44	1.60	1.40	1.40	1.46 ¹⁹	NL
11	1.56	2.00	.80	1.40	1.49 ¹⁸	NL
12	1.5	1.60	1.40	1.80	1.57 ¹³	SL
13	1.58	2.60	1.80	3.80	2.45 ⁴	SL
14	1.25	2.00	1.00	3.40	1.91 ⁸	SL
15	1.08	2.00	1.80	2.40	1.82 ¹⁰	SL
16	2.08	3.00	1.80	3.80	2.67 ¹	ML
17	2.17	2.60	2.40	3.20	2.59 ²	ML
18	1.50	1.40	1.60	2.00	1.56 ¹⁶	SL
19	1.25	1.60	2.00	1.40	1.56 ¹⁵	SL
20	1.08	1.60	2.00	1.60	1.57 ¹⁴	SL

M2P = Male Two-Parent

M1P = Male One-Parent

F2P = Female Two-Parent

F1P = Female One-Parent

- 0-1.49 - Not Limiting - NL
- 1.50-2.49 - Slightly Limiting - SL
- 2.50-3.49 - Moderately Limiting - ML
- 3.50-4.49 - Limited - L
- 4.49-5.00 - Limited Severely - LS

TABLE IX
SENIOR LIMITATIONS BY PARENTS IN HOUSEHOLD

#	M2p 26	M1p 17	F2p 21	F1p 11	Ave.	Limit Factor
1	1.08	2.29	1.10	1.45	1.48 ¹⁴	NL
2	1.88	2.71	1.90	2.00	2.12 ⁴	SL
3	1.73	2.06	1.24	2.27	1.83 ⁶	SL
4	1.31	2.18	1.52	.82	1.46 ¹⁵	NL
5	1.73	2.21	1.62	.64	1.57 ¹¹	SL
6	1.35	1.94	1.76	1.45	1.63 ¹⁰	SL
7	1.50	2.99	1.90	1.00	1.67 ⁸	SL
8	1.62	2.06	1.71	6.63	1.51 ¹³	SL
9	1.04	1.82	1.24	.64	1.19 ²⁰	NL
10	1.08	1.94	1.29	.64	1.24 ¹⁸	NL
11	1.23	2.00	1.14	1.09	1.37 ¹⁷	NL
12	1.58	1.82	1.33	.91	1.41 ¹⁶	NL
13	3.27	3.82	1.71	4.18	3.10 ¹¹	ML
14	2.12	3.06	1.71	3.55	2.61 ³	ML
15	2.12	2.00	1.95	1.00	1.67 ⁷	SL
16	2.77	3.59	1.90	3.45	2.95 ²	ML
17	1.50	2.53	1.76	1.55	1.84 ⁵	SL
18	1.15	1.94	1.24	.55	1.22 ¹⁹	NL
19	1.46	1.88	1.381	1.55	1.56 ¹²	SL
20	1.54	2.24	1.24	1.55	1.64 ⁹	SL

M2P = Male Two-Parent

M1P = Male One-Parent

F2P = Female Two-Parent

F1P = Female One-Parent

- 0-1.49 - Not Limiting - NL
- 1.50-2.49 - Slightly Limiting - SL
- 2.50-3.49 - Moderately Limiting - ML
- 3.50-4.49 - Limited - L
- 4.49-500 - Limited Severely - LS

While females from single parent families were the least limited group with an average response of 2.32.

In the sophomore class the group most severely limited was also the males from single-parent households with an average response of 2.80. The males from two-parent families were the second most limited group with a 2.19 average response. Followed by the girls from single-parent homes with an average response of 2.00. The least limited group were the girls from two-parent families with a 1.89 average response.

Juniors had an average class response of 2.59. The group most limited were the females from single-parent families with an average response of 3.20. Next most limited group were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.60. They were followed by the females from two-parent families with a 2.40 average response. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 2.17.

The senior class average was 1.84. The most severely limited were the males from single-parent families with a 2.53 average response. Second most limited group were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.76. Followed by the females from single-parent families with an average response of 1.55. The least limited were the males from two-parent families with a 1.50 average response.

TABLE X

FRESHMAN LIMITATIONS FROM ACTIVITIES INTERFERING WITH HOMEWORK FROM SCHOOL

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	10	41.67	3	12.50	4	16.67	4	16.67	3	12.50	2.46
	Single	17	0	0.00	7	41.18	2	11.77	2	11.77	1	5.88	5	29.41	2.71
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	9	32.14	7	25.00	5	17.86	4	14.29	3	10.71	2.46
	Single	25	1	4.00	10	40.00	3	12.00	3	12.00	7	28.00	1	4.00	2.32
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													2.49

TABLE XI

SOPHOMORE LIMITATIONS FROM ACTIVITIES INTERFERING WITH HOMEWORK FROM SCHOOL

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	1	4.76	4	19.05	3	14.29	2	9.52	4	19.05	2.19
	Single	13	3	23.08	3	23.08	3	23.08	2	15.38	1	7.69	1	7.69	1.85
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	8	42.10	3	15.79	0	0.00	3	15.79	2	10.53	1.89
	Single	12	4	33.33	1	8.33	3	25.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	2	16.67	2.00
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													2.23

TABLE XII

JUNIOR LIMITATIONS FROM ACTIVITIES INTERFERING WITH HOMEWORK FROM SCHOOL

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	0	0.00	2	22.22	4	44.44	0	0.00	2	22.22	2.17
	Single	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.60
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	2.40
	Single	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	3.20
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													2.59

TABLE XIII

SENIOR LIMITATIONS FROM ACTIVITIES INTERFERING WITH HOMEWORK FROM SCHOOL

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	10	38.46	4	15.38	4	15.38	0	0.00	2	7.69	1.54
	Single	17	3	17.65	4	23.53	1	5.88	3	17.65	2	11.76	4	23.53	2.53
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	8	38.10	2	9.52	3	14.29	1	4.76	3	14.29	1.76
	Single	11	5	45.45	1	9.09	2	18.18	1	9.09	2	18.18	0	0.00	1.45
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.84

In an examination of all 16 groups, the males from single-parent families appear to be the most severely limited with an average response of 2.67. The second most limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 2.27 average response. They are followed by the females from two-parent families with an average response of 2.13. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with a 2.08 average response.

Question thirteen ranked as the second most limiting factor. It stated that the student must earn his or her own spending money. The freshman ranked it sixth with a class average response of 2.14. The most severely limited freshman group were females from two-parent families with an average response of 2.36. The group that followed them in degree of limitation were the males from single-parent families with a 2.24 average response. They were followed by the females from single-parent families with a 2.20 average response. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 1.75.

The sophomores ranked question 13 as the second most limiting factor with an average class response of 2.05. The sophomore group most limited were the girls from single-parent families with an average response of 2.50. Boys from single-parent and two-parent families tied for the next most limited group both with an average response of 2.00. The least limited group were the females from two-parent families with a 1.68 average response.

Junior's ranked question 13 in a tie for third with an average response of 2.45. Females from single-parent families were the most severely limited group with a 2.80 average response. Second most limited group were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.60. Next were the females from two-parent families with a 1.80 average response. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with a 1.58 average.

The senior class ranked question 13 as second most limiting with a class average of 3.10. The most severely limited group were the females from single-parent families with an average of 4.18. Second most limited group were the males from single-parent families with a 3.65 average. Followed by the males from two-parent families with an average response of 3.27. The least limited group were the female's from two-parent families with an average response of 1.71.

The cross-sectional view shows single-parent females to be the most severely limited with a 3.17 average response. They were followed by the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.62. The third most limited group were males from two-parent families with a 2.15 average response. Least limited were the females from two-parent families with a 1.89 average response.

The third most limiting question was question number 3. Question 3 stated that the parental work schedule

TABLE XIV

FRESHMAN STUDENT EMPLOYMENT AS A LIMITING BARRIER TO PARTICIPATION IN EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	14	58.33	6	25.00	1	4.17	2	8.33	1	4.17	1.75
	Single	17	0	0.00	9	52.94	2	11.76	2	11.76	1	5.89	3	17.65	2.24
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	15	53.57	2	7.14	3	10.71	2	7.14	6	21.43	2.36
	Single	25	1	4.0	14	56.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	3	12.00	4	16.00	2.20
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													2.14

TABLE XV

SOPHOMORE STUDENT EMPLOYMENT AS A LIMITING BARRIER TO PARTICIPATION IN EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	2	9.52	3	14.29	5	23.81	1	4.76	3	14.29	2.00
	Single	13	3	23.08	5	38.46	0	0.00	2	15.39	0	0.00	3	23.08	2.00
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	10	52.63	0	0.00	4	21.05	0	0.00	2	10.53	1.68
	Single	12	2		5	41.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	41.67	2.50
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													2.05

TABLE XVI

JUNIOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT AS A LIMITING BARRIER TO PARTICIPATION IN EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	0	0.00	5	55.56	0	0.00	2	22.22	1	11.11	1	1.11	2.22
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	2.60
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.80
	Single	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	60.00	3.80
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													2.45

TABLE XVII

SENIOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT AS A LIMITING BARRIER TO PARTICIPATION IN EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	2	7.69	5	19.23	2	7.69	4	15.39	1	3.85	12	46.15	3.27
	Single	17	0	0.00	2	11.76	2	11.76	1	5.88	4	23.53	8	47.07	3.82
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	3	14.29	9	42.86	4	19.85	2	9.52	2	9.54	1	4.76	1.71
	Single	11	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	2	18.18	11	9.09	7	66.4	4.18
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													3.10

conflicted with scheduling of the students activity. Freshman and sophomores rated it fourth. Junior rated it third. Seniors rated question 3 as the sixth most limiting. In the initial examination it was recognized that the most limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 2.67 average response. Second most limited group were the males from single-parent families with a 2.13 average response. Followed by the males from two-parent families with a 1.93 average response. The least limited group were the females from two-parent families with a 1.75 average response.

The freshman class reveals that female's from single-parent families were the most limited with a 2.88 average response. They were followed by the males from single-parent families with an average limitation of 2.41. Next most limited were the group of females from two-parent families with a 1.86 average response. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with a 1.79 average response.

Sophomores had a class average of 1.97 on question number three. The group that was most limited were the males from single-parent families with a 3.60 average response. Second most limited group were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 2.88. The group that was second in most limitations were the females from single-parent families with an average response of 2.41. They were followed by the females from two-parent

families with a 1.86 average response. Least limited were the males from two-parent homes with a 1.79 average response.

The junior class' average response was 2.45. Females from single-parent families were the most severely limited with a 3.60 average response. Second most limited group were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 2.44. The least limited groups were both the males from single-parent families and the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.88.

The senior class had an average response of 1.83 on question three, and they ranked it sixth. Females from single parent families were the most limited by question six. They had an average response of 2.27. Males from single-parent families followed with a 2.06 average response. The group that followed in succession were the males from two-parent families with a 1.73 average response.

In the cross-sectional view combining classes and comparing on family type and sex, the group that was most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 2.27 average response. They were followed in succession by the males from single-parent families with a 2.13 average response. Third in succession were the males from two-parent families with a 1.93 average response. Least limited were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.75.

TABLE XVIII

PARENTAL WORK SCHEDULE LIMITING FRESHMAN PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	2	8.33	10	41.67	7	29.17	1	4.17	4	16.67	0	0.00	1.79
	Single	17	0	0.00	4	23.53	5	29.41	4	23.53	4	23.53	0	0.00	2.41
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	14	50.00	6	21.43	6	21.43	2	7.14	0	0.00	1.86
	Single	25	1	40.00	8	32.00	2	8.00	3	12.00	4	16.00	7	28.00	2.88
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													2.24

TABLE XIX

PARENTAL WORK SCHEDULE LIMITING SOPHOMORE PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES

Sophomores Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	6	28.57	6	28.57	3	14.29	1	4.76	3	14.29	2	9.52	1.76
	Single	13	1	7.69	5	38.46	1	7.69	1	7.69	1	7.69	2	15.39	2.15
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	2	10.53	6	31.58	4	21.05	3	15.79	4	21.05	0	0.00	2.05
	Single	12	4	33.33	2	16.67	2	16.67	1	8.33	1	8.33	2	16.67	1.92
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.97

TABLE XX

PARENTAL WORK SCHEDULE LIMITING JUNIORS PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES

Juniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	0	0.00	3	33.33	3	33.33	0	0.00	2	2.22	1	11.11	2.44
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.88
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.88
	Single	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	3.60
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													2.45

TABLE XXI

PARENTAL WORK SCHEDULE LIMITING SENIORS PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES

Seniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	3	11.54	13	50.00	2	7.69	5	19.23	2	7.69	1	3.85	1.73
	Single	17	2	11.76	8	47.06	2	11.76	0	0.00	2	11.76	3	17.65	2.06
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	2	9.52	15	71.43	3	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.76	1.24
	Single	11	4	36.36	1	1.09	2	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	36.36	2.27
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.83

Question number sixteen ranked fourth among limiting factors. The freshmen rated question sixteen, fifteenth. Sophomores ranked it sixth. However, both the junior and the seniors ranked question 16 as the most limiting factor to participation in extra-curricular activities. The question stated that the extra-curricular activities interfere with the students job schedule.

Freshman class ranked question 16, fifteenth with an average class response of 1.77. The group that was most limited were the females from two-parent families with a 2.17 average response. The group that was second most limited were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 1.79. Third most limited were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 1.59. The group least limited were the females from single parent families.

The sophomore group had an average of 1.80 response. Males from single-parent families were the most limited with a 2.46 average response. Second most limited were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.68. Followed very closely by the males from the two-parent families with a 1.57 average response. Least limited in the sophomore class were females from single-parent families with a 1.50 average response.

Question 16 was ranked as the most limiting factor by the junior class with an average response of 2.67. The

group that was most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 3.80 average response. Followed by the males from single-parent families with an average response of 3.00. Third most limited group were the males from two-parent families with a 2.08 average response. The least limited group were females from two-parent families with a 1.80 average response.

Seniors also ranked question 16 as the most limiting item on the questionnaire with a class average response of 3.36. The group most limited were the males from two-parent families with a 4.50 average response. Second most limited group were the males from single-parent families with a 3.59 average response. They were followed very closely by the females from single-parent families with a 3.45 average response. Least limited were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.90.

Viewing this question cross-sectionally the females from single-parent families were the most limited with a 2.57 average. Second most limited group were the males from two-parent families with an average of 2.49. Single-parent males followed in third with a 2.26 average. The least limited group were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.89.

Fifth most limiting factor on the questionnaire was question number fourteen. Freshman ranked it fifth with a 2.18 average. Sophomores ranked it tenth with a 1.72 average. Junior ranked it eighth with an average response

TABLE XXII

ACTIVITIES OF THE FRESHMAN INTERFERES WITH JOB SCHEDULE

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	12	50.00	3	12.50	7	29.76	1	4.17	0	0.00	1.79
	Single	17	0	0.00	11	64.71	2	11.76	3	23.53	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.59
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	16	57.14	1	3.57	6	21.43	5	17.86	0	0.00	2.00
	Single	25	1	4.00	17	68.00	3	12.00	3	8.00	1	4.00	1	4.00	2.23
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.90

TABLE XXIII

ACTIVITIES OF THE SOPHOMORE INTERFERES WITH JOB SCHEDULE

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	5	23.81	4	19.05	2	9.52	1	4.76	2	9.52	1.57
	Single	13	2	15.36	4	30.77	1	7.69	3	23.08	3	23.08	1	7.69	2.46
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	10	52.63	2	10.53	3	15.79	1	5.26	1	5.26	1.68
	Single	12	4	33.33	5	41.67	0	0.00	1	8.33	0	0.00	2	16.67	1.5
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.80

TABLE XXIV

ACTIVITIES OF THE JUNIOR, INTERFERES WITH JOB SCHEDULE

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	0	0.00	2	22.22	3	33.33	1	11.11	1	11.11	2	22.22	2.08
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3.00
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	1.80
	Single	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3.80
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													2.67

TABLE XXV

ACTIVITIES OF THE SENIOR INTERFERES WITH JOB SCHEDULE

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	2	7.69	9	34.61	1	3.65	3	11.54	3	11.54	8	30.77	2.27
	Single	17	0	0.00	3	17.65	2	5.88	3	23.53	1	5.88	8	47.06	3.59
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	3	14.29	10	47.62	1	4.76	3	14.29	1	4.76	3	14.29	1.90
	Single	11	0	0.00	4	36.36	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	6	54.54	3.55
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		65													2.95

of 1.91. The senior ranked it third with a 2.61 average response. Question fourteen stated that the student was too involved with a conflicting activity.

Freshman's average response to question 14 was 2.18. The most limited group were females from two-parent families with a 2.54 average response. The group that was second on limitation were the females from single-parent families with a 2.48 average response. Followed in succession by males from single-parent families with a 2.12 average response. Least limited group were the males from two-parent families with 1.58 average response.

Sophomores rated question 14 tenth with 1.72 average response. The most limited group were the males from two-parent families with a 2.14 average response. They were followed by the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.95. Third most limited group were the males from single-parent households with an average response of 1.46. Least limited sophomore group by question number 14 were the females from single-parent families.

Juniors ranked question 14 eighth with an average response of 1.91. The group that was most limited were the females from single-parent families with an average response of 3.80. Second most limited group were the males from single-parent families with a 2.00 average response. Next most limited group were the males from two-parent families with a 1.25 average response. Least limited by

TABLE XXVI

LIMITATIONS FROM THE FRESHMAN BEING MORE INVOLVED IN CONFLICTING ACTIVITY

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	12	50.00	3	12.50	4	16.69	2	8.33	2	8.33	1.58
	Single	17	0	0.00	7	41.18	2	11.76	3	17.65	5	29.41	0	0.00	2.12
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	13	39.29	3	10.71	5	17.86	6	21.43	3	10.71	2.54
	Single	25	1	4.00	10	40.00	3	12.00	4	16.00	1	4.00	6	24.00	2.48
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													2.18

TABLE XXVII

LIMITATIONS FROM THE SOPHOMORE BEING MORE INVOLVED IN CONFLICTING ACTIVITY

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	3	14.29	2	9.52	2	9.52	3	14.29	4	19.05	2.14
	Single	13	4	30.77	5	38.62	1	7.69	1	7.69	1	7.69	1	7.69	1.46
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	2	10.53	11	57.89	0	0.00	1	5.26	2	10.53	3	15.79	1.95
	Single	12	4	33.33	4	33.33	2	16.67	1	8.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	1.33
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.72

TABLE XXVIII

LIMITATIONS FROM THE JUNIOR BEING MORE INVOLVED IN CONFLICTING ACTIVITY

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	0	0.00	5	55.56	2	22.22	2	22.22	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.25
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2.00
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	5	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.00
	Single	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	3.40
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.91

TABLE XXIX

LIMITATIONS FROM THE SENIOR BEING MORE INVOLVED IN CONFLICTING ACTIVITY

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	3	11.53	10	38.46	4	15.38	3	11.54	2	7.69	4	15.38	2.12
	Single	17	0	0.00	4	23.53	2	11.76	3	17.65	5	29.41	3	17.65	3.06
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	6	28.57	2	19.05	6	28.57	1	4.76	0	0.00	1.71
	Single	11	0	0.00	3	27.27	0	0.00	2	18.18	0	0.00	6	54.54	3.55
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													2.66

question 14 were the females from two-parent families with a 1.00 average response.

Seniors ranked question 14 third with an average response of 2.61. The most limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 3.55 average response. Males from two-parent families followed in succession with a 3.06 average response. Third most limited group were the males from two-parent families with 2.12 average response. The least limited group were the females from two-parent families with a 1.71 average response.

Examining the cross-sectional view the group that is most limited are the females from single-parent families with 2.69 average response. Followed by the males from single-parent families with a 2.16 average response. The females from two-parent families were third most limited with a 1.80 average response. Least limited were the males from two-parent families with a 1.77 average response.

Sixth most limiting question was factor number fifteen, which stated too many hours had to be put in for too little recognition. Freshman ranked it third. Sophomore ranked it seventh. Juniors ranked it tenth. Seniors rank it seventh.

The freshman group that was most limited by question 15 were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 2.57. The next most limited group were the males from single-parent families with a 2.24 average response. Third in succession were the females from

single-parent families with an average response of 2.12. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with a 2.08 average response.

The Sophomore group that was most limited by question 15 were males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.00. They were followed by the males from two-parent families with a 1.81 average response. The group that was third in average response were the females from two-parent families with a 1.68. The least limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 1.67 average response.

Junior's ranked question number 15 as its tenth most limiting factor. The group that was most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 2.40 average response. Next, most limited group were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.00. Third most limited group were the females from two-parent families with a 1.80 average response. Least limited by question 15 were the males from two parent families with an average response of 1.08.

The seniors ranked question 15 seventh among limiting factors. The group that was most severely limited were the males from single-parent families with a 2.00 average response. They were followed in succession by females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.95. Next in line were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 1.73. Group that was least limited

TABLE XXX

FRESHMAN ACTIVITIES LIMITED BECAUSE TOO MANY HOURS WERE REQUIRED FOR TOO LITTLE RECOGNITION

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	2.08	11	45.83	5	20.84	2	8.33	2	8.33	3	12.50	2.00
	Single	17	0	0.00	5	29.41	6	35.29	4	23.53	1	5.88	1	5.88	2.24
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	9	32.14	6	21.43	6	21.43	2	7.14	5	17.86	2.57
	Single	25	1	4.00	10	40.00	4	16.00	4	16.00	3	12.00	2	8.00	2.12
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		95													2.25

TABLE XXXI

SOPHOMORE ACTIVITIES LIMITED BECAUSE TOO MANY HOURS WERE REQUIRED FOR TOO LITTLE RECOGNITION

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	4	19.05	4	19.05	2	9.52	0	0.00	4	19.05	1.81
	Single	13	3	23.08	5	38.46	0	0.00	1	7.69	2	15.38	2	15.38	2.00
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	2	10.53	8	42.00	5	26.32	3	15.79	0	0.00	1	5.26	1.68
	Single	12	4	33.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	2	16.67	1.67
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.79

TABLE XXXII

JUNIOR ACTIVITIES LIMITED BECAUSE TOO MANY HOURS WERE REQUIRED FOR TOO LITTLE RECOGNITION

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	4	44.44	3	33.33	1	11.11	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.08
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.00
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	1.80
	Single	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.40
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.82

TABLE XXXIII

SENIOR ACTIVITIES LIMITED BECAUSE TOO MANY HOURS WERE REQUIRED FOR TOO LITTLE RECOGNITION

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	3	23.08	10	38.46	4	15.38	3	11.54	2	7.69	4	15.38	2.12
	Single	17	3	17.65	4	23.53	5	29.41	1	5.88	4	17.65	1	5.88	2.00
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	5	23.81	5	23.81	3	19.05	1	4.76	2	9.52	1.95
	Single	11	5	45.45	4	36.36	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	9.09	1.00
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.67

were the females from single-parent families with a 1.00 average response.

The cross-sectional view sees the males from single-parent families as being the most limited group with an average response of 2.06. They were followed by females from two-parent families with an average response of 2.00. Third most limited group were the female from single-parent families with a 1.80 average response. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 1.68.

Seventh most limiting factor was question eight, which stated the student was more involved in a directly competitive activity limited involvement. Freshman rated it as the second most limiting factor with average response of 2.38. Sophomores ranked it as twelfth most limiting with a 1.61 average response. Juniors considered it to be fifth among limiting factors. Seniors also ranked it twelfth with an average response of 1.51.

Freshman from both sexes from two-parent families considered it to be limiting. The females from two-parent families were most severely limited by this factor, with an average response of 2.86. Males from two-parent families were next with a 2.58 average response. The males from single-parent families were third with 2.06 average response. They were closely followed by the females from single-parent families with an average of 2.00.

Sophomores rated question 8 as twelfth among limiting factors with an average response of 1.61. The females from two-parent families were the most limited with a 2.05 average response. Males from two-parent families next in succession with an average response of 1.76. Single-parent males were third with an average response of 1.62. Females from single-parents were least limited by this question; their average response was 1.00.

Juniors rated question number 8 as fifth in degree of limitations with a 2.24 average class response. Single-parent females were the most severely limited with an average response of 3.20. Followed by the single-parent males with 2.40 average response. Next were the two-parent females with an average response of 1.80. Males from two-parent families were the least severely limited with 1.56 average response.

Seniors ranked question 8 as twelfth with a 1.51 response. Seniors most limited by question 8 were males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.06. They were followed by the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.71. Males from two-parent families were next with an average response of 1.64. The group least limited were females from single-parent families with a 1.62 average response.

The cross-sectional view sees the females from single-parent being the most limited with a 2.11 average response. Followed by the males from single-parent families followed

Table XXXIV
Freshman Participation Limited by Competition from other Activities

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	8	33.33	4	16.67	3	12.50	3	12.50	5	20.83	2.33
	Single	17	0	0.00	8	47.06	3	17.65	4	23.53	1	5.88	1	5.88	2.06
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	6	21.43	6	21.43	8	28.57	2	7.14	6	21.43	2.86
	Single	25	1	4.00	13	52.00	4	16.00	2	8.00	2	8.00	3	12.00	2.00
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													2.31

Table XXXV
Sophomores Participation Limited by Compition from other Activities

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	5	23.81	3	14.29	1	4.76	2	9.52	3	14.29	1.76
	Single	13	3	23.08	6	46.15	0	0.00	2	15.38	1	7.69	1	7.69	1.62
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	0	0.00	9	47.37	4	21.05	3	15.79	2	10.53	1	5.26	2.05
	Single	12	4	33.33	5	41.67	2	16.67	1	8.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.00
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.61

Table XXXVI
Juniors Participation Limited by Competition from other Activities

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	4	44.45	3	33.33	0	0.00	1	11.11	0	0.00	1.56
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	2.40
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.80
	Single	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	3.20
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													2.24

Table XXXVII
Seniors Participation Limited by Competition from other Activities

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	5	19.24	10	38.46	4	15.38	2	7.69	2	7.69	3	11.54	1.81
	Single	17	3	17.65	5	29.41	2	11.76	4	23.53	1	5.88	2	11.54	1.81
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	5	23.81	7	33.33	4	19.05	0	0.00	1	4.76	1.71
	Single	11	5	45.45	5	45.45	1	9.10	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.63
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.51

with an average response of 2.04. Next were males from two-parent families with a 1.88 average response. The females from two-parent families were the least limited with a 1.71 average response.

The eighth most limiting factor was question number seven, which states, the student was not closely associated with others in the club. The freshman ranked it as twelfth most limiting factor with a 1.87 average response. Sophomores rated it as eleventh with an average response of 1.71. Juniors ranked it eleventh also, with an average response of 1.74. Seniors ranked it eighth with an average response of 1.67.

Freshman ranked it as the twelfth most limiting factor. Females from single-parent families were the most limited with a 2.08 average response. The group next most limited were the females with two-parents with a 1.86 average response. Males from single-parent families were next in succession with an average response of 1.82. The least limited group were males from two-parent families with an average response of 1.71.

Sophomores ranked it eleventh. The groups most severely limited by question seven were both males and females from two-parent families with a 1.95 average response. They were followed by males from single-parent families with an average response of 1.85. Least limited by question seven were the females from single-parent families with a 1.08 average response.

Juniors, also ranked question seven as eleventh most limiting, with an average response of 1.74. Females from single-parent families were the most limited with a 2.20 average response. They were followed by males from single-parent families with a 2.00 average response. Next most limited group were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 1.67. Least limited were the females from two-parent families with a 1.40 average response.

Seniors ranked question seven as eighth most limiting, with an average response of 1.67. Males from single-parent families were the most severely limited with a 2.29 average response. The next most limited group were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.90. Males from two-parent families followed with a 1.50 average response. The least limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 1.00 average response.

Comparisons made by combining grades shows the males from single-parent families to be the most limited with an average response of 1.99. Females from two-parent families followed with 1.78 average response. Males from single-parent families followed them very closely with 1.71 average response. The least limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 1.59 average response.

The ninth most limiting factor was question number two. It stated, that availability of financing to buy equipment or accessories was a limiting factor. Freshman

TABLE XXXVIII

INDIVIDUAL WAS NOT CLOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE IN THE CLUB AS A FRESHMAN LIMITATION

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	2	8.33	14	58.33	2	8.33	3	12.50	1	4.18	2	8.33	1.71
	Single	17	0	0.00	9	52.94	3	17.65	4	23.53	1	5.88	0	0.00	1.82
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	15	53.57	4	14.29	7	25.00	2	7.14	0	0.00	1.86
	Single	25	1	4.00	15	60.00	2	8.00	1	4.00	0	0.00	6	24.00	2.08
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.87

TABLE IXL

INDIVIDUAL WAS NOT CLOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE IN THE CLUB AS A SOPHIOMORE LIMITATION

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	6	28.57	4	19.04	1	4.76	0	0.00	3	14.29	1.52
	Single	13	2	15.39	6	46.15	1	7.69	2	15.39	0	0.00	2	15.36	1.85
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	7	36.84	4	21.05	3	15.79	2	10.53	1	5.26	1.95
	Single	12	5	41.67	5	41.67	0	0.00	1	8.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	1.08
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.60

TABLE XL

INDIVIDUAL WAS NOT CLOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE IN THE CLUB AS A JUNIOR LIMITATION

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	6	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	22.22	1.78
	Single	5	0	0.000	2	40.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.00
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
	Single	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2.20
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.85

TABLE XLI

INDIVIDUAL WAS NOT CLOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE IN THE CLUB AS A SENIOR LIMITATION

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	9	34.62	5	19.23	5	19.23	0	0.00	1	3.85	1.35
	Single	17	3	17.65	4	23.53	1	5.88	5	29.41	2	11.76	2	11.76	2.29
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	7	33.33	4	19.05	4	19.05	2	9.52	0	0.00	1.90
	Single	11	5	45.45	3	27.24	1	9.09	2	18.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.00
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.64

ranked question two, seventh. Sophomores ranked question two, third. Juniors ranked question two, sixth. Seniors ranked question two, fourth.

The average response of the freshman was 2.11. The most limited freshman group were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.47. The next most limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 2.12 average response. They were followed by the males from two-parent families with a 2.14 average response. Least limited were the females from two-parent families with an average response of 1.82.

Sophomores had an average response of 2.00. The most limited group were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.23. Second most limited were the females from two-parent families with a 1.95 average response. They were closely followed by the females from single-parent families with a 1.92 average response. Males from two-parent families were least limited with a 1.91 average response.

Juniors ranked question two as the fourth most limiting item with average response being 2.12. Males from single-parent families were most severely limited with an average response of 2.71. They were followed by the females from single-parent families with a 2.00 average response. Next were the females from two-parent families; their average response was 1.90. The group least limited

were the males from two-parent families with a 1.88 average response.

Seniors ranked question number two as the fourth most limiting factor. The most limited group were the males from one-parent families. Followed by the females from single-parent families. Next in succession were the males from two-parent families. The least limited group were the females from two-parent families.

The combined responses from the freshman through the seniors revealed the most limited group to be the females from single-parent families with an average response of 2.26; followed by the males from single-parent families with a 2.20 average response. Next were the males from two-parent families with an average response of 2.01. The least limited group were the females from two-parent families.

Tenth most limiting factor was question number one. Question one asked to what extent was the availability of transportation a limiting factor. Freshman ranked it as eighth. Sophomores ranked question as fifth most limiting. Juniors ranked it as ninth most limiting. Seniors ranked it as the fourteenth most limiting factor.

Freshman ranked question as the eighth most limiting factor with an average response of 2.08. The group that was most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 2.48 average response. Next were the males from single-parent families with a 2.18 average response.

TABLE XLI

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS OF ACTIVITY LIMITED PARTICIPATION OF FRESHMEN

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	9	37.50	8	33.34	2	8.33	2	8.33	2	8.33	2.04
	Single	17	0	0.00	3	17.65	6	35.29	6	35.29	1	5.88	1	5.88	2.47
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	13	46.42	4	14.29	4	14.49	2	7.14	5	17.86	1.82
	Single	25	1	4.00	11	44.00	4	16.00	4	16.00	3	12.00	2	8.00	2.12
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													2.11

TABLE XLII

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS OF ACTIVITY LIMITED PARTICIPATION OF SOPHOMORES

Sophomores Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	5	23.81	6	28.57	3	14.29	2	9.52	3	14.29	2	9.52	1.91
	Single	13	1	7.69	6	46.15	1	7.69	1	7.69	2	15.39	2	15.39	2.23
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	2	10.53	6	31.57	6	31.57	2	10.53	2	10.53	1	5.26	1.95
	Single	12	4	33.33	3	25.00	0	0.00	2	16.67	1	8.33	2	16.67	1.92
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													2.00

TABLE XLIII

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS OF ACTIVITY LIMITED PARTICIPATION OF JUNIORS

Juniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	2	22.22	3	33.33	1	11.11	1	11.11	1	11.11	2.22
	Single	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.60
	Single	5	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	3.00
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													2.06

TABLE XLIV

FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS OF ACTIVITY LIMITED PARTICIPATION OF SENIORS

Seniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	3	11.54	13	50.00	3	11.54	2	7.69	1	3.85	4	15.38	1.88
	Single	17	3	17.65	3	11.76	2	11.76	3	17.65	4	23.53	3	17.65	2.71
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	2	9.53	9	42.86	5	23.81	1	4.76	2	9.53	2	9.53	1.90
	Single	11	4	36.36	2	18.18	1	9.09	1	9.09	0	0.00	3	27.27	2.00
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													2.12

They were followed by the females from two parent families with a 2.11 average response. The least limited group were the males from two-parent families with 1.54 average response.

Sophomores had an average response for the class of 1.85; the fifth most limiting item. The most limited sophomore group were the males from two-parent families with 2.10 average response. They were followed by the females from two-parent families with a 2.05 average response. Third most limited were the males from single-parent families with a 1.84 average response. The least limited group were the females from two-parent families with a 1.42 average response.

Juniors ranked question one as the ninth most limiting factor, with an average response of 1.91. The most limited group were the females from single-parent families with a 2.40 average response. Next most limited were the males from two-parent families with a 2.22 average response. They were followed by the females from single-parent families with a 1.60 average response. Least limited were the males from single-parent families 1.40 average response.

The senior class ranked question one as the fourteenth most limiting item on the questionnaire with an average response of 1.48. The males from single-parent families were the most limited group with an average response of 2.29. Females from single-parent families followed with a

1.45 average response. Next were the females from two-parent families with a 1.10 average response. The males from two-parent families were the least limited with an average response of 1.08.

The cross-sectional view of grades nine through twelve revealed that females from single-parent families were the most limited with an average response of 1.94. They were followed very closely by males from single-parent families with an average response of 1.93. Next were the males from two-parent families with a 1.74 average response. The least limited group were the female's from two-parent families with a 1.72 average response.

These were the top ten questions based on their average response to each question. The final two questions may have been extremely limiting to certain individual groups, but as collective informational source the responses did not warrant any further examination. The remainder of the responses...(See Table 6,7,8,9).

TABLE XLVI

TRANSPORTATION AS A LIMITING FACTOR TO PARTICIPATION IN ACITIVITIES FOR SOPHOMORES

Sophomores Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	5	23.81	3	14.29	6	28.57	2	9.52	2	9.52	3	14.29	2.09
	Single	13	1	7.69	7	53.86	2	15.38	1	7.69	0	0.00	2	15.38	1.84
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	6	31.58	2	10.53	5	26.32	1	5.26	2	10.52	2.05
	Single	12	4	33.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	2	16.67	0	0.00	1	8.33	1.42
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.85

TABLE XLVII

TRANSPORTATION AS A LIMITING FACTOR TO PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES FOR JUNIORS.

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	0	0.00	2	22.22	3	33.33	1	11.11	1	11.11	1	11.11	2.22
	Single	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.60
	Single	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	2.40
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.91

TABLE XLVIII

TRANSPORTATION AS A LIMITING FACTOR TO PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES FOR SENIORS

Seniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	3	11.54	18	69.23	0	0.00	5	19.53	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.08
	Single	17	3	17.64	6	35.29	1	5.88	2	11.66	0	0.00	5	29.41	2.09
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	2	9.52	16	76.19	2	9.52	1	4.76	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.10
	Single	11	4	36.36	3	27.27	0	0.00	3	27.27	1	9.09	0	0.00	1.45
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.43

TABLE XLIX

TRANSPORTATION AS A LIMITING FACTOR TO PARTICIPATION IN ACITIVITIES FOR SENIORS

Seniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	3	11.54	18	69.23	0	0.00	5	19.53	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.08
	Single	17	3	17.64	6	35.29	1	5.88	2	11.66	0	0.00	5	29.41	2.09
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	2	9.52	16	76.19	2	9.52	1	4.76	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.10
	Single	11	4	36.36	3	27.27	0	0.00	3	27.27	1	9.09	0	0.00	1.45
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.43

TABLE L
 QUESTIONS RANKING BY AVERAGE MEAN RESPONSE LIMITATION
 ON A REVERSE SCALE

Question Number	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Point Total	Rank
1	8	5	9	14	36	10
2	7	3	6	4	35	9
3	4	4	3	6	17	3
4	17	15	20	15	67	17
5	9	9	17	11	46	12
6	16	13	7	10	46	11
7	12	11	11	8	32	8
8	2	12	5	13	30	7
9	10	19	12	20	61	16
10	19	20	19	18	76	20
12	11	8	13	16	48	13
13	6	2	4	2	13	2
14	5	10	8	1	26	5
15	3	7	10	7	27	6
16	15	6	1	2	25	4
17	1	1	2	5	9	1
18	20	18	16	19	73	19
19	13	16	15	13	56	15
20	14	14	14	9	51	14

TABLE LI

TOP TEN QUESTIONS ON A GROSS-SECTIONAL VIEW OF GRADES NINE THROUGH
TWELVE ON THE BASIS OF SEX AND FAMILY TYPE

Question Number	Male two-parent	Male one-parent	Female two-parent	Female one-parent	Rank of limitation
17	2.08	2.67	2.13	2.27	1
13	2.15	2.62	1.89	3.17	2
3	1.93	2.13	1.75	2.67	3
16	2.49	2.26	1.89	2.57	4
14	1.77	2.16	1.80	2.69	5
15	1.68	2.06	2.00	1.80	6
8	1.88	2.04	2.11	1.71	7
7	1.71	1.99	1.78	1.59	8
2	2.01	2.20	1.82	2.26	9
1	1.74	1.93	1.72	1.94	10

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The decade of the eighties is rapidly drawing to a close. We have seen many changes come about. Changes in schools, in personal mobility, and in family life. These changes have left some dramatic impressions on the youth of today. Which leads us to the problem stated on page four of this thesis. Many adolescents have had their lives dramatically altered by the loss of a parent, either by death or the more common occurrence, divorce. This disruption of lifestyle often leads to a change in academic performance and/or level of involvement in extra-curricular activities. This disruption of lifestyle can be observed by many of the current trends in society, and by the affects of divorce.

These trends include increased mobility and an increase in single-parent families. Mobility changes are a result of new technology such as airplanes, automobiles, and trains. These transportation modes make it easier for families to relocate. Often, relocation is necessary for economic reasons. The increase of mobility has also acted as deteriorating factor of the family support system. The

traditional safety network may no longer be available. Moving into a new town the community, the church, and extended family may not be present. This family support network has in turn led to the increase of single-parent families.

The family unit once thought of as a father, mother, and children as being the norm, is no longer the case. All too often divorce is seen as the answer for marital problems. Rapidly the single-parent family unit is seen as the norm not the exception. In 1960 sixteen percent of the families were single-parent in America, in 1980 this figure had risen to 26.5 percent, 1987 in Broken Arrow High School this had risen to 40.31 percent. These changes in marital status often involve children of the adults involved. Shock waves are often manifested in many forms.

These affects of single-parenting can be seen in changes in sociocultural patterns. These sociocultural changes are seen in changes in family units toward single-parenting. the families of divorce often cause disruption in daily activities. It also often times includes a move away from familiar surroundings and into a new school or a new city. The child often feels torn between mother and father. These changes can be magnified stress developed by separation of parents. There are times when effects of divorce are not all bad, if the end result is a move to a more positive environment. This is the case if one or both parents are abusive to either the children or other spouse.

To label or stereotype a child as being from a "broken home" and disadvantage is often a misnomer.

One of the major resultant effects is the lowering of income. About ninety percent of all single-parent households are headed by women. Women in the work force often earn less than men of an equivalent occupation. The new single-parent family may be forced to find a lower rent living accommodation with fewer amenities. This reduction of income may require the family to spend less income on extra-curricular activities or force the student to seek a job. These points can be seen by viewing the top ten limiting factors in the survey. It does force the adolescent to accept certain work oriented responsibilities.

The level of maturation at which the single-parent household occurs is important. To move through the developmental task continuum is difficult enough without the added stress of separation from a parent. Stress can make the tasks more difficult and confuse individuals ability to develop a pleasant personality and high self-image. Self-image is extremely important to a persons success. Productivity is often linked to self-image. There are those individuals that have the resiliency to reinforce their self-image through difficult developmental tasks.

Development may be more difficult with only one parent as a role model. As young people learn through modeling.

Absence of one parent can have varied effects on children. Single-parenting is destroying the old stereo types of masculine and feminine. These single-parent families are seeing more of a uni-sex person. Traditional male, female roles around the house are changed. In role modeling the amount and quality of time is often more essential to the outcome of the personality. A number of factors are also recognized as well as modeling, peer groups, input from textbooks and school.

School achievement is based on many factors motivation, intelligence scores, cognitive development, and other intrinsic factors. Each factor is affected by stress. Stress is produced by parental separation. A separation creating financial difficulty, and move to a new school often creates an atmosphere of confusion and anxiety. These often take a toll on a students academic performance. It is not to say that children of two-parent are more academically advanced. But, it does indicate that two-parent families are more conducive to academic achievement.

The school's role in separation of a family is to be aware of the needs of the community. In being aware of the communities needs, it is not to say the school should intervene in community. The school is to provide an atmosphere of continuity for education and development. The school is a facilitator of education. It is possible for educators to detect signs of family disruption. Many

times if support and reassurance does not come from school it may not come from anywhere else.

The data indicates that there is definitely a difference between single-parent families and two-parent families. There is a high incidence of single-parent families. In initial portion of the survey it shows the students from a single-parent home have a lower grade point and participate in fewer activities. The second portion determined the ten most limiting factors surveyed. It also showed that for many of the factor those from a single-parent family were the most limited. The questions that were the major barriers to participation in extra-curricular activities were those that involved a need for money, time away from home, or transportation to an activity. These are a generalized interpretation of the barriers. But, they followed the items discussed in review of literature.

Findings

The findings of the study as related to the objectives are as follows:

1. It was found that 40.4 percent or 104 students were from single-parent families.
2. Findings show that grade point average of male was 2.49. The average female had a 2.62 grade point average. Males from two-parent families had a 2.54, and males from single-parent families had a

2.45 grade point average. Females from two-parent families had 3.01 grade point average, those from single parent families had 2.22 grade point average.

3. It was found that the 258 students participated in a total of 629 activities for an average of 2.44 activities per student. The 80 males participated in 181 activities for an average of 2.26 activities per student. The 52 males from participated in 131 activities for an average 2.51 activities per student. The 74 females from two-parent families participated in 226 activities for an average of 3.05 activities per female. Those females from single-parent families participated in 91 activities for a 1.75 activities per student.
4. It was found that of the twenty of the items surveyed one was not limiting to the freshman; five questions were not limiting to the sophomores; three questions were not limiting to the juniors; seven questions were not limiting to the seniors.

The top ten most limiting questions were examined, and item number seventeen was the most limiting question on the survey. The findings show that in the freshman class the freshman single-parent males were the most limited group, with a 2.71 average response. Sophomore class, the group

most limited were males from single-parent families with an average of 2.80. Juniors most limited were females from single-parent families with a 3.20. The senior class group most limited were the males from single-parent families, an average of 2.53. The most limited group were the males from single-parent families with 2.67 degree of limitation.

Second most limiting question was item number thirteen. Freshman group most severely limited were the females from two-parent families with a 2.36 average response. Sophomores most limited were females from single-parent families with a 2.50 average response. Junior girls from single-parent families were the most limited with a 2.80 degree of limitations. Seniors most severely limited were the females from single parent families with an average response of 4.18.

Third most limiting question was item number three. Freshman group most limited by number three were the females from single-parent families with 2.67 average response. Sophomore group most limited were the males from single parent families with a 3.60 average response. Juniors most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 3.60 average response. Seniors most limited were the females from single parent families with an average response of 2.27.

It was found that question sixteen was the fourth most limiting factor. The freshman group that was most limited were the females from two-parent families with an average

response of 2.17. Sophomore group most limited were males from single-parent families with 2.46 average response. Juniors most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 3.80 average response. Senior group most limited were the males from two-parent families with a 4.50 average response.

Findings indicate that the fifth most limiting factor was question number 14. Freshman group most limited were the females from two-parent families with a 2.54 average response. Sophomore group most limited were the males from two-parent families with a 2.14 average response. Junior group most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 3.80 average response. Senior group that was most limited were the females from single-parent families with an average response of 3.55.

It found that the sixth most limiting factor was question number 15. Freshman group that was most limiting were the females from two-parent families with a 2.57 average response. The sophomore group that was not limited were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.00. Junior group most limited by question 15 were the males from single-parent families 2.40. Senior group most limited were the males from single-parent families with 2.00.

Seventh most limiting factor was question number eight. Freshman females from two-parent families were most severely limited with a 2.86 average response. Sophomore

females from single-parent families were the most limited group with a 2.05 average response. Juniors most severely limited were the females from single-parent families with a 3.20 average response. Senior males from single-parent families were the most limited with a 2.06 average response.

Eighth most limiting factor was question number seven. Freshman most limited were females from single-parent families with a 2.08 average. Sophomores most limited were the males and females from two-parent families with an 1.85 average response. Junior females from single-parent families were most limited with a 2.20 average response. Senior group most limited were the males from two-parent families with a 2.29 average response.

It was found that the ninth most limiting factor was question number two. Freshman group most limited were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.47. Sophomore group most limited were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.23. Juniors most limited group were the males from single-parent families with an average response of 2.71. Senior group most limited were the males from single-parent families with a 2.06 average response.

It was found that the tenth most limiting factor was question number one. Freshman group most limited were the females from single-parent families with a 2.48 average response. Sophomore group most limited were the females

from single-parent families with a 2.40 average response. Junior group most limited were the males from single-parent families with a 2.22 average response. Senior group most limited were the males from single-parent families with 1.48 average response.

It was also found that the final ten items were of dramatically lowered response level. These items are attached in the appendix. the most limiting of these items was number 6 with an average response of 1.71. The least limiting being item number 10 with an average response of 1.50.

It was also found that 33 out of 40 or 82.5% of the most limited groups were from single-parent families.

Conclusions

It was concluded from the data that nearly half of all the students surveyed were from single-parents.

It was concluded that of the respondents those from two-parent families had a higher grade point average, than those from single-parents.

From the data it can be concluded that both the males and females from two-parent families had participated in more total activities and had a higher average of activities participated in per student.

It also can be concluded that there are barriers to involvement in activities. It also can be concluded that

vast majority of the students that were limited by these ten barriers lived in single-parent families.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the examination of the top ten limiting barriers.

Limitation number one question seventeen, the Freshman class males from single-parent families were moderately limited. Sophomore group most limited were the males from single-parent families with a moderate degree of limitation. Junior group most limited were the females from single-parent families with a moderate degree of limitation. Senior group most limited were the males from single-parent families with a moderate degree of limitation.

From the second most limiting barrier it can be concluded that females from single-parent families were the group most limited. The females from single-parent families were the most limited group in 3 of the 4 groups, in the fourth they were second most limited.

Third most limiting barrier was item number three, freshman females from single-parent families were the most limited group with a moderate degree of limitation. Sophomore males from single-parent families were the most limited with a limiting degree of limitation. Juniors most limited were the females from a single-parent family with limiting degree of limitation. Seniors most limited were the females from single-parent families with a slight degree of limitation.

It was concluded that question sixteen ranked fourth among barriers. The freshman group most limited were the females from two-parent families with a slight degree of limitation. Sophomore group most limited were the males from single-parent families with slight degree of limitation. Juniors most limited were the female from single-parent families with a limiting degree of limitation. Senior group most limited were the males from two-parent families with severe degree of limitation.

Fifth most limiting factor, question 14, also had conclusions that could be drawn from the data received. In the Freshman respondents the most limited group were females from single-parent families with a moderate degree of limitation. Sophomores most limited were males from two-parent families with a slight degree of limitation. Juniors most limited were females from single-parent families with a limiting degree of limitation. Senior group most limited were the females from single-parent families with a limiting degree of limitations.

Sixth most limiting factor was question number 15. The freshman group most limited were the females from two-parent families with a limiting degree of limitation. Sophomores most limited were the males from single-parent families with a slight degree of limitation. Junior group most limited were the males from single-parent families with a slight degree of limitation. Seniors most limited

were the males from single-parent families with a slight degree of limitations.

It can be concluded that the seventh most limiting factor was item number eight. Freshman group most limited were the females from two-parent families with a moderate degree of limitation. Sophomore group most limited were the females from single-parent families. Junior females from single-parent families had limited degree of limitation. Senior males had a slight degree of limitation for the most limited group.

Eighth most limiting factor was question number seven. Freshman most limited by it were females from single-parent families with a slight degree of limitation. Sophomore group most limited were the males and females two-parent families with slight degree of limitation. Junior females from single-parent families were slightly limited. Senior males from two-parent families were slightly limited.

Ninth most limiting factor was question number two. Freshman males from single-parent families slightly limited. Sophomore males from single-parent families were slightly limited. Senior males from single parent families were also slightly limited.

It was concluded that the tenth most limiting factor was question number one. Freshman group most limited were the females from single-parent families with a slight degree of limitation. Sophomore females from single-parent families were slightly limited. Junior males from single-

parent families were slightly limited. Senior males from single-parent families were not limited.

It can be concluded from these top ten limitations that females from single-parent families were the most limited group.

Recommendations

It appears that the following recommendations are appropriate.

1. It is my recommendation that further study be done in this area. I feel these studies should be conducted in rural, urban, and suburban communities.

2. It is my further recommendation that school administration use this information to assist those students who are potential candidates for emotional disturbance from divorce. It can help identify precursors to further and more severe problems from dissolution of the family unit.

3. I would also recommend that studies be done to cover the effects of Single-Parent family versus the Two-Parent Family in the areas of attendance, truancy, and discipline referral relationships.

It is my recommendation that further study be done on this area. At the present time insufficient data is available for conclusive action. I feel that further studies should be done in both rural and urban communities. It would also be helpful if the format of the survey

instrument be revised to correct for individuals not responding to all questions. It would also be helpful to have the survey administered by the individual that wrote it. There is more important information which can be obtained from area. Information that could assist schools to help those individuals that have developed problems resulting from the dissolution of a family unit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ourth, John, Sally Bank Zakariya. "The School and the Single Parent Student: What Can the School do to help." Principal Vol. 60 (Sept. 1982), pp. 24-33.
- Spencer, Rich. "Single-Parent Families Rise Dramatically." Washington Post, May 3, 1982, pg. 3.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. Marital Status and Living Arrangements: March 1982. (Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 372) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982a.
- Lazarus, Mitchell. "One-Parent Families and their Children." Principal Vol. 58 (Sept. 1980), pp. 31-37.
- Erikson, Erik. Identity, Youth, and Crisis: New York, W. W. Norton, 1968.
- Lipsitz, Joan. "Making it the Hard Way: Adolescents in the 1980's." Testimony Prepared for the Crisis Intervention Task Force House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families. October 27, 1983.
- Ourth, John. "Children in One-Parent Homes the School Factor." Principal Vol. 60 (Sept 1982) pp. 40.
- Lazarus, Mitchell. "One-Parent Families and their children." Principal Vol. 58 (Sept. 80) pp. 31-37.
- Rowland, Virginia. "Resource Adequacy and Time Use in One-Parent and Two-Parent Families." (Ph.D. dissertation, Library, Oklahoma State University, May, 1983.)
- Lipsitz, Joan. "Making it the Hard Way: Adolescents in the 1980's." Testimony Prepared for the Crisis Intervention Task Force House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, October 27, 1983.
- Haskins, Ron. "Single-Parent Families: Policy Recommendations for Child Support." Paper Presented at the Conference on Changing Roles of Women in North Carolina. April 1983.
- Roland, Virginia. "Resource Adequacy and Time Use in One-parent and Two-Parent Families." (Ph.D. dissertation, Library, Oklahoma State University, May, 1983.)

Zakariya, Sally Banks. "Another Look at Children of Divorce." Principal Vol. 60 (Sept. 1982) pp. 34-37.

Meyers, David E. "Single-Parents. Working Mothers and Educational Achievement of Secondary School Age children." Department of Education, Washington D.C., June 1983.

Ourth, John and Sally Bank Zakariya. "The School and Single-Parents Student: What can the School do to Help." Principal Vol. 60 (Sept. 1982) pp. 38.

APPENDIX

Dr. Whitworth,

I am in the process of obtaining a Masters of Science from Oklahoma State University in Agricultural Education.

I am requesting approval to administer a survey to approximately four hundred students grades 9-12, for my study. Enclosed you will find a copy of the survey. Any suggestions or comments would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Barry Weathers

Mr. Barry Weathers
1013 West Lansing
Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012

Dear Mr. Weathers:

Please accept this letter as notification of approval, from the Broken Arrow Public Schools, to conduct the survey you requested.

If we can be of any further service, please let us know.

Sincerely,

BROKEN ARROW PUBLIC SCHOOLS



Edward D. Whitworth, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent
for Administrative Services

lc

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

There are two segments to this survey. The first deals with basic information from individual students. These are age, grade, sex, grade point, number of parents, and number of activities participated in during the year. The grade point is to be cumulative for all semesters on the Four Point Scale.

The second portion deals with the student's opinion about items that may present limitations to their participation in extra curricular activities. These responses range from 1 to 5. With a response of one being not limited by the item. Response number two being slightly limiting. Response number three being moderately limiting. Response number four is an item that is limiting. Number five response being the most severe limitation.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Sex Male _____ Female _____

Age _____

Grade Freshman _____ Sophomore _____
Junior _____ Senior _____

Cumulative Academic Grade Point on 4.0 Scale

4.0 - A 3.0 - B 2.0 - C 1.0 - D _____

Grades for Math _____ English _____ Science _____ History _____

Are you living with two parents Yes _____ No _____

Number of extra curricular activities involved with during the year, include sports, clubs, other school related, or church groups. Include each individual sport.

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ or more _____

In each club or sport how many activities do you participate in during the year

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ or more _____

In each activity rate your involvement with 1 least limiting 5 most severely limiting

1 ___ Not Limiting 2 ___ Slightly Limiting 3 ___ Moderately Limiting
4 ___ Limiting 5 ___ Severely Limited

Rate the following factors that limit your participation in club or sport involvement

Place an x in the appropriate blank

1 being the least limiting 5 being the most severely limiting

1. Availability of transportation

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

2. Availability of financing to buy equipment or other accessories

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

3. Parents work conflict with scheduling of preparation or activity

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

Figure 1. QUESTIONNAIRE

4. Do not get along with people in this particular club
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
5. Personal preference for the activity
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
6. Do not know many of the people in the club
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
7. Not closely associated with people in the club
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
8. Competition from other activities
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
9. Joined club in preparation for a job but no jobs were available
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
10. Facilities available were not adequate for activity
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
11. Club Sponsor or Coach not adequately prepared
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
12. No support from the community for this activity
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
13. Student must be employed to earn own spending money
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
14. More involved in conflicting activity
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
15. Too many hours too little recognition
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____
16. Activity interferes with job schedule
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

Figure 2. QUESTIONNAIRE

17. Activities interfere with homework from school

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

18. Fear of initiations into club

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

19. Activity interferes with household chores

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

20. Too much work expected from individuals participating in the activity

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

QUESTION FOUR

DO NOT GET ALONG WITH OTHER MEMBERS IN THE CLUB

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	11	45.83	4	16.67	6	25.00	1	4.17	1	4.17	1.92
	Single	17	0	0.00	12	70.59	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	11.76	1.65
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	16	57.14	8	28.58	2	7.14	1	3.57	1	3.57	1.68
	Single	25	2	8.00	18	72.00	2	8.00	1	4.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	1.40
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		95													1.66

QUESTION FOUR

DO NOT GET ALONG WITH OTHER MEMBERS IN THE CLUB

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	6	28.57	7	33.33	3	14.29	2	9.52	1	4.78	2	9.52	1.57
	Single	13	0	0.00	8	61.53	2	15.39	1	7.69	2	15.39	0	0.00	1.77
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	12	63.16	1	5.26	1	5.26	1	5.26	1	5.26	1.37
	Single	12	4	33.33	6	50.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	
Sub Total		31													1.08
TOTAL		65													1.45

QUESTION FOUR

DO NOT GET ALONG WITH OTHER MEMBERS IN THE CLUB

Juniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	2		4		2		0	0.00	1		0	0.00	1.33
	Single	5	0	0.00	5	1.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.00
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
	Single	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.20
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.23

QUESTION FOUR

DO NOT GET ALONG WITH OTHER MEMBERS IN THE CLUB

Seniors Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	4	15.39	16	61.54	2	7.69	2	7.69	2	7.69	0		1.31
	Single	17	3	17.65	6	35.29	1	5.88	3	17.65	0	0.00	4	23.53	2.18
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	2	9.52	11	52.38	5	23.81	2	9.52	0	0.00	1	4.77	1.52
	Single	11	5	45.46	3	27.27	3	27.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.82
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.46

QUESTION FIVE

PERSONAL PREFERENCE FOR THE ACTIVITY

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	2	8.33	8	33.33	5	20.50	3	12.50	3	12.50	3	12.50	2.25
	Single	17	0	0.00	12	70.59	2	11.76	1	5.89	0	0.00	2	11.76	1.71
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	16	57.14	8	28.57	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	14.29	1.86
	Single	25	1	4.00	12	48.00	3	12.00	6	24.00	2	8.00	1	4.00	1.96
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.95

QUESTION FIVE

PERSONAL PREFERENCE FOR THE ACTIVITY

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	6	28.57	4	19.05	5	23.81	1	4.76	4	19.05	1	4.76	1.81
	Single	13	3	23.08	5	38.46	0	0.00	3	23.08	0	0.00	2	15.38	1.85
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	9	47.37	1	5.26	3	10.53	0	0.00	4	21.05	1.95
	Single	12	4	33.33	5	41.67	0	0.00	1	8.33	2	16.67	0	0.00	1.33
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.74

QUESTION FIVE

PERSONAL PREFERENCE FOR THE ACTIVITY

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	5	55.56	1	11.11	1	11.11	1	11.11	0	0.00	1.56
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2.00
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	1	20.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.20
	Single	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.54

QUESTION FIVE

PERSONAL PREFERENCE FOR THE ACTIVITY

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.07	11	42.31	2	7.69	1	3.85	3	11.54	3	11.54	1.73
	Single	17	3	17.64	5	29.41	0	0.00	5	29.41	1	5.88	3	17.64	2.29
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	2	9.53	13	61.90	2	9.52	1	4.76	1	4.76	2	9.53	1.62
	Single	11	5	45.45	5	45.45	1	9.10	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.64
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.57

QUESTION SIX

DO NOT KNOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE CLUB

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	2	8.33	14	58.33	5	20.84	2	8.33	0	0.00	1	4.17	1.46
	Single	17	0	0.00	10	58.82	4	23.53	3	17.65	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.82
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	19	67.86	2	7.14	4	14.29	2	7.14	1	3.57	1.71
	Single	25	1	4.00	15	60.00	3	12.00	1	8.0	0	0.00	5	20.0	1.96
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.74

QUESTION SIX

DO NOT KNOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE CLUB

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	6	28.57	4	14.05	1	4.76	0	0.00	3	14.29	1.52
	Single	13	2	15.38	8	61.54	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	23.08	1.54
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	9	47.37	3	15.79	3	15.79	0	0.00	1	5.26	1.53
	Single	12	5	41.67	3	25.00	1	8.33	0	0.00	3	25.00	0	0.00	1.42
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.50

QUESTION SIX

DO NOT KNOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE CLUB

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	6	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	22.22	1.78
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1.80
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.80
	Single	5	0	0.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2.60
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													2.00

QUESTION SIX

DO NOT KNOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE CLUB

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	11	42.31	4	15.38	4	15.38	1	3.85	0	0.00	1.35
	Single	17	3	17.65	6	35.29	1	5.88	3	17.65	4	23.53	0	0.00	1.94
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	3	14.29	10	47.62	2	9.52	3	14.29	1	4.76	2	9.52	1.76
	Single	11	5	45.46	2	18.68	2	18.18	0	0.00	2	18.18	0	0.00	1.45
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.63

QUESTION NINE

JOINED CLUB IN PREPARATION FOR A JOB BUT NO JOBS WERE AVAILABLE

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	16	66.67	3	12.50	2	8.33	0	0.00	2	8.33	1.58
	Single	17	0	0.00	7	70.59	2	11.76	2	11.76	1	5.89	0	0.00	2.06
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	21	75.00	2	7.14	2	7.14	1	3.58	2	7.14	1.61
	Single	25	1	4.00	15	60.00	1	4.00	4	16.00	0	0.00	4	16.00	2.88
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.90

QUESTION NINE

JOINED CLUB IN PREPARATION FOR A JOB BUT NO JOBS WERE AVAILABLE

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	8	38.10	4	19.05	4	19.05	3	14.28	1	4.76	1	4.76	1.43
	Single	13	3	23.00	6	46.15	1	7.69	1	7.69	0	0.00	2	15.39	1.62
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	11	57.79	3	15.79	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	10.53	1.42
	Single	12	6	50.00	5	41.61	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33	.83
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.29

QUESTION NINE

JOINED CLUB IN PREPARATION FOR A JOB BUT NO JOBS WERE AVAILABLE

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	5	55.56	0	0.00	2	22.22	1	11.11	0	0.00	1.67
	Single	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	2.20
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.06
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.72

QUESTION NINE

JOINED CLUB IN PREPARATION FOR A JOB BUT NO JOBS WERE AVAILABLE

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	16	61.54	2	7.69	1	3.85	1	3.85	0	0.00	1.04
	Single	17	3	17.65	5	29.41	3	17.65	4	23.53	1	5.88	2	11.76	1.82
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	12	57.14	3	14.29	1	4.76	0	0.00	1	4.76	1.24
	Single	11	5	45.45	5	45.45	1	1.90	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.64
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.19

QUESTION TEN

FACILITIES AVAILABLE WERE NOT ADEQUATE FOR ACTIVITY

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	2	8.33	16	66.67	0	0.00	3	16.67	2	8.33	0	0.00	1.50
	Single	17	0	0.00	11	64.70	3	17.65	3	17.65	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.53
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	22	78.57	2	7.14	1	3.57	3	10.72	0	0.00	1.46
	Single	25	1	4.00	17	68.00	3	12.00	1	4.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	1.64
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.53

QUESTION NINE

JOINED CLUB IN PREPARATION FOR A JOB BUT NO JOBS WERE AVAILABLE

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	5	23.82	4	19.05	2	9.52	1	4.76	2	9.52	1.57
	Single	13	2	15.39	6	46.15	1	7.69	2	15.39	0	0.00	2	15.39	1.85
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	16	84.21	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.84
	Single	12	5	41.67	5	41.67	0	0.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	1.00
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.27

QUESTION NINE

JOINED CLUB IN PREPARATION FOR A JOB BUT NO JOBS WERE AVAILABLE

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	5	55.56	2	22.22	0	0.00	1	11.11	0	0.00	1.44
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.60
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.40

QUESTION NINE

JOINED CLUB IN PREPARATION FOR A JOB BUT NO JOBS WERE AVAILABLE

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	17	65.38	1	3.85	0	0.00	1	3.85	1	3.85	1.08
	Single	17	3	17.65	4	23.53	4	23.53	4	23.53	2	11.76	0	0.00	1.94
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	12	57.38	2	9.52	2	9.52	0	0.00	1	4.76	1.29
	Single	11	5	45.45	5	45.45	1	9.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.64
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.24

QUESTION ELEVEN

CLUB SPONSOR OR COACH NOT ADEQUATELY PREPARED

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	14	58.32	6	25.00	1	4.17	1	4.17	1	4.17	1.58
	Single	17	0	0.00	10	58.82	4	23.53	2	11.76	1	5.89	0	0.00	1.65
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.000	18	64.29	6	21.42	3	10.72	1	3.57	0	0.00	1.54
	Single	25	1	4.00	13	5.60	4	16.00	2	8.00	1	4.00	3	12.00	1.88
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.66

QUESTION ELEVEN

CLUB SPONSOR OR COACH NOT ADEQUATELY PREPARED

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	4	19.05	4	19.05	4	19.05	1	4.76	1	4.76	1.57
	Single	13	3	23.08	7	53.85	1	7.69	1	7.69	0	0.00	1	7.69	1.31
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	8	47.37	4	21.05	2	10.53	1	5.26	0	0.00	1.42
	Single	12	5	41.67	6	50.0	1	8.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.67
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.33

QUESTION ELEVEN

CLUB SPONSOR OR COACH NOT ADEQUATELY PREPARED

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	5	55.55	1	11.11	1	11.11	1	11.11	0	0.00	1.56
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2.00
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	1	20.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.80
	Single	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.49

QUESTION ELEVEN

CLUB SPONSOR OR COACH NOT ADEQUATELY PREPARED

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	14	53.85	4	15.38	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	7.69	1.23
	Single	17	3	17.654	7	41.12	0	0.00	3	17.65	2	11.76	2	11.76	2.00
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	11	52.38	6	23.81	1	4.76	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.14
	Single	11	5	45.45	4	36.36	0	0.00	1	9.09	0	0.00	1	9.09	1.09
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.37

QUESTION TWELVE

NO SUPPORT FROM COMMUNITY FOR THIS ACTIVITY

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	1	4.17	13	54.16	4	16.67	2	8.33	0	0.00	4	16.67	1.96
	Single	17	0	0.00	9	52.94	3	17.65	1	5.89	2	11.76	2	11.76	2.12
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	20	71.43	4	14.29	1	3.57	2	7.14	1	3.57	1.57
	Single	25	1	4.00	13	56.00	4	16.00	3	12.00	0	0.00	3	12.00	1.84
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		95													1.87

QUESTION TWELVE

NO SUPPORT FROM COMMUNITY FOR THIS ACTIVITY

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	7	33.33	2	9.52	4	19.05	6	28.58	1	4.76	1	4.76	1.76
	Single	13	3	23.08	6	46.15	0	0.00	2	15.39	0	0.00	2	15.39	1.69
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	3	15.79	4	21.05	5	26.32	0	0.00	1	5.26	6	31.58	2.53
	Single	12	5	41.67	4	33.33	3	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.83
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.75

QUESTION TWELVE

NO SUPPORT FROM COMMUNITY FOR THIS ACTIVITY

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	2	22.22	2	22.22	2	22.22	1	11.11	1	11.11	1.50
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.60
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.80
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.49

QUESTION TWELVE

NO SUPPORT FROM COMMUNITY FOR THIS ACTIVITY

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	8	30.77	6	23.03	3	11.54	0	0.00	3	11.54	1.58
	Single	17	3	17.65	6	35.29	3	17.65	2	11.76	2	11.76	1	5.88	1.82
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	8	38.10	5	23.81	3	14.28	1	4.76	0	0.00	1.48
	Single	11	5	45.45	4	36.36	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	7.09	.91
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.41

QUESTION EIGHTEEN
FEAR OF INITIATION INTO CLUB

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	2	8.33	12	70.83	4	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	4.17	1.25
	Single	17	0	0.00	11	64.71	4	23.53	2	11.76	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.47
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0		22	78.58	3	10.71	2	7.14	0	0.00	1	3.57	1.39
	Single	25	1	4.00	18	72.00	0	0.00	2	8.00	0	0.00	3	16.0	1.76
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.47

QUESTION EIGHTEEN
FEAR OF INITIATION INTO CLUB

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	8	38.10	5	23.81	3	14.29	1	4.76	1	4.76	2	9.52	1.33
	Single	13	3	23.08	6	46.15	0	0.00	2	15.39	0	0.00	2	15.39	1.69
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	5	26.32	10	52.63	0	0.00	2	10.53	1	5.26	1	5.26	1.32
	Single	12	4	33.33	6	50.00	1	8.33	1	8.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	.91
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.31

QUESTION EIGHTEEN
FEAR OF INITIATION INTO CLUB

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severely Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	4	44.44	1	11.11	1	11.11	1	11.11	1	11.11	1.50
	Single	5	0	0.00	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.40
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	4	80.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	1.6
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2.00
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.56

QUESTION EIGHTEEN
FEAR OF INITIATION INTO CLUB

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	15	57.69	2	7.69	2	7.69	0	0.00	1	3.85	1.15
	Single	17	3	17.65	5	29.41	2	11.76	4	23.53	0	0.00	3	17.65	1.94
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	4	19.05	13	61.90	0	0.00	3	14.29	1	4.76	0	0.00	1.24
	Single	11	6	54.54	4	36.36	1	9.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	.55
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.22

QUESTION NINETEEN

ACTIVITIES INTERFERES WITH HOUSEHOLD CHORES

Freshman Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	24	2	8.33	15	62.50	5	20.83	0	0.00	1	4.17	1	4.17	1.42
	Single	17	0	0.00	10	58.83	0	0.00	4	23.53	1	5.88	2	11.76	2.12
Sub Total		41													
Females	Two	28	0	0.00	15	53.37	7	25.00	5	17.86	0	0.00	1	3.57	1.75
	Single	25	1	4.00	13	52.00	5	20.00	3	12.00	1	4.00	2	8.00	1.84
Sub Total		53													
TOTAL		94													1.78

QUESTION NINETEEN

ACTIVITIES INTERFERES WITH HOUSEHOLD CHORES

Sophomore Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	21	8	38.10	3	14.29	6	28.57	2	9.52	0	0.00	2	9.52	1.48
	Single	13	4	30.77	7	53.85	1	7.69	1	7.69	0	0.00	0	0.00	.92
Sub Total		34													
Females	Two	19	4	21.05	10	52.63	1	5.26	0	0.00	2	10.53	2	10.53	1.58
	Single	12	5	41.67	2	16.67	3	25.00	1	8.33	0	0.00	1	8.33	1.33
Sub Total		31													
TOTAL		65													1.33

QUESTION NINETEEN

ACTIVITIES INTERFERES WITH HOUSEHOLD CHORES

Junior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	9	1	11.11	5	55.55	1	11.11	1	11.11	0	0.00	1	11.11	1.25
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.60
Sub Total		14													
Females	Two	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	0	0.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	2.00
	Single	5	0	0.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1.400
Sub Total		10													
TOTAL		24													1.56

QUESTION NINETEEN

ACTIVITIES INTERFERES WITH HOUSEHOLD CHORES

Senior Students	Family Units	Number of Students	No Response		Not Limiting		Slightly Limiting		Moderately Limiting		Limiting		Severly Limiting		Average Response
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Coefficient Value of response			0		1		2		3		4		5		
Males	Two	26	6	23.08	12	46.15	3	11.54	2	7.69	4	3.85	2	7.69	1.46
	Single	17	3	17.65	6	35.29	3	17.65	1	5.88	3	17.65	1	5.88	1.88
Sub Total		43													
Females	Two	21	5	23.81	8	38.10	4	19.05	3	14.29	1	4.76	0	0.00	1.38
	Single	11	5	45.45	2	18.18	0	0.00	2	18.18	1	9.09	0	0.00	1.55
Sub Total		32													
TOTAL		75													1.56

VITA

BARRY R. WEATHERS

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE EFFECTS OF PARENTING AS PERCEIVED BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN THE AREAS OF ACADEMIC AND EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

Major Field: Agriculture Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Stillwater, Oklahoma, February 2, 1956, the son of Dale and Vena Weathers.

Education: Graduated Stillwater High school, Stillwater, Oklahoma 1974; received Bachelor of Science Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, May 1982; completed the requirements for Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1988.

Professional Experience: Vocational Agriculture Instructor, Broken ARrow, Oklahoma, 1982-Present.

Professional Organizations: Oklahoma Vocational Association; American Vocational Association; Oklahoma Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association.