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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

School-aged girls who are pregnant before they complete their high school courses of study comprise an exceptional student population. Similar to other exceptional student populations, they have exceptional needs which regular school program personnel are not trained to serve. Similar to other exceptional student populations, they are legally required to be served by public schools.

Inasmuch as compulsory education makes the public school system the major societal institution serving teenagers, school personnel are the most likely to identify school-aged, pregnant girls early in their pregnancies and to direct them to appropriate sources of help (Murdock, 1968). Similarly, school personnel are the most likely to influence these girls to continue their education. Compared with pregnant teenagers who drop out of school, those pregnant teenagers who complete their high school education are least likely to have repeated early pregnancies and are most likely to lead economically self-sufficient lives (Howard, 1968).
Although school personnel have access to school-aged, pregnant girls, their role in providing educational and support services to this student population is unclear. If professional personnel in public schools are to encourage pregnant teenagers to complete high school, then school courses and programs which respond to their exceptional student needs must be available. If such courses and programs are to be offered in the schools, then school superintendents and principals have major administrative responsibilities in developing, implementing, and maintaining them. This study is designed to gather and to interpret information about the attitudes of public school administrators and about school system practices regarding courses and programs for pregnant, school-aged students in an effort towards clarifying the role of the public school in serving pregnant teenagers.

The rationale of the study and statewide information pertinent to the study are presented in this section to further describe the background of the problem.

**Rationale of the Study**

This study examines the preferences and practices of selected North Carolina school superintendents and principals regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students. The rationale of this study is based upon four realities:
1. Societal problems posed by pregnant, school-aged students and attendant public expectations of schools regarding those problems

2. Criteria existing in the literature of various disciplines which address the needs of pregnant, school-aged students and which identify programs which are effective in meeting the needs of pregnant, school-aged students

3. North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction priorities to meet the wide range of student needs in secondary schools and, thereby, to decrease the number of students dropping out of school

4. Lack of information about: (a) existing programs in North Carolina public secondary schools which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students and address the concerns of society, and (b) existing perceptions and preferences of North Carolina school administrators regarding the appropriate role of the schools in providing services to pregnant, school-aged students.

The first basis for the rationale of this study, societal problems posed by school-aged pregnancies, is reported in the literature of various disciplines. A review of this literature is included in Chapter Two. Specific societal problems associated with school-aged pregnancy are: school dropouts; unemployed or unproductive young parents; increased dependency on national welfare programs; repeated early pregnancies; jeopardized life and health of newborn babies; and
poor parenting (Klerman, 1975). Attendant public expectations of schools regarding school-aged pregnancy are evident in legal mandates. Legally, public schools are expected to provide service to pregnant and parenting school-aged students (Title IX, Educational Amendments, 1972). Legally, pregnant, school-aged students are included in the North Carolina definition of exceptional student populations who have the right to be served appropriately by special or regular school programs or some combination of the two (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1979). Appropriate educational services relate to the exceptionality of the student population. North Carolina public school educators are expected to provide appropriate educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students even though special education training for professionals serving this exceptional student population does not exist in pre-service or in-service teacher training programs. Societal problems posed by school-aged pregnancies and attendant public expectations that the public schools provide appropriate services to pregnant, school-aged students comprise an area which requires examination of practices in schools and of perceptions of school administrators.

The second basis for the rationale of this study, criteria which address effective school programs for pregnant, school-aged students, is reported in literature about teenage pregnancy in the fields of education, psychology, medicine, and social work. A review of this literature is included in
Chapter Two; it includes reports of applied research, project descriptions, program comparisons, and case studies. This literature addresses: causes of school-aged pregnancy; program variables which focus on preventing early pregnancies; medical, psychological, and social needs of pregnant, school-aged students; academic, vocational, and guidance program variables appropriate to pregnant, school-aged students; program variables which focus on parenting skills of school-aged mothers; and program processes for cooperative planning between schools and other community agencies with respect to serving pregnant, school-aged students. This study has been designed to examine the practices in public schools and the perceptions of public school administrators regarding educational and support services for pregnant, school-aged students in relationship to literature-identified criteria for such services.

The third basis for the rationale of this study, the priorities of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction to meet the wide range of student needs in secondary schools and, thereby, to decrease the number of students dropping out of school (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1977), relates directly to pregnant, school-aged students in two ways. First, the needs of students, related to their pregnancies and their expected status as parents, broaden the traditional range of student needs met in public secondary schools. Secondly, pregnant, school-aged students are estimated to represent a high percentage of those who annually
drop out of school prior to high school completion (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1980). State Department of Public Instruction staff members, in their efforts to increase the capacities of secondary schools to meet the wide range of student needs, are planning to provide guidelines and direction to the school administrators of local units. Information about administrators' preferences and practices in local units regarding school services for pregnant, school-aged students will be useful in designing guidelines for:

1. Practical, organizational, and management processes necessary for implementing effective programs for pregnant, school-aged students

2. Program ingredients which keep pregnant students, who soon become parenting teenagers, from dropping out of school

3. Staff development activities for personnel who provide educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students.

Such processes, program ingredients, and staff development activities are dependent upon the perceptions and behavior of the administrators responsible for the programs. The results of this study, identification of program criteria and of local school administrators' perceptions and practices regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students, will provide baseline information necessary for the implementation of State Department of Public Instruction direction and guidelines to local units.
The fourth basis for the rationale of this study is the absence of information about North Carolina public schools with respect to the provision of instructional and support services for pregnant, school-aged students. There is no systematically gathered information about what is and what is not being provided for pregnant students in the 145 public school systems of North Carolina. There is no information describing the perceptions and preferences of North Carolina superintendents and principals regarding public school programs for pregnant, school-aged students. This study has been designed to gather such information from the thirty-four public school systems within the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina.

The rationale of this study has been presented to explain the need for information about North Carolina public school system practices and public school administrators' preferences regarding school services for pregnant, school-aged students.

Statewide Information Pertinent to the Study

Information about North Carolina which is pertinent to this study relates to the role of the State Department of Public Instruction in funding and program planning for local systems and to the extent of the statewide, teenage pregnancy problem.

The North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction funds 64 percent of the operating expenses of the
public school system in North Carolina (North Carolina Public Schools, 1979). The department is responsive to State Board of Education and state government concerns about high school dropouts. Dropouts include a high percentage of girls who are pregnant or parenting. North Carolina Governor Hunt has established an Advisory Council on Children and Youth (GACCY); its Task Force on Adolescent Sexuality, Pregnancy and Parenthood reported the following data about teenage pregnancy:

- North Carolina ranks fifth in the nation in the proportion of births to mothers under nineteen
- In 1978, 17,335 babies were born to women under the age of twenty in North Carolina; 5,000 of these were the second or third child
- While the percentage of births to teens has declined slightly in the last few years, the number of births among females ten to fourteen years old has increased
- There has been a tremendous increase in the number of out-of-wedlock births
- Approximately 8,000 teenagers chose to terminate their pregnancies
- Of those teens who gave birth, almost half received no prenatal care during the first trimester
- The death rate for infants born to teens is twenty-three per 1,000 overall
- In 1962, there were 8,000 cases of gonorrhea reported; in 1978 there were 37,000—and one in three was a teen
- The number of teenage mothers in North Carolina receiving AFDC increased from 205 in 1976 to 4,664 in 1979; forty-two percent of these cases were teen mothers who were also heads of household. (Governor's Advisory Council on Children and Youth, 1980).

Inasmuch as the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction plays a major role in the funding of local systems, it is able to play a major role in program planning for local systems. The statewide priority to meet the wide range of high school students' needs and, thereby, to decrease the school dropout rate is responsive to teenage pregnant girls
in local systems who drop out of school because their needs are not usually met by local public school courses or programs.

The population of pregnant and parenting school-aged girls who have yet to complete high school is one for which appropriate services could be provided by the public schools. This has been demonstrated to be true, nationally, by selected school programs (Garmezy, 1970; Green, 1969). Relevant North Carolina state assistant superintendents and directors, interviewed by this researcher, expressed interest in providing guidelines and direction to secondary school principals which will increase their understandings and skills necessary for implementing effective school programs for pregnant students. These state agency decision makers are aware that pregnant students typically "drop out" of school and frequently feel "pushed out" of school, despite the illegality of exclusions based on pregnancy or childbirth (Title IX, Educational Amendments, 1972). These decision makers are also aware that the programmatic needs of pregnant students are generally unknown to secondary school principals. In addition to considering school programs which can prevent unwanted teenage pregnancy, Department of Public Instruction decision makers are considering ways either to deliver educational and support services to those school-aged students who are already pregnant or to participate in community programs which can do similarly. This study has been designed to gather information
which can be used by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for determining the nature of its guidelines and direction to local school systems.

The rationale of the study, information about the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, and information about teenage pregnancy in North Carolina have been included to fully present the background of the problem. The statement of the problem follows.

**Statement of the Problem**

There are three basic purposes of this study:

1. To describe the extent to which literature-identified educational and support services needed by pregnant, school-aged students are provided in existing programs of the thirty-four public school systems within the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina.

2. To report existing preferences and perceptions of superintendents and of principals serving seventh through twelfth graders in the thirty-four public school systems regarding the provision of literature-identified educational and support services for pregnant, school-aged students.

3. To examine any existing relationships, selected on the basis of data gathered in this study, regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students which address: (a) attitudinal differences between groups of public school administrators; (b) discrepancies between
literature-identified criteria and both the preferences and practices of public school administrators; and (c) discrepancies between the preferences and the practices of public school administrators.

Some questions follow which further disclose the three basic purposes of this study. Each purpose is discussed in a separate section. In each of the sections, a general question is followed by specific questions which are drawn from the literature.

**Educational and Support Services Provided**

What is the general status and scope of services provided for pregnant, school-aged students in the thirty-four public school systems of the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina?

1. Do the school systems provide the special programs, courses or services for pregnant, school-aged students which are described in the literature as responsive to the needs of these students

2. Do the school systems have local policies which govern services for pregnant, school-aged students

3. Do the school systems provide pregnant students with the ability to choose between regular and special program options

4. How comprehensively do special programs for pregnant students provide literature-identified academic and
special instructional services, counseling and guidance services, health services, and social services

5. How do the school systems organize their special programs for pregnant students

6. How is the community involved in school system administered special programs for pregnant students

7. Do the school systems provide special services in the regular schools or in special schools

8. How do the school systems administer, evaluate, and fund special programs for pregnant students

Preferences and Perceptions of Educational Administrators

What are the preferences and perceptions of the superintendents or their designees and of the principals of public schools serving seventh through twelfth graders in the thirty-four public school systems of the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina regarding public school provision of educational and support services for pregnant, school-aged students?

1. Do the administrators think that public schools should provide special programs, courses or services for pregnant, school-aged students which are described in the literature as responsive to their needs

2. Do the administrators think that pregnant students should have the ability to choose between regular and special program options
3. To what extent do the administrators think that public schools should provide for pregnant students comprehensively with academic and special instruction, counseling and guidance, health, and social services

4. How do administrators think that public schools should organize services for pregnant students

5. How do administrators think that public schools should involve the community in services for pregnant students

6. What are the administrators' preferences regarding the provision of special services to pregnant students in the regular schools or in special schools

7. What are the perceptions of administrators from school systems which have no special programs for pregnant students regarding the reasons for the non-existence of special programs

8. What are the personal insights of some questionnaire respondents about serving pregnant students in public schools?

Relationships Among Literature-Identified Criteria, Educational and Support Services Provided, and the Preferences and Perceptions of Educational Administrators

Do the data gathered in this study suggest any existing relationships among literature-identified program criteria, school system practices and the perceptions of school administrators regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students?
1. Are there attitudinal differences between central office and building level administrators regarding school services for pregnant students

2. Are there attitudinal differences between administrators from school systems which have special programs and administrators from school systems which do not have special programs for pregnant students regarding school services for them

3. Are there discrepancies between literature-identified program criteria for pregnant students and the practices in those systems which have special programs

4. Are there discrepancies between literature-identified program criteria and administrators' preferences regarding public school services for pregnant students

5. What are the discrepancies between the preferences of public school administrators and the practices in their school systems regarding public school services for pregnant students?

The three purposes of the study, amplified by specific questions drawn from the literature, have been presented to state the problem of the study.

**Design of the Study**

This study is designed to survey thirty-four school system superintendents or their designees and 339 principals of regular schools serving seventh through twelfth graders. The thirty-four superintendents or their designees represent
the total population of chief administrators in the local educational systems of North Carolina's eight standard metropolitan statistical areas. The 339 principals represent the total population of chief building administrators of schools serving seventh through twelfth graders in the same thirty-four systems.

The survey has been deemed the most appropriate methodology for the purposes and the plan of this study. The survey is appropriate because this study is designed to give descriptions and reports of practices, attitudes, and relationships. This study is not designed to show cause and effect relationships. Its purposes are analogous to the purposes of survey research which Kerlinger (1964) has defined as the study of populations "to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables" (Kerlinger, 1964).

In reviewing the literature, the researcher was able to identify characteristics, factors, and issues which are perceived to affect the provision of educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students. These findings significantly contributed to the development of a questionnaire for the study and to the investigator's capacity to interpret the data generated in the study.

Of the 145 school systems in North Carolina, this study surveys educational administrators of the thirty-four systems within the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of the state for the following reasons:
1. Populations of standard metropolitan statistical areas share proximity and access to community health and welfare agencies which population centers of 50,000 or more provide

2. Populations of standard metropolitan statistical areas share certain criteria of economic interactions, such as commuting to work, established by the U.S. Department of Commerce

3. On the bases of access to similar community resources and similar economic interactions, these thirty-four systems are more comparable than would be so of all 145 school systems in the state (United States Office of Management and Budget, 1975).

For purposes of the study and the analysis of data, the responding chief administrators of the identified school systems and school buildings will be examined as follows:

1. According to their representativeness of the total population surveyed based on (a) the sizes of their systems, (b) the dropout rates of their systems, (c) the rates of births to girls seventeen years and under of their counties, and (d) the answers to key questionnaire items on the part of sampled non-respondents

2. According to characteristics which define them with respect to (a) administrative role, (b) administrative experience, (c) sex, (d) grade level organizations of their buildings, (e) student populations of their buildings and
systems, and (f) the existence of special programs for pregnant students in their systems.

3. According to their practices in providing educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students.

4. According to their preferences and perceptions regarding the role of public schools in providing educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students.

The study has been designed to gather and examine the data necessary for answering the specific questions which address the three purposes of the study.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are defined for the purposes of this research:

1. **Pregnant, school-aged students**—girls, under eighteen years of age, who are enrolled in high schools and whose pregnancies occur before they complete high school.

2. **Regular program services**—programs or program components which are customary, usual, and appropriate for students served by the regular programs of the public school system and which are staffed and otherwise funded by annual budget provisions.

3. **Special program services**—programs or program components which are particular, specific, and appropriate for students whose special needs are not met by regular programs and which are staffed and otherwise funded by annual school system budget provisions.
4. Referral services—programs or program components which are staffed, otherwise funded, and provided by agencies other than the school system to which students are referred by the school system

5. A special course for pregnant students—one class period per school day devoted to a course specially designed for pregnant students

6. A special program for pregnant students—two or more class periods per school day specially designed for pregnant students

7. A special school for pregnant students—a school for pregnant students located away from the regular schools to which they are assigned

8. Home instruction—instruction provided in a student's home by a homebound teacher, funded by the school system

9. Educational and support services—school system regular and special instructional program components of academic and vocational courses and support program components of pupil personnel services, i.e. guidance counselors, school psychologists, school social workers

10. Psycho-social services to pregnant, school-aged students—program components which serve psychological needs of pregnant students (i.e. confusion between pregnancy demands and demands of adolescence) and social needs of pregnant students (i.e. welfare, day care, transportation)
11. **Medical services to pregnant, school-aged students**—program components which serve physical needs of expectant mothers

12. **Comprehensive services to pregnant, school-aged students**—programs which provide educational support, psycho-social, and medical services to pregnant, school-aged students

13. **Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA)**—an area which centers around one or more adjacent cities with a population of 50,000 or more and whose population meets certain criteria of economic interaction, such as commuting to work, as established by the United States Department of Commerce.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

For the purposes of this investigation, the following assumptions are held:

1. That a significant percentage of the selected population will consider the problem of this study worthy of taking the time to respond to the questionnaire

2. That the respondents will answer honestly

3. That the questionnaire items will not encourage biased responses

4. That respondents will have adequate information about their own systems for responding accurately to the various questions in the instrument
5. That the responding school administrators are desirous of information and of procedural guidelines which could clarify the appropriate role of public schools in serving pregnant, school-aged students.

Limitations of this study are:

1. The lack of experience on the part of most school administrators regarding the complexity of the needs of pregnant, school-aged students which might make it difficult for them to respond to many questions of the instrument

2. The normal shortcomings of survey research which will not allow this study to probe deeply into relationships between variables and which will necessitate much money, time, and technical survey research skills, i.e., instrument construction

3. The possible inadequate number of returns for reliable analysis of data

4. The inability of the researcher to verify that the responses were accurate.

Significance of the Study

The major significance of the study is the contribution of information to decision-making administrators of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction regarding the appropriate role of public schools in serving pregnant, school-aged students. This information will be generated by the survey research of the study which is designed to describe the preferences and practices of superintendents and principals
and to examine and report relationships among their preferences, their practices, and the literature-identified criteria for serving pregnant, school-aged students.

The contribution of this information is of major significance for three reasons:

1. The information is presently unknown
2. The information can be utilized in providing program guidelines to public school superintendents and principals
3. The information can clarify any discrepancies between public expectations and the expectations of school administrators regarding the role of schools in serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged girls.

The findings of the study should also be useful to the faculties and staffs of school programs, community health and social agencies, and community employment agencies which serve pregnant, school-aged girls. Moreover, the review of the literature relative to researched programs, interdisciplinary and comprehensive perspectives, and attitudinal considerations should make a contribution to the body of knowledge pertaining to programs which serve pregnant, school-aged students.

It is hoped that the findings of the study will promote further research on the role of public education in providing services to exceptional populations and in the area of statewide assessments as tools for planning procedures which
utilize information for providing program guidelines to local systems.

The review of literature pertaining to this study is presented in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In an effort to identify the characteristics, factors, and issues which are perceived to affect the provision of educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students, an extensive search of literature was conducted. The search has made it possible to build upon related studies and reports among dissertations, other reports of research, program descriptions, program comparisons, and documentary reports. The literature search has provided valuable information needed for the construction of a data-gathering instrument for this study. The literature search has provided information about current thinking and practices which affect the role of public education in serving school-aged, pregnant students.

Current literature pertinent to this study is categorized into four areas: (1) national perspectives relating to societal problems associated with school-aged, pregnant girls; (2) specific needs of school-aged, pregnant girls and mothers associated with pregnancy and motherhood; (3) school programs for school-aged, pregnant students during and following their pregnancies; and (4) preferences and practices of
school administrators regarding public school provision of educational, support, social, psychological, and medical services to pregnant, school-aged students during and following their pregnancies.

National Perspectives Relating to Societal Problems of School-Aged Pregnancy

The rate of adolescent pregnancy and childbearing in the United States is among the highest of any industrialized country. It is estimated that eleven million American teenagers, out of over forty million, are sexually active and of those, about one million teenage girls become pregnant each year. Of these one million, 600,000 give birth and approximately 90 percent keep their babies. Approximately 400,000 of the teenaged girls who give birth each year are seventeen years of age and under, including 30,000 who are fourteen years and under. Forty-four percent of those teenaged girls who give birth become pregnant again within one year; 70 percent within two years (HEW, 1980). These figures were reported in the February, 1980 Information Bulletin of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The existence of this office is evidence that societal problems exist associated with adolescent pregnancy. Teenagers comprise the only group in our society for which the number of births continues to show an increase; in some areas of the country, 30 to 40 percent of births are to teenagers (Cattanach, 1976).
Efforts have been made to understand societal causes and effects of school-aged pregnancy and childbearing. Societal causes of adolescent pregnancy, as reported by researchers, are: the sexual revolution of the sixties (Zelnick and Kantner, 1974), and the upsurge of both the feminist movement and movements stressing personal, self-actualization goals (Bernard, 1975). These researchers posit that the social changes reflecting the turmoil of the sixties led to more explicit societal acceptance of sexual behavior, in general. The deduction is that the climate of societal acceptance of sexual behavior mixed with feminist perspectives led to a sharp decline in double standard sexual attitudes and behaviors. Increased sexual activity of adolescents, particularly of school-aged girls, is reported (Chilman, 1976).

Apparent societal consequences of adolescent childbearing, as reported by researchers, are:

1. Increased childbirth outside of marriage (Zelnick and Kantner, 1974)
3. A high correlation between adolescent pregnancy and high-risk medical factors for mothers and babies (Osofsky, 1970)
4. A high correlation between adolescent pregnancy and broken teenage marriages (Green, Lowe, 1976)
5. A high correlation between adolescent pregnancy and negative parenting (Epstein, 1979)
6. A high correlation between adolescent pregnancies and dropping out of school (Burchina, 1960; Hathaway and Monachesi, 1963; Mott, 1978)


Furstenberg reports consequences of teenage parenthood in his longitudinal study of 404 teenage mothers in terms of negative impacts on educational, occupational, marital, and childbearing patterns of teenage mothers (Furstenberg, 1976).

National perspectives of societal problems were summed up by Senator Edward Kennedy at the Subcommittee Hearings on School-Age Mothers during the first session of the Ninety-Fourth Congress when he said,

Pregnancy among school-age girls is the leading cause of high-school dropouts among girls and imposes a terrible burden on the girl, as well as a social burden on society. And for about sixty percent of these girls, the birth of a child begins a cycle of dependency upon public welfare (U.S. Congressional Record, 1975).

The Ninety-Fourth Congress was responsible for a bill which provides for state grants to administer comprehensive services for school-age girls and their offspring (House of Representatives, 1976). The procedures outlined in this bill include: designation of one responsible agency, comprehensive health care, family planning, comprehensive counseling, and monitoring for child abuse and neglect.

It is well documented that the causes and consequences of teenage pregnancy cross disciplines and areas of
responsibility (Braen and Forbush, 1975; Cannon-Bonventre, 1979; Dempsey, 1971; Duxbury, 1976). Clearly societal resources in the following disciplines and areas are involved in potential solutions: education, medicine, psychology, social welfare, and government. It is the interdisciplinary nature of the problem which underscores the need for interdisciplinary responses and solutions to the problem. Existing program models and program concerns point out the need for:

(a) increased coordination of existing services and agencies for pregnant teenagers (Myers, 1972; Pushaw, 1978); (b) improved regulations of county, state, and federal organizations designed to prevent teenage pregnancy or to serve pregnant teenagers (Hill, 1978); (c) formalized procedures to give pregnant students their rights (Childs, 1972; Corns, 1972; Education Commission of the States, 1977; Klerman, 1975).

Specific Needs of School-Aged, Pregnant Girls and School-Aged Motherhood

Specific needs of school-aged, pregnant girls and school-aged mothers can be categorized into two groups:

(a) those psychological, social, physical, and educational needs which might also be the causes of their pregnancies; and
(b) those psychological, social, physical, medical, and educational needs which are the results of their pregnancies. The first group of needs is the content of studies concerned about appropriate intervention which is primary, designed to
prevent or diminish school-aged pregnancy. The second group of needs is the content of studies concerned with appropriate intervention which is secondary, designed to prevent or diminish adverse consequences of school-aged pregnancy.

**Primary Intervention**

Many studies have examined relationships between teenage pregnancy and specific psycho-social characteristics of the individual girls who become pregnant. These studies attempt to arrive at means of identifying potential candidates for teenage pregnancy in order to intervene, primary intervention being prevention. In 1976, Cattanach reported the results of a study conducted in Markesan, Wisconsin, in 1974-1975 which isolated the following seven categories of situations leading to conscious or unconscious intentional pregnancies: (1) a desire to escape unpleasant home situations; (2) a strong dislike for school; (3) a goal to "trap" a mate; (4) a need to create a captive lover, namely a baby; (5) a need for recognition or attention from authority figures; (6) a need to prove one's womanhood; (7) a goal to qualify for financial welfare assistance (Cattanach, 1976). The implication is that intervention activities with girls whose life situations are defined by those categories can prevent intentional pregnancies. No suggestions are made regarding effective ways to identify these girls before they become pregnant.
One study examined the extent to which teenage girls perceive themselves to have problems or to have negative family adjustment. The subjects studied were from among three groups: pregnant teenagers, teenage mothers, and never pregnant teenagers (Greenberg, 1973). Such perceptions were found to be significantly lower for the never pregnant group. Recommendations resulting from this study include dealing with the self-perceived problems of teenagers in schools, in order to provide improved self-understanding for those with negative perceptions about their own lives.

The extent of participation in recreational activities and hobbies among teenage girls was studied. The subjects studied were pregnant and never pregnant twelve to seventeen year olds. Such participation was significantly higher for those never pregnant. The recommendation resulting from this study is to give priority to providing recreational interests to young teenagers in programs which serve them (Curtis, 1974).

A study conducted in 1976 examined the vocational maturity and career choices of pregnant and never pregnant high school girls. The pregnant girls exhibited significantly lower vocational maturity and significantly less stable career choices. The recommendation resulting from this study is to give priority to providing career development and vocational training to high school students (Pollack, 1976).
Measures of ego development have been utilized in studies to examine feelings of guilt among groups of sexually active teenage girls. Teenage girls who practice family planning are more expressive of guilt feelings than those who become pregnant and seek abortions. Teenage girls who become pregnant and seek abortions express more guilt feelings than those who carry to term (Kunkes, 1978; Sorenson, 1973). The recommendation resulting from these studies is to use measures of ego development to identify potential teenage mothers.

Other studies with implications for preventive programs have identified the following characteristics of teenagers who become pregnant: they are more passive than never pregnant teenagers (Esplin, 1977); compared to non-pregnant peers, they lack aspirations and future goals (Knipe, 1978; Waxler, 1979); those studied from middle-class socio-economic backgrounds exhibit more non-conforming behavior than do their non-pregnant peers (Weikert, 1978); those studied of junior high age express more romantic attitudes toward love than their non-pregnant peers (Conley, 1979), and they tend to be estranged from their parents (Sorenson, 1973). These studies suggest that identified characteristics could be used as criteria for selecting potential school-aged, pregnant girls to participate in preventive programs.
Another category of studies which addresses intervention strategies to prevent teenaged pregnancy is that category concerned with sex education. Lack of knowledge of contraceptives has been the focus of studies which could be cited as evidence for including sex education and family planning in any preventive programmatic approach. Data from 190 patients at planned parenthood clinics provided two groups: one of teenagers who always use contraceptives and were not pregnant; one of teenagers who never use contraceptives and were having unwanted pregnancies. Results showed that of sexually active teenagers, those who have accurate sex knowledge have a greater likelihood of using contraceptives to avoid pregnancies (Eaton, 1979).

A study of low socio-economic teenagers revealed that the younger ones (under fifteen years of age) were the ones most likely not to use birth control methods due to lack of knowledge and understanding (Cobliner, 1974). Low birth control knowledge and attitudes on the part of teenagers crosses socio-economic and sex lines (Potter and Smith, 1976; Furstenberg, 1969). Recommendations resulting from these studies include the provision of sex education and family planning as preventive programs.

Other studies have examined general sexual characteristics of teenage populations. These studies attempt to describe certain societal trends from an historical perspective. It is reported that there is evidence to document
the lowering of the age of puberty since 1880 in many Western countries (Lesser, 1962; Tanner, 1955); that the mean age at menarche has declined at the rate of four months each decade for the last century (Garrison, 1965). It is also reported that sexual activity on the part of teenagers has increased significantly (Vener and Stuart, 1974; Zelnik and Kantner, 1972), and that early sex activity is particularly widespread among inner city, black children as compared with other teenage populations (Lesser, 1962).

To summarize the results of these studies, primary intervention is designed to prevent or diminish school-aged pregnancy by serving certain needs of school-aged girls before they become pregnant. This researcher questions the capacity of public school staffs to be held accountable for providing the kinds of primary intervention strategies which would appropriately respond to the psycho-social-sexual characteristics of school-aged girls who become pregnant. The following realities preclude such intervention: most professionals in secondary public schools are trained in subject matter areas; most public school schedules are strained to include the basic courses required for graduation; most public school funding and staffing are strained to provide acceptable teacher-student ratios. Thus, neither school schedules, nor school staffing, nor professional training of teachers allows for public school primary intervention with teenage girls whose psycho-social characteristics are predictive of early pregnancy.
Studies which address prevention of teenage pregnancy are also relevant to already pregnant school-aged students. Some of the criteria of school programs which address the psycho-social characteristics of already pregnant, school-aged students are derived from these studies which address the needs of the potentially pregnant students. The questionnaire developed for the present study reflects programmatic criteria derived from studies which examine relationships between teenage pregnancy and specific psycho-social characteristics of teenage girls who become pregnant.

Secondary Intervention

Secondary intervention, responding to the specific needs of school-aged girls who are already pregnant or already mothers, is addressed by studies which focus on prenatal care of mother and baby and postpartum support of teenage mothers. A review of secondary intervention studies follows which examines these studies in the context of identifying program recommendations for serving pregnant, school-aged students in public schools.

There has been an historical shift of emphasis in studies concerning the high-risk medical nature of teenage pregnancy. The early sixties produced studies which linked higher than normal medical problems with adolescent pregnant girls as a total group (Aznar and Bennett, 1961). Specific obstetric problems of the mother and pediatric implications of the baby are cited as consequence of: immature physical
development and immature emotional development (Battaglia and Frazier, 1963; Claman and Bell, 1964). Inadequate physical size, poor nutrition, psychological conflicts between simultaneous adolescence and motherhood, and resulting incapacities to assume the responsibilities of pregnancy have been cited as causes of such complications as: infant mortality, premature birth, hypertension, and malnutrition.

By the seventies, specific populations within the general category of teenage pregnancy were discretely linked with high-risk medical consequences: (a) the low-income pregnant adolescent, whose socio-economic background is most likely to have been depriving (Osofsky, 1970); and (b) the pregnant adolescent under fifteen whose very youth is most likely to preclude readiness (Duenhoelter, 1975). A National Academy of Science study, published in 1973, looked at infant mortality rates in New York City; numbers of deaths under one year of age for every one thousand live births were matched with ages of mothers. Results of this study are: mothers under fifteen years of age—43.5 infant deaths; mothers fifteen to nineteen years of age—30.5 infant deaths; and total population of mothers—21.9 (Institute of Medicine, 1973). A program recommendation resulting from studies which examine prenatal conditions of teenage pregnancy is to provide special educational and counseling experiences for school-aged, pregnant girls, particularly for those under fifteen and for
those from low-income homes, which emphasize their responsibilities for pre-natal care.

Studies which examine the needs of teenage mothers after their babies are born include: those which are concerned with the development and counseling needs of the mothers, themselves; those which are concerned with parenting skills of the mothers; and those which are concerned with the relationships between the young mothers and their immediate families, particularly their own mothers.

Defining success for the teenage mother as high school graduation, preparation for economic self-sufficiency, and postponement of subsequent pregnancies until after high school graduation, significant differences between those who are successful and those who are not seem correlated with aspirations (Knipe, 1978). Maturational crisis involving poor self-perceptions and inadequate relationships with others, which commonly accompanies teenage pregnancy, can be overcome when young mothers are directed to deal with their aspirations in future oriented, group, problem-solving counseling sessions (Daily, 1971). Aspirations are linked with the ability to choose from among a range of options, which, in turn, are linked with perceptions of sex and family roles (Kelleris, 1972; Wise, 1979). Counseling and support services are needed by all teenage mothers (Gallagher, 1973). Black adolescent mothers need special counseling dealing with those concepts significant to them such as black
survival and liberation (Gilbert, 1974). Program recommendations resulting from these studies are: to provide counseling services which lead pregnant students to improved understandings of themselves; and to provide future oriented experiences for pregnant students which lead them to identify aspirations.

Even though eighteen year olds and under who delivered living infants are increasingly keeping their babies (Shea, 1971), their knowledge and attitudes regarding child-rearing practices are significantly lower than those of older mothers (Belfort, 1970). Their lack of parenting skills (Delissovoy, 1973), the low level of stimulation they provide their babies, and the divided mothering they provide to their babies (Sugar, 1976) indicate their immediate needs for counseling or instruction which will help them develop parenting understandings and skills. Most adolescents do not know what to expect of a baby; their expectations are unrealistic and they find parenthood to be unsatisfying (Walters, 1978). Program recommendations resulting from these studies are: to provide special counseling and support services to pregnant and parenting teenagers which focus on their special needs as simultaneous adolescents and parents; and to provide instruction about child development and about parenting skills to teenage parents.

Since increased numbers of teenage mothers are keeping their babies, increased attention has been given to the potential, natural support of their families, particularly
that of the new grandmothers (Smith, 1975). The new grandmother has needs of her own which must be fulfilled if she is going to be able to provide support. There is evidence that the new grandmother, regardless of socio-economic status, feels social disgrace, financial strain, and overburdened responsibility when her young daughter gives birth (Bryan-Logan, 1974; Singer, 1971; Wright, 1967). The new grandmother needs counseling or direction to deal with the concerns of her transitional role which has a double-edge: that her daughter will not make something of herself; that she, the grandmother, is too young to be straddled (Smith, 1971). Once this concern is resolved, the new grandmother can respond to the documented receptivity and need on the part of the young mother for sharing feelings and for intimacy with her own mother (Benedek, 1970; Bibring, 1961; Friedman, 1966; Van Der Ahe, 1969). Because of this propitious time for a significant relationship between the two, it is important to bring the new grandmother into the plans of the young mother for establishing and realizing aspirations (Young, 1975). The results of a longitudinal study singled out the roles and support of the immediate family of the young mother as significant in their realization of life plans (Furstenberg, 1976). Program recommendations resulting from these studies are to provide counseling for the new grandmother and to include new grandmothers or other significant immediate family members in counseling sessions with the young mothers.
The decision on the part of a school-aged girl to become a mother is "a complex process involving support and pressures from family and boyfriend, personal attitudes and goals, and economic and educational factors" (Fischman, 1971). The consequences faced by the teenager who continues her pregnancy and keeps her baby are known, though not to her (Whelan, 1973). Thus, effectively planned programs which prepare pregnant teenagers for known consequences can result in improved care for the adolescent mother and her offspring; illustration of this is evident in the programs implemented by the National Consortium on Early Childbearing (Nelson, 1973).

The problems attendant to the approximately 550,000 teenagers who keep their babies each year can be tackled, if not solved, by social and educational programs which address parenthood, long-term follow-up, basic life maintenance skills, infant care, flexible school schedules, and reduction of isolation (Cannon-Bonventre, 1979).

In summary, the literature which deals with specific needs of pregnant and parenting teenagers suggests that effective programs for pregnant, school-aged girls should include: (a) counseling components which emphasize self-understanding, problem solving, identification of future goals, and support relationships with significant immediate family members; and (b) flexible instructional components which emphasize accurate sex knowledge, pre-natal care, child development, parenting skills, vocational skills, and
recreational interests. The questionnaire developed for the present study reflects the programmatic criteria derived from this literature.

In the next section, literature which deals with school programs for school-aged, pregnant students is reviewed.

**School Programs for School-Aged Pregnant Students During and Following their Pregnancies**

The public schools are prominently involved in society's expectations regarding the problem of teenage pregnancy. In addition to being viewed as the solution to the problem, schools are viewed as contributors to the problem due to established punitive or restrictive policies, procedures, and attitudes (Howard, 1973; Osofsky, 1968). A national survey of 153 school districts of 100,000 or more student population revealed that a generally applicable, successful pattern for schools to cope with the problem of teenage pregnancy was not visible (Atkyns, 1968). As recently as 1979, in a research review related to teenage pregnancy, Chilman called for a sound knowledge base as a foundation for public policy and for continued support and further implementation of the 1972 federal legislation prohibiting schools that receive public funding from excluding pregnant girls (Chilman, 1979).

By 1970, it was evident that the trends in the United States vis-à-vis school programming for pregnant teenagers
were: (a) increased opportunities for girls to choose special classes or regular school options, (b) increased state funding, and (c) increased focus on the rehabilitation of the individual (Wurtz, 1970). The Minneapolis School System experience is indicative; they progressed from homebound instruction in 1957, to a special education continuing center, to the integration into the total school system with choices for the pregnant girl (Garmezy, 1970). A comprehensive program approach to respond to the multiple needs of these students has increasingly been viewed as appropriate (Kipps and Griggs, 1975). A comprehensive program is defined as one which includes psychological, social, medical, and educational program services (St. Pierre, 1980).

Where to provide comprehensiveness has been approached from differing perspectives. The regular school classroom has successfully served as base for a variety of other locations which provide the comprehensive attention to pregnant students (Woodbury, 1970). The special school administered by the school system has successfully served as a base for comprehensively serving pregnant students (Nix, 1979). Hospital centers have successfully provided the base for comprehensive programs with the school system assuming responsibility for coordination of the education component (Grady, 1975).

Comprehensive programs have three common service components: early and consistent pre-natal care; education; and
counseling. They are designed to serve the total girl. To larger or lesser extents, they provide additional services such as infant day care, services to young fathers, services to new grandmothers, vocational training and placement, post-partum care, birth control, pediatric care, psychological testing and treatment, legal services, and adoption and abortion counseling (Howard, 1971).

A survey which examined program components of thirteen sample school programs for pregnant girls concludes that the school is in the prime position to administer the kind of multidisciplinary approach needed to respond to the many needs of pregnant teenagers (Clark, 1978). One of Clark's recommendations is that such school programs should provide the educational services and coordinate the provision of other services; others concur (Boykin, 1968). Examination of effective programs indicates the need for an on-site administrator who is skilled in both administering and coordinating (Washington, 1973).

Those school system programs which have been described as effectively comprehensive are: the YMED Program in upstate New York; the Special Continuing Educational Center in Minneapolis; the Webster School in Baltimore, Maryland; the Florence Crittenden Comprehensive Care Center in Chicago; the Citrus High School in Azuza, California; the Edgar Allen Poe School in Baltimore; and the system-run programs in Columbus, Ohio, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Compton, California (Heller and
Kiraly, 1973; Washington, 1973). Comprehensive school programs have the capacity to effectively serve individual needs and to effectively serve all groups of society. When one researcher compared program participants of a comprehensive program to non-participating pregnant students, participants' improvements in certain aspects of self-concept and in control of selves were significant (Monaster, 1967). And, when another researcher examined the racial composition of comprehensive program participants, it was found that as the community increasingly accepts a comprehensive school program for teenaged parents, the student population increasingly reflects society's population distribution of racial groups (Osofsky, 1968).

Specific program components of a comprehensive school program for pregnant, school-aged students have been studied for the purpose of determining their effectiveness in responding to the needs of the individual students and of society. The component which has received the most attention, in this regard, is that of counseling. Counseling, as a means to decrease the incidence among this population of dropping out of school and as a means to improve this population's perceptions of themselves, has been judged effective (Birdwhistell, 1969; Brennan, 1977; Dailey, 1971; Ruebel, 1975). Counseling is also seen as a means to improve motivation to learn (Kelly, 1973) and as a way to increase the self-expression of program participants (Middleman, 1970). Group counseling, in
particular, has been effective with pregnant teenagers in increasing their choices regarding the redirection of their lives (Rosenberg, 1975). Such choices cluster around: what to do with the baby—abort? give up? keep? and what to do with self—employment? education? training? (Sharpe, 1975; Wolleat, 1975).

Components of comprehensive school programs which focus on parenting skills have developed in response to the needs for young people to be effective parents (Kruger, 1973). Parenting skills training links improved awarenesses and understandings of infant development with improved parenting behavior (Rispoli, 1979). Parenting skills training also includes skills in non-verbal cooperative behavior towards infants (Keen, 1979). Closely related are specific courses in child development, offered in many states, which are taught as part of the regular school program (Weigle, 1974). Indeed, the family life educator, whose training includes the areas of pre- and post-natal care, mental health issues, therapy, and crisis intervention, is seen as an appropriate person to be responsible for designing school and community programs for teenage mothers and their children (Burkhart and Whatley, 1973).

A limited number of studies have followed up on pregnant teenagers in attempts to evaluate program effectiveness. A three-year study of 487 girls who attended Baltimore's comprehensive Webster School matched to a non-treated group
(girls who had not attended the comprehensive school program during their pregnancies), looked for results in relation to program objectives: continuation of high school, maintenance of good health, and reduction in number of subsequent pregnancies. The most significant difference between the two groups was in the better health of the "treated" mothers and babies; there was no significant difference regarding the number of subsequent pregnancies (Howard, 1968). A similar study revealed that significantly higher numbers of program participants returned to regular school following pregnancy than of "untreated" girls (Ewer and Gibbs, 1976).

Other researchers reported that a high percentage of pregnant teenagers do not return to school after pregnancy regardless of regular school or comprehensive program attendance (Stith, 1978). Withdrawal from school and recidivism after a post-delivery school return are the two most frequently cited problems to be prevented. A two-year follow-up study of 361 girls who had attended a comprehensive program for pregnant students reported: 88 percent returned to regular school; after two years 43.3 percent withdrew, 36.4 percent graduated, and 20.2 percent were still in school. Declining attendance among these students predictably led to dropping out. The reasons given for withdrawal from school in the order of frequency were: the need to work to earn money, problems at home, care of baby, dislike of school, failing grades, another pregnancy. The same study reported that
80 percent of the young mothers who had attended the comprehensive program started to use contraception after their initial deliveries; the recidivism rate amongst the 80 percent was half that of those not known to use contraception (Dempsey, 1972).

Many follow-up studies on program participants link success with specific program components. In a 1975 study, Rosenberg reported that participants in a group therapy component established by an obstetric-gynecological department in conjunction with a psychiatric department of a large, metropolitan hospital were taking good care of themselves, using available resources, and requesting continued treatment to deal with "our messes that got us in these troubles" (Rosenberg, et al, 1975). In another 1975 study, Slavick reported that high percentages of participants in two San Francisco Peninsula special programs providing interdisciplinary services left the programs with marketable, entry-level skills for post-secondary employment (Slavick, 1975). More than 80 percent of the participants in a New York City program for monolingual and bilingual Spanish pregnant students who were two years or more behind in reading or math achieved mastery of identified learning objectives (Strum, 1976).

A follow-up study on participants in an interagency program conducted in Los Angeles Health Centers revealed that a much higher percentage remained in school than did non-participants of a similar population. This was attributed to
the staffing: regular medical and educational personnel, a coordinator, a child welfare and attendance official, a counselor, and a social worker. That the girls were expected to remain in the program until eight weeks after childbirth was also cited as a reason for successful school results (Los Angeles City Schools, 1967).

Evaluating school programs which attempt to serve or provide for the comprehensive needs of pregnant students is in its infancy stages (McCarthy and Syropoulos, 1972). Program evaluation promises to clarify the conditions needed for program objectives to be reached, no matter where the program is housed (Jekel, 1975; Klerman, 1979). Existing final evaluation reports of programs typically appraise the extent to which high school diplomas are earned, pregnancy is understood, health care services are utilized, and community social agencies are utilized (Milwaukee Public Schools, 1972).

Other programmatic qualities are not typically appraised because of the lack of experience on the part of school personnel in dealing with them as they apply to comprehensively serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged students. An example is the subject of a recent dissertation which examined the differential impact of traditional scheduling and modular-flexible scheduling on learning and school behavior of adolescents (Carlen, 1977). A logical question, vis-à-vis pregnant students, is: would continuation after pregnancy and high school graduation be
significantly higher for those whose flexible schedules allowed them to be more available to their infants than for those whose school schedules were not flexible? Many such questions have yet to be tackled addressing program variables which may relate to post-pregnancy school withdrawal and teen-age pregnancy recidivism.

It has been suggested that school program variables can be classified into three clusters which apply to school withdrawal of high-risk student populations: those which are attributable to motivation, and can best be addressed in school programs by counseling components; those which are attributable to program deterrents, which appropriate program components could attempt to address; and those which are attributable to external supports, which appropriate program components could also attempt to address (Dempsey, 1972). This classification accommodates the three barriers which discourage school-aged mothers from returning to school cited by Jekel: educators' policies or attitudes; unavailable day care; and fear of ridicule by peers (Jekel, 1975).

In summary, the literature which deals with school programs for school-aged, pregnant students during and following their pregnancies suggests that effective comprehensive programs should address: (a) school completion; (b) family planning; (c) use of community resources; (d) basic skills; (e) employment; (f) self-esteem; (g) decision-making; (h) health; (i) parenting; (j) relationships with significant family members; and (k) infant day care. In
addition, the literature suggests that programs should be staffed by an on-site director who has both administrative and coordinating skills and by professional personnel representing educational, medical, social and psychological fields and that the programs should be evaluated. The questionnaire developed for the present study reflects the programmatic criteria derived from this literature.

In the next section, literature which deals with the preferences and practices of school administrators regarding pregnant, school-aged students is reviewed.

Preferences and Practices of School Administrators Regarding Public School Provision of Services to Pregnant, School-Aged Girls

Additional research is needed to learn more about the capabilities of different program options to serve the needs of pregnant students comprehensively, and about the attitudes and behavior of the educational administrators involved (Clark, 1978). In this light, a limited number of studies have examined the attitudes and perceptions of school administrators regarding school programs for pregnant, school-aged students.

There are implications from some of these studies for the staff development of principals. Despite the existence of policies which provide for the equal access to public school opportunities and which are non-exclusionary towards pregnant students, the attitudes of principals are punitive or exclusionary (Harrison, 1972; Warren, 1972; Willmarth and
Olsen, 1964). Principals have few clear perceptions regarding how to serve pregnant students in school programs (Johnson, 1971). Principals do not identify with the concerns and needs of students who are brand-new mothers and whose post delivery period can significantly interfere with continuation of education (Henderson, 1978).

As a result of a 1973 survey in Illinois to which 188 administrators, 154 board members, and 218 teachers responded, Roland concluded the following: that existing programs may well be designed more for the convenience of the school than for the needs of the pregnant teenagers; and that the Illinois State Department of Public Instruction should coordinate a statewide effort to provide guidelines for comprehensive programs of continuing education for pregnant students (Roland, 1973).

The literature search revealed one study which served as a springboard for the methodology utilized to investigate the problem of this study. The Woessner study, conducted in California in 1978, utilized a survey questionnaire to gather data about existing programs for pregnant students and to compare the attitudes of site and centralized administrators towards educational options for pregnant students. The results of the Woessner study have made a contribution of knowledge towards clarifying the nature of existing special programs for pregnant students in California and towards clarifying California's public school administrators'
perceptions about serving pregnant girls in public schools. Woessner reported the following results: (a) in 51 percent of the districts, the only option available to pregnant students is to attend regular classes; (b) a special program for pregnant students exists in 20 percent of the districts; (c) existing programs concentrate on instruction in nutrition, child care and development, and labor and delivery; and (d) there are differences in the perceptions of differing groups of administrators. Woessner reported the following differences in administrators' perceptions: principals differ from superintendents significantly in their receptivity to including special programs and comprehensive program components for pregnant students in their schools, superintendents being more receptive to the idea; male principals differed significantly from females, the females being more receptive to specific program components which serve pregnancy related needs; and principals from districts where special programs exist differed significantly from principals from districts where no special programs exist, those from districts with programs being more receptive to a comprehensive program separate from the regular school program (Woessner, 1979).

Information about the issues which concern the preferences of school administrators and the practices in school systems resulting from this literature is reflected in the questionnaire of the present study.
Summary

The review of the literature has examined the following areas pertinent to the present study:

1. National perspectives relating to societal problems associated with school-aged pregnancy
2. Specific needs of school-aged, pregnant girls and school-aged mothers
3. School programs for school-aged, pregnant students during and following their pregnancies
4. Preferences and practices of school administrators towards public school provision of services to pregnant, school-aged girls.

Criteria for implementing school programs for pregnant, school-aged students have been identified in this review. They include criteria which could effectively decrease drop-out rates for this population and could effectively increase the number of teenage mothers who delay repeated early pregnancies. They include criteria which could improve health and parenting factors related to teenage mothers and their babies. They include criteria which could improve the self esteem, the decision making skills, and the economic self-sufficiency of teenage mothers.

Perceptions of school administrators and reports of school practices regarding the implementation of school programs for pregnant, school-aged students have also been identified in this review. They include perceptions and
practices which resist literature-identified criteria for implementing school programs for pregnant, school-aged students. They also include perceptions and practices which are receptive to literature-identified criteria for implementing school programs for pregnant, school-aged students.

The review of the literature determined the basis for the development of questionnaire items of the major data collection instrument of this study. The purpose of the questionnaire is to survey the preferences of selected public school superintendents and principals in North Carolina and the practices in their systems regarding the public school provision of literature-identified services to pregnant, school-aged students.

The method of investigation is presented in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Problem

There are three basic purposes of this study to which methodological procedures were applied:

1. To describe the extent to which literature-identified educational and support services needed by pregnant, school-aged students are provided in existing programs of the thirty-four public school systems within the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) of North Carolina.

2. To report existing preferences of administrators in the thirty-four school systems of North Carolina's SMSA's regarding provision of literature-identified educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students.

3. To examine any existing relationships, selected on the basis of data gathered in this study, regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students which address (a) attitudinal differences between groups of school administrators, (b) discrepancies between literature-identified criteria and both the preferences and practices of school administrators, and (c) discrepancies between the preferences and the practices of school administrators.
In the sections that follow the population, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis procedures are described.

**The Population: Identification Procedures**

The total population for this study was comprised of two groups of public school administrators in North Carolina:

1. The thirty-four superintendents in the standard metropolitan statistical areas
2. The 339 principals of schools serving students in grades seven through twelve in the standard metropolitan statistical areas.

The procedures utilized to identify the total population selected for this study were as follows:

1. Use of United States Chamber of Commerce maps and materials for their designation of the standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina and the populations of each city and county within them
2. Use of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction Education Directory for 1979-80 for its delineation of city and county school systems, the student populations of each system, and the name and address of the superintendent of each system
3. Use of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction Education Directory for 1979-80 for its listing of each individual school within each school system
which includes school grades served, number of teachers, name and address of the school, and name of the principal.

**Superintendents and Principals**

The total number of surveyed superintendents and the total number of surveyed principals serving students in grades seven through twelve in the thirty-four school systems of the eight SMSA's in North Carolina are presented in Table 1 according to their systems, counties and SMSA's.

**Instrument Development**

The questionnaire developed for this study was designed and refined through a process which included the following procedures:

1. The identification of literature-cited criteria for programs and specific services which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students and of a literature-cited instrument which served as a springboard for the questionnaire of this study (Woessner, 1979)

3. Interviews with North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction administrators for the purpose of gathering statewide concerns and perspectives pertinent to this study

3. A pilot study involving the superintendent and twenty-six principals of one of the school systems included in this study followed by interviews with them for the purpose of gathering suggestions for instrument improvement.
### TABLE 1

**BREAKDOWN OF THE SURVEYED POPULATION OF THE STUDY: NORTH CAROLINA SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS SERVING GRADES SEVEN THROUGH TWELVE: SMSA, COUNTY, AND SYSTEM DESIGNATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMSA</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>School System</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>N of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asheville</td>
<td>Buncombe</td>
<td>Buncombe County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asheville</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Madison County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Alamance</td>
<td>Alamance County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte-</td>
<td>Gaston</td>
<td>Gaston County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastonia</td>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>Charlotte-Mecklenburg Comprehensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Union County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monroe City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Cumberland County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro-</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Davidson County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem-High Point</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexington City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSA</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>School System</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>N of Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomasville City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth</td>
<td>Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>Guilford County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greensboro City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Point City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>Randolph County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asheboro City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes</td>
<td>Stokes County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadkin</td>
<td>Yadkin County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannapolis-Concord-Salisbury</td>
<td>Cabarrus County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concord City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kannapolis City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>Rowan County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salisbury City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh-Durham</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Durham County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durham City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raleigh-Wake Comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SMSA</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>School System</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>N of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapel Hill City</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>Brunswick County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>New Hanover County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals:

8 SMSA’s
20 Counties
34 School Systems
34 Superintendents
339 Principals
The Literature Search

The literature search for identifying literature-cited criteria for programs and specific services which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students included the following sources: Dissertation Abstracts International, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Education Index, Current Index to Journals in Education, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Psychological Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, and Index Medicus.

The questionnaire utilized by another study which served as a springboard for this study (Woessner, 1979) was examined for its content, design, format, and clarify. The purposes of the Woessner study were linked with issues uniquely relevant to program considerations for pregnant students in California. Though the content and format of Woessner's questionnaire were conceptually relevant, they were modified considerably for practical application to this study.

Interviews with State Department of Public Instruction Administrators

State department administrators in the following positions were interviewed: Deputy Assistant State Superintendent for Secondary Education; Assistant State Superintendent for Student Services; Director of the Division of Pupil Personnel Services; Director of the Division for Exceptional Children; and Coordinator of Extended School Day Programs. These interviews served to identify information needed by state
department administrators pertaining to existing services for pregnant students. Items were included in the questionnaire which addressed the need to know what is and what is not being provided for pregnant students in the public schools of North Carolina included in the study.

The Pilot Study

A pilot study involving the superintendent and twenty-six principals of the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County School System was conducted during August, 1980. This pilot study raised concerns on the part of the respondents regarding the practicality of the questionnaire. The analysis of data collected by the pilot run confirmed those concerns.

Interviews and conversations with pilot study respondents led to these types of modifications of the questionnaire:

1. Ambiguous items were reworded for improved understanding
2. The format was changed for improved clarify
3. The nature of the response choices was changed to improve analysis.

A panel of respondents and a research analyst assisted in the revisions.

The questionnaire used in this study has been placed in the appendix (Appendix A).
The Questionnaire

The rationale of the questionnaire was derived from literature-identified criteria of educational and support service needs of pregnant, school-aged students. It was further developed by criteria identified in interviews with those in positions of responsibility for administering such services. These criteria are the bases for the validity of the items of the questionnaire to which respondents reacted regarding their preferences and their practices. The purposes of the questionnaire relate to the purposes of the study: to gather information which can be used to describe and report practices, preferences and relationships among them. These descriptions and reports presented and analyzed in Chapter Four relate to the educational and support services identified in literature as responsive to the needs of the pregnant, school-aged students.

Section A: Demographic Information

Section A of the questionnaire contains eight items for all respondents and an additional five items for building administrators to describe themselves, their school system populations, and their school building populations.

Four of the items in Section A were included in order to describe the role, experience, age and sex characteristics of the population of the study. In addition, respondents' identification of two characteristics, role and sex, allowed for two comparisons of the perceptions of subgroups within
the study's population reported in the literature:
(a) centralized administrators (superintendents or their
designees) with building administrators (principals), and
(b) male administrators with female administrators (Woessner,
1979).

Eight of the items in Section A were included in
order to describe the size, grade-level, racial, and socio­
economic characteristics of the student populations served by
the systems and buildings administered by the questionnaire
respondents.

One of the items in Section A was included in order
to report principals' estimates of the number of students in
their schools who become pregnant each year.

Section B: Types of Programs--
Program Options

Section B of the questionnaire contains nine items
derived from the literature and the interviews which relate to
programmatic approaches and program options for pregnant,
school-aged students in public schools. These items were in­
cluded in order to report existing preferences and practices
of the population of the study regarding program approaches
and options for pregnant students.

Two of the items in Section B relate to opposite pro­
gram approaches. One approach provides school services to
pregnant students only in the regular school program. The
other approach provides pregnant students with the option to
choose between the regular school program and special courses or a special program designed for them.

Six of the items in Section B relate to the following types of program options: (a) options which provide special courses or a special program for pregnant students in the regular school; (b) options which provide a special program for pregnant students in a special school located away from the regular school; and (c) an option which provides home instruction for pregnant students.

One of the items in Section B relates to exempting pregnant students under sixteen years of age from school attendance.

Each item in Section B contains two response sections. The first section deals with the administrators' preferences and provides three possible answers: yes, no, and I do not know. The second section deals with present practice in the school systems involved and provides three possible answers: yes, no, and I do not know.

Section C: Special Program and Course Components—Specific Services

Section C contains seven categories of specific services and procedures of special programs or courses identified in the literature and in interviews as responsive to the needs of pregnant, school-aged students. The first category, academic instructional services, includes five items which describe school provisions for offering academic instruction to pregnant, school-aged students. The second
category, special instructional services, includes six items which describe school provisions for instruction relevant to the special needs of pregnant, school-aged students, i.e. child development and parenting skills. The third category, health services, includes three items which describe school provisions for medical and para-medical services to pregnant students. The fourth category, counseling and psychological services, includes six items which describe school provisions for regular and special guidance, counseling, and therapy for pregnant students. The fifth category, social welfare services, includes five items which describe services normally ascribed to social welfare agencies, i.e. infant care, job placements. The sixth category, organizational procedures, includes seven items which describe school organizational practices and procedures relevant to serving the needs of pregnant students, i.e. flexible scheduling and transferability to and from regular classes. The seventh category, community involvement, contains four items which describe school provision for community awareness and responsibility regarding school program services for pregnant students.

These seven categories contain a total of thirty-six items which were included in order to report existing preferences and practices of the population of the study regarding components and specific services of special programs or courses for pregnant, school-aged students. Respondents reacted to each of these thirty-six items in three ways:
1. By indicating their preferences regarding whether each specific service should be provided in public schools, with possible answers of: yes, no, and I do not know.

2. By reporting the practice of each specific service in their special programs or courses for pregnant students, if their systems have any, with possible answers of: yes, no, and I do not know.

3. By reporting the absence of any special programs or courses for pregnant students in their systems with the answer of: there are no special courses or programs in my system.

Section D: Reasons for Non-Existence of Special Programming for Pregnant Students in Schools

Section D contains nine items to be ranked in their order of significance. Each item is a reason which has been identified in the literature as responsible for the absence of special public school programs for pregnant, school-aged students (Woessner, 1979). Those respondents whose systems have no special programs for pregnant students were asked to rank these nine items from the most responsible reason to the least responsible reason.

Section E: Organizational Features of Existing School Programming for Pregnant Students

Section E contains three items which describe administrative, evaluative, and funding features of existing programs. Respondents were asked to select one of four responses
for each item; if no response is appropriate, respondents were asked to write in appropriate information. This section was designed in response to literature-identified concerns regarding the administration, evaluation, and funding of special programs for pregnant, school-aged students (Roland, 1973).

Section F: Policy and Experiential Considerations

Section F contains two items. One item relates to the incidence of a non-discriminatory policy. The second item, an optional one, is an open-ended question which relates to personal experiences of respondents with either problems or successes in providing school services to pregnant, school-aged students. The general data gathered by this open-ended question provided heuristic information relevant to administrative perceptions and practices regarding public school services for pregnant students. This information is presented in Chapter Four.

The content and the format of the questionnaire made it possible to collect and analyze data about the preferences and practices of the respondents in relation to the role of public schools in providing educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students.

The methodological procedures used to ascertain the validity of the questionnaire related to its content, format, and practical application. The procedures used to determine
the content of the questionnaire have been presented: the content was determined on the basis of literature-identified needs of pregnant, school-aged girls and literature- and interview-identified issues which affect the public school provision of educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students. The procedure used to determine the format of the questionnaire has been presented: the format was established by clustering the content items according to conceptual categories. The procedure used to determine the practical application of the questionnaire was the pilot study.

The questionnaire served as a practical and applicable instrument for collecting and analyzing the data necessary to achieve the purposes of this study.

**Collection Procedures**

**Categorization of Respondents**

Unobtrusive procedures were utilized to identify the schools, the systems, the counties, and the SMSA's represented by the respondents in order to: (a) examine the extent of response within systems and counties and the distribution of responses among them; (b) ascertain whether relationships exist between the distribution of response and demographic characteristics of counties and systems; and (c) identify non-respondents by cross referencing the schools of respondents with schools listed in the 1979-80 North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction Education Directory on
the basis of data gathered from the questionnaire. These procedures involved varying the design of the questionnaire title (examples: underlining, asterisks) according to SMSA designation and varying the placement of staples according to system designation.

The Survey Mailing

Various procedures were utilized in the survey to encourage the identified population to respond to the questionnaire in this study. Some of these are listed below:

1. Respondents were assured school anonymity in the cover letters of explanation and of request for response (Appendix B).

2. A letter of support for this study from the state Deputy Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education which asks that the results of this study be shared with the state agency was included with the letter which invited the identified population to respond (Appendix C).

3. At the end of the questionnaire respondents were told that they would receive the results of this study if they would indicate interest in receiving the results.

4. A stamped, addressed envelope was included for respondents to return the questionnaires.

5. A postal card was mailed as a reminder to all potential respondents one week after the mailing of the questionnaire (Appendix B).
The questionnaire was mailed on September 8, 1980; the postal card reminder was mailed on September 15, 1980.

**Interpretation Procedures**

Interpretation of the data gathered for this study required methodological procedures appropriate for two processes:

1. Accounting for non-respondents among the total population surveyed in order to investigate the existence of non-response bias which may have adversely affected confidence in the population of the study regarding its representativeness of the total population surveyed.

2. Coding and computing questionnaire responses in order to analyze the data gathered by the questionnaire of the study.

**Procedures for Non-Response Analysis**

Confidence in the study's population regarding its representativeness of the total population surveyed was examined. Three procedures for investigating the existence of significant differences between questionnaire respondents and non-respondents were carried out. In the following paragraphs, these three procedures are described: (a) interviewing a random sample of non-respondents; (b) examining response participation within individual systems and counties; and (c) examining the response distribution of school building administrators.
Interviewing a random sample of non-respondents.

In order to investigate possible bias on the part of questionnaire non-respondents which may have related their non-response to their perceptions or to the practices in their systems regarding pregnant students, a follow-up telephone interview of a random sample of non-respondents was conducted. Interviewees were asked five key questions from the questionnaire. One question addressed a possible relationship between practices in their systems regarding special programming for pregnant students and participation in the study. Four questions addressed a possible relationship between administrators' perceptions regarding special programming for pregnant students in public schools and participation in the study. This interview study was based on the assumption that should the five questions evoke answers which are significantly different from the answers given by questionnaire respondents, then non-respondents' bias could have accounted for their non-response.

Certain parameters imposed upon the telephone interview study determined the sample size for random selection of the subjects to be interviewed. The parameters were established by the alpha, beta, and standard error values of the power formula utilized to determine the sample size. The values of the formula were: alpha = .05; beta = .20; and standard errors fixed by the numbers and response percentages of the populations studied. The formula established a
difference exceeding fifteen percentage points between the response percentages of questionnaire respondents and of telephone interviewees answering a question similarly as a significant difference. The formula established a sample size of twenty-seven non-respondents as sufficient to examine potential differences between the two groups at the .05 level of significance. The formula established that the resulting telephone interview study would be able to observe differences, if they exist, at the .2 level.

Examining response participation within individual systems and counties. Bias on the part of non-respondents which may have related their non-response to demographic characteristics of their systems or their counties was investigated. The percentages of response participation within systems surveyed were examined in relation to both school system sizes and school system dropout rates. The percentages of response participation within counties surveyed was examined in relation to county rates of births to school-aged girls.

The sources used to gather data about these demographic characteristics were:

1. The 1978-79 North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction Statistical Profile of School Systems which presents the size and the dropout rate for each system in the state
2. The 1978 Baby Yearbook for the State of North Carolina which presents the total number of births in each county by the age of the mother.

A non-parametric statistic for rank order correlation, Kendall's Tau, was used to determine whether a significant relationship exists between participation in the study and school system size, school system dropout rate, or county rate of births to school-aged girls.

**Procedures for Analysis of Questionnaire Responses**

A coding format was prepared for responses to each item on the questionnaire and for school system identification. As the questionnaires were returned, this information was coded into the IBM 370 Computer at Triangle Universities Computation Center in North Carolina via a printing terminal device.

A computer program to compute frequencies and percentages of response to each item and for response identification was developed with the assistance of a consultant from the Division of Research of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. This program was devised to count returned questionnaires of respondents from each school system and to count responses to items of the questionnaire for the following groups of the respondents:

1. The total number of respondents
2. The responding superintendents or their designees
3. The responding principals
4. The responding males
5. The responding females
6. The responding superintendents from systems which provide special courses or programs for pregnant, school-aged students
7. The responding superintendents from systems which do not provide special courses or programs for pregnant, school-aged students
8. The responding principals from systems which provide special courses or programs for pregnant, school-aged students
9. The responding principals from systems which do not provide special courses or programs for pregnant, school-aged students.

The presentation and analysis of the data is made in Chapter Four through the use of descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptions of five procedures for analyzing group responses follow: (a) frequencies and percentages; (b) scores and their use for multi-variate analysis of variance; (c) composite ranks; (d) standard errors of differences; and (e) content frequency.

**Frequencies and Percentages.** Frequencies and percentages of responses describe the administrative role, administrative experience, age, and sex of questionnaire
respondents. Responding administrators are further described according to the following information about the student bodies they serve: size, racial composition, and economic characteristics. Principals are further described according to the school grades served in their schools and their estimates of the annual number of pregnant girls in their buildings. Thus, frequency and percentage counts describe the demographic characteristics pertaining to the respondents.

Frequency and percentage counts report responses of the study's population for the following areas regarding pregnant students: program approaches and options; components and specific services of special programming; organizational features of existing school programs; and incidence of a non-discriminatory policy. Thus, an item by item analysis was performed on the basis of frequencies and percentages of responses.

**Scores.** Group scores were computed to present the extent to which positive (Yes) responses were given for preferences and for practices regarding the provision of educational and support services to pregnant students in public schools. The score was calculated separately for clusters of items defining five general areas of program service to pregnant students: academic instructional services (AIS); special instructional services (SIS);
health services (HS); counseling/psychological services (C/PS); and social welfare services (SWS). Scores of AIS and SIS were combined to form a score for Instructional Services; scores for HS, C/PS, and SWS were combined to form a score for Support Services. Finally, the scores for all areas were combined to form a comprehensive score.

Scores were computed separately for superintendents and for principals and within each group for those from systems which have special programming and for those from systems which do not have special programming for pregnant students. Each group's mean score represents the proportion of positive responses made by that group. Preference scores indicate the overall degree to which groups of respondents prefer services for pregnant, school-aged students. Practice scores represent the overall degree to which services are offered to these students in systems which have special programming for pregnant, school-aged students.

An investigation was made for any overall significant difference between the preferences of superintendents and of principals and between the preferences of administrators from systems which have special programming and administrators from systems which do not have special programming. Holling's T-square Statistic was utilized for multi-variate analysis of variance. Consideration was given to AIS, SIS, HS, C/PS, and SWS preference scores as measures of potential
significant differences between groups. This test was performed to conservatively ascertain whether any overall, significant attitudinal differences exist between groups of school administrators with differing roles or with differing system practices regarding school services to pregnant, school-aged students.

**Composite ranks.** Respondents from systems without programs were asked to indicate the reasons why their systems had no programs by ranking nine items from the most important to the least important reason. Separate frequency matrices were constructed for superintendents or designees and for principals showing the frequency within each rank of each item. A normalized ranking procedure was used to determine the composite rank for all respondents within a group. The average rank for each reason is presented for superintendents or designees and for principals; hence the relative significance of each reason as a deterrent to public school provision of services for pregnant students as it is perceived by each group is apparent.

**Standard errors of differences.** Groups of respondents were examined and compared with one another regarding their responses to individual items of the questionnaire. Central office administrators (superintendents or designees) were
compared with building level administrators (principals); administrators from systems with special program for pregnant students were compared with those from systems without such programs; male administrators were compared with female administrators.

A difference between groups on a particular item regarding preferences or practices was considered significant at the .05 level of significance if it exceeded 1.96 standard errors of the difference. A difference between the preferences and practices within one group regarding a specific response or regarding a pair of responses was considered significant at the .01 level if it exceeded 2.65 standard errors of the difference. The most conservative test criterion was obtained by calculating the standard error of the proportions using a value of 0.5 as the population proportion. Hence, the standard error calculations in these comparisons depend only on the size of the groups being analyzed.

Content frequency. The content of responses to the open-ended question which asks respondents to share their experiences in providing services to pregnant, school-aged students was analyzed. The nature of these responses and the frequency of any particular observations are reported.

This chapter has described the methodological procedures utilized to identify the population of this study, to develop the questionnaire as the survey instrument of this
study, to collect the data pertinent to the design of this study, and to interpret the data collected for this study. Chapter Four presents the data that was collected from those administrators in the eight SMSA's of North Carolina who participated in the study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze data obtained from demographic documents, from interviews with non-respondents to the questionnaire, and from the questionnaire responses of the North Carolina school superintendents or their designees and principals who participated in this study. These data are presented and analyzed within the following categories:

1. Data which address confidence in the population of the study as a representative sample of the total population surveyed

2. Data which describe demographic characteristics of the population of the study and of their schools, school systems, and counties

3. Data which report existing literature-identified programs for pregnant, school-aged students in North Carolina public schools as reported by respondents of the questionnaire

4. Data which report preferences of the respondents concerning public school provision of literature-identified program options for pregnant, school-aged students
5. Data which address relationships among the preferences of respondents, the practices in their school systems, and literature-identified criteria concerning special services of special programs for pregnant, school-aged students.

6. Data which report reasons for the non-existence of special programs for pregnant, school-aged students as reported by respondents from systems without special programs.

7. Data which report subjective information submitted by those respondents who answered the optional, open-ended question which asked them to share their insights from experiences regarding service to pregnant students.

The following sections present the data gathered in the study according to the seven categories described above.

**Confidence in the Sample Population**

In this section, confidence in the population of the study as a representative sample of the total surveyed population is examined. Data obtained from examining confidence in the study's sample are presented in the following order: first, data from interviewing a randomly selected sample of non-respondents to the questionnaire; and secondly, data from correlating percentages of participation in the study in individual systems and counties with system sizes, system drop-out rates, and county rates of teenaged births.

The total number of respondents participating in the study was 233, which represents 62.5 percent of the total
population of superintendents and principals within the eight SMSA's of North Carolina who were invited to participate in the study. Thirty-one superintendents or designees responded, representing 91.2 percent of the total population of superintendents. Responding principals numbered 202, which represents 59.6 percent of the total population of principals. A summary of the numbers and percentages of the two major groups of respondents is presented in Table 2.

### Table 2

**The Two Major Groups of the Study by Number and Percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Groups</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>N of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents or designees</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designees</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 373 administrators surveyed, three superintendents and 137 principals did not respond. The population of questionnaire non-respondents, 140 school administrators, represents 37.5 percent of the total population surveyed.
Data from Interviewing Randomly Selected Non-Respondents

A follow-up telephone interview reached thirty-one randomly selected questionnaire non-respondents, all of whom were principals. This number is four more than the sample size of non-respondents established as sufficient to interview for the purpose of accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences between questionnaire respondents and non-respondents.

Interviewed non-respondents were asked the following five key questions derived from the study's questionnaire:

1. Questionnaire Item #48b: Does your system have two or more courses (a special program) specially designed for pregnant girls

2. Questionnaire Item #14a: Should pregnant students attend regular classes as the only program available to them

3. Questionnaire Item #15a: Should pregnant students be able to choose to attend regular classes or to attend special courses designed specially for them

4. Questionnaire Item #31a: Should special courses or programs for pregnant students include instruction in parenting skills

5. Questionnaire Item #38a: Should special courses or programs for pregnant students provide personal counseling services, i.e. decision making about problems related to the expected baby and to expected motherhood?
Interview responses of thirty-one principals who did not respond to the questionnaire were compared with questionnaire responses of the 202 principals who responded to the questionnaire. This comparison is presented in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**

**PERCENTAGES OF "YES" ANSWERS TO SELECTED QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AMONG TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>#48b</th>
<th>#14a</th>
<th>#15a</th>
<th>#31a</th>
<th>#38a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Interview</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 Questionnaire</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was determined that the responses of the interviewees did not differ significantly from the responses of the questionnaire respondents. The observed differences between interviewees and questionnaire respondents in responses to the five questions were not of sufficient magnitude to be significant at the alpha = .05 level as determined by the power formula utilized in establishing the sample size of questionnaire non-respondents to be interviewed.

**Data from Correlating Participation in the Study with Demographic Characteristics**

Participation in the study within systems. Participation in the study on the part of questionnaire recipients within individual systems was examined in relation to two
demographic characteristics. Percentages of returned questionnaires from every surveyed school system were correlated with both the sizes and the drop-out rates of those systems. The distribution of system rates of participation in the study according to the sizes of the surveyed systems is presented in Table 4. The distribution of system rates of participation in the study according to the drop-out rates of surveyed systems is presented in Table 5.

Kendall's Tau, a non-parametric statistic for rank order correlation, was used to test the significance of the relationships between the extent of participation in the study within individual school systems and both system sizes and system drop-out rates. The values of the statistic are \(-.02\) for system sizes (\(z=.166\)) and \(-.04\) for system drop-out rates (\(z=.12\)). The standard normal distribution was used to test the significance of the Tau statistic. The corresponding values of \(z\) are not significant at the alpha = .05 level since each fails to exceed the tabled \(z\) value of 1.96.

**Participation in the study within counties.** Participation in the study on the part of questionnaire recipients within individual counties was examined in relation to county births to school-aged mothers (17 years old and younger). A ratio of school-aged births to total county school populations (males and females, K through 12) was computed for each county surveyed. Each ratio was changed to a percentage. Percentages of returned questionnaires from every surveyed
### TABLE 4

**DISTRIBUTION OF SYSTEM PARTICIPATION RATES ACCORDING TO SIZES OF SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Size of System*</th>
<th>System Rate of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>82,056</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>57,715</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>45,866</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>38,319</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>36,272</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>26,612</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>25,225</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>21,912</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>17,574</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>17,073</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>14,972</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>13,431</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12,513</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>12,319</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>10,960</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>9,919</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>9,751</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>8,158</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>5,759</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>3,173</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction, Education Directory, 1979-1980. (Raleigh, N.C., 1979).*
TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF SYSTEM PARTICIPATION RATES
ACCORDING TO SYSTEM DROPOUT RATES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Dropout Rate**</th>
<th>System Rate of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**The published annual estimated dropout rate for N.C. School year, 1978-1979, is 8.0. However, this rate does not take into account those who drop out during the summer. It is estimated that 32% of those students who enrolled in the ninth grade during the 1975-1976 school year dropped out of school before completing high school (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction; The Drop Out Problem in the Public Schools of North Carolina, 1980).
county were correlated with the percentages of school-aged births among the school populations for those counties. The distribution of county rates of participation in the study according to percentages of births to school-aged mothers relative to the school populations in the surveyed counties is presented in Table 6.

**TABLE 6**

**DISTRIBUTION OF COUNTY PARTICIPATION PERCENTAGES AND PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL-AGED MOTHERS* AMONG SCHOOL POPULATIONS WITHIN THE COUNTIES+**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentages of School-Aged Mothers Among Student Populations</th>
<th>County Participation Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.66%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>.64%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.62%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.59%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.58%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>.58%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>.58%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>.56%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>.55%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.46%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>.43%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>.41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>.38%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>.37%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>.33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall's Tau statistic was used to test the significance of the relationship between the extent of participation in the study within individual counties surveyed and the ratio of school-aged mothers to school populations in the counties surveyed. The value of the statistic is 

z = 0.69 (\text{z} = .69). The standard normal distribution was used to test the significance of the Tau statistic. The corresponding value of z is not significant at alpha = 0.05 level since it fails to exceed the tabled z value of 1.96.

In summary, data was presented in this section which addresses confidence in the sample of the population of the study. It was determined that the responses of the interviewed non-respondents to the questionnaire did not differ significantly from the responses of the questionnaire respondents regarding five key questionnaire items. The five key questionnaire items dealt with system practice and administrators' perceptions regarding the provision of educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students. It was determined that the relationship between the extent of participation in the study on the part of surveyed school administrators and the sizes of their systems is not significant. It was determined that the relationship between the extent of participation in the study on the part of surveyed school administrators and the incidence of school-aged mothers relative to the school populations in their counties is not significant.
Data which describe the sample population of the study are presented in the next section.

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents and of their Buildings and Systems

In this section, demographic characteristics of the respondents, their school buildings, and their school systems are presented in order to describe the sample population of the study. These characteristics serve to define the respondents as groups of individuals with memberships in social groups pertinent to the study. Descriptive data regarding demographic characteristics of the sample population are presented in three categories: (a) characteristics of the respondents; (b) characteristics of the school buildings of respondents; and (c) characteristics of the school systems of respondents.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Administrative experience and age distribution. The administrative experience of the total group of respondents was distributed across all categories of experience levels. Over half of them (59 percent) had been educational administrators for more than ten years. The administrative experience of the principals was less than that of the superintendents or their designees. Fifty-eight percent of the principals and 68 percent of the superintendents or their designees had been educational administrators for more than ten
years. A summary of the administrative experience of respondents is presented in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

**BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-15 years</th>
<th>over 15 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents or Designees</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the respondents (71 percent) were between thirty-six and fifty-five years of age. Sixty-four percent of the superintendents or designees and 73 percent of the principals were in this age category. A summary of the ages of respondents is presented in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**

**BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Under 25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents or Designees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sex distribution of respondents. The sex classification within each major group of respondents was overwhelmingly male, although a majority of superintendents' designees were female. All twelve of the superintendents were male; 63 percent of the superintendents' designees were female. Only 8 percent of the principals were female. A summary of the sex distribution of respondents is presented in Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

**BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO SEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendents or Designees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of the School Buildings of Respondents

Data which was reported by participating principals and which describe the following characteristics of their school buildings are presented: (a) the sizes of student populations; (b) the racial composition of student populations; (c) the socio-economic levels of student populations; (d) the building grade level organizations; and (e) the estimated annual numbers of pregnant students.
Distribution of respondents according to the sizes of the student populations of their buildings. Sixty percent of the responding principals reported that they administer buildings that serve between five hundred and one thousand students. Fifteen percent reported that they administer buildings which serve fewer than five hundred students and 22 percent reported that they administer buildings which serve more than one thousand students. Table 10 summarizes the distribution of the responding principals according to the student populations of their buildings.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDING PRINCIPALS ACCORDING TO THE STUDENT POPULATIONS OF THEIR BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Responding Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 500</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1,000</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 1,500</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 - 2,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of respondents according to the racial compositions of their buildings. The percentage of white students in the public schools of the North Carolina SMSA's
reflects the racial composition within them. The minority population of these schools is primarily made up of black students; two counties have small percentages of American Indian students and a few others have small percentages of Indochinese and Hispanic students (North Carolina: Statistical Profile, 1979).

The responding principals reported percentages of white students in their buildings. The distribution of reported percentages is presented in Table 11 together with the distribution of percentages of white students in the thirty-four school systems surveyed in this study. Each distribution reflects the desegregated schools of North Carolina, achieved by busing.

TABLE 11

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WHITE STUDENTS IN THE BUILDINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND IN THE THIRTY-FOUR SYSTEMS WITHIN THE EIGHT SMSA'S OF NORTH CAROLINA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Composition (Percent White)</th>
<th>Principals Reporting Building Percentages of White Students</th>
<th>Systems' Percentages of White Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of respondents according to the student socio-economic compositions of their buildings. Responding principals reported the percentage of students in each of their buildings who are either eligible for free or reduced lunch or are, by some other measure, from low socio-economic homes. Responding principals who reported that over 40 percent of their students are from low socio-economic homes numbered forty-three, which represents 21 percent of the participating principals. Ten of the thirty-four SMSA school systems, representing 29 percent of the systems surveyed, are reported to have student populations composed of over 40 percent from low socio-economic homes. Only 5 percent of the principals reported that under 10 percent of the students in their buildings are from low socio-economic homes. Distributions of the responding principals and of the thirty-four surveyed systems according to percentages of students reported to be from low socio-economic homes are presented in Table 12.

Distribution of responding principals according to the grade level organizations of their buildings. The 202 principals participating in the study administer buildings with various grade level organizations serving students in differing combinations of grades seven through twelve. Among the respondents' buildings, 25 percent serve grades seven through nine and 23 percent serve combinations of grades with seventh or eighth grade as the highest level. Thirty-one percent of
**TABLE 12**

THE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS FROM LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC HOMES IN THE BUILDINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND IN THE THIRTY-FOUR SYSTEMS SURVEYED WITHIN THE EIGHT SMSA'S OF NORTH CAROLINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Composition (Percent Low)</th>
<th>Principals Reporting Building Socio-Economic Composition</th>
<th>SMSA Systems According to Student Socio-Economic Composition*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% - 40%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% - 30%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>99+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOURCE: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, ESEA Title I Office. Reports of Principals; School Food Services Data. (Raleigh, N.C., 1980).

responding principals report that their buildings serve senior high school students in either nine through twelve or ten through twelve grade level organizations. The distributions of the principals who participated in the study and of the total population of principals surveyed are presented in Table 13.

**Annual number of pregnant students estimated by responding principals.** About a third of the responding principals estimated that more than five girls who are students in their buildings become pregnant each year. Nineteen percent
### TABLE 13

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDING PRINCIPALS AND OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF PRINCIPALS* ACCORDING TO THE GRADE LEVELS SERVED BY THE BUILDINGS THEY ADMINISTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>Responding Principals</th>
<th>Total Population of 339 Principals*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7 or 8**</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other***</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>99+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Grade level organizations with seventh grade or eighth grade as the highest grade (k-8, 4-8, 5-8, 6-8, 7-8, K-7, 4-7).

***Includes: k-12, 6-9, 8-9, 9-10, 8-12, special education.

of the responding principals estimated that more than ten of their students become pregnant each year. A summary of principals' estimates of the number of students in their buildings who become pregnant each year is presented in Table 14.

In an attempt to evaluate the accuracy of these estimates, these percentages of responding principals representing the four ranges of estimated numbers were applied to one large county of the study, Mecklenburg County. The ratio of births to school-aged girls compared to all births in
TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF 202 RESPONDING PRINCIPALS BY THEIR ESTIMATES OF THE NUMBER OF ANNUAL PREGNANCIES OF STUDENTS IN THEIR BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Number of Pregnancies</th>
<th>Responding Principal N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>99+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mecklenburg County (North Carolina Vital Statistics, 1978) was not excessively high compared with the other nineteen counties in the study: six were higher; three were about the same; and ten were lower. The ratio of the number of births to school-aged girls to the number of students in the public schools was not excessively high compared with the other nineteen counties in the study: seven were higher; two were the same; and ten were lower. Hence, it is assumed that Mecklenburg County is a representative county regarding the incidence of births to school-aged girls.

The estimated number of pregnant students for Mecklenburg County was 157. This resulted from multiplying the reported percentages of principals by the median number in the
appropriate range of estimated numbers. The actual number of births to seventeen year olds and under in Mecklenburg County during the one year of 1978 was 472; to sixteen year olds and under, 265. Even taking into account those pregnant school-aged girls who are not students, these reports of pregnancies by building principals seem grossly underestimated when compared with census reported numbers of pregnancies for school-aged girls.

Characteristics of the School Systems of Respondents

Data which was reported by participating superintendents or their designees and which describes the following characteristics of their school systems are presented: (a) size; (b) racial student population composition; and (c) socio-economic student population composition.

Distribution of superintendents participating in the study according to system size. The distribution of superintendents participating in the study, based on responses from them or from their designees, was examined according to the sizes of their systems. Of the thirty-one participating superintendents, 32 percent administer systems with five thousand to ten thousand students and 23 percent administer systems with ten thousand to twenty thousand students. Data is presented in Table 15 which describes the distribution of the thirty-one participating superintendents and of the thirty-four superintendents surveyed according to system size.
TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PARTICIPATING SUPERINTENDENTS AND OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF SUPERINTENDENTS WITHIN THE EIGHT SMSA'S OF NORTH CAROLINA* ACCORDING TO SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Size</th>
<th>31 Responding Superintendents</th>
<th>Total Population of 34 Superintendents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 40,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Distribution of superintendents participating in the study according to the racial compositions of their school systems. The distribution of superintendents participating in the study, based on responses from them or from their designees, was examined according to the reported percentages of white students in their systems. Of the thirty-one participating superintendents, 77 percent report that they administer systems in which over 60 percent of the students are white and 19 percent report white student populations under 60 percent. Data is presented in Table 16 which describes the distribution of the thirty-one participating superintendents and of the
thirty-four superintendents surveyed according to the reported percentages of white students in their systems.

**TABLE 16**

**DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPATING SUPERINTENDENTS AND OF THE TOTAL POPULATION OF SUPERINTENDENTS WITHIN THE EIGHT SMSA'S OF NORTH CAROLINA* ACCORDING TO SCHOOL SYSTEM STUDENT RACIAL COMPOSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Composition (Percent White)</th>
<th>31 Superintendents Participating</th>
<th>34 Superintendents Surveyed*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 80</td>
<td>10 N 32 %</td>
<td>12 N 35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 80</td>
<td>14 N 45 %</td>
<td>16 N 47 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 60</td>
<td>5 N 16 %</td>
<td>5 N 15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 40</td>
<td>0 N 0 %</td>
<td>0 N 0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>1 N 3 %</td>
<td>1 N 3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 N 3 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31 N 99+ %</td>
<td>34 N 100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Distribution of superintendents participating in the study according to the socio-economic compositions of their school systems. The distribution of superintendents participating in the study, based on responses from them or from their designees, was examined according to the reported percentages of students from low socio-economic homes. Student populations with over 30 percent of the students from low socio-economic homes were reported by 65 percent of the central office administrators. Data is presented in Table 17.
which describe the distribution of the thirty-one participating superintendents and of the thirty-four superintendents surveyed according to the reported percentages of students from low socio-economic homes in their systems.

The thirty-one central office respondents reported the percentage of students in their systems who are either eligible for free and reduced lunch or are, by some other measure, from low socio-economic homes. The percentages of low socio-economic students reported for all thirty-four surveyed systems by ESEA Title I records were derived only from free and reduced lunch data. This difference in reporting criteria is assumed to account for a discrepancy in Table 17. Only six systems of the thirty-four surveyed have 30 to 40 percent of their students who are eligible for free or reduced lunch, yet twelve of the thirty-four superintendents reported this percentage range as low socio-economic.

In summary, data was presented in this section which describe demographic characteristics pertaining to the sample population of the study. The respondents were described by reported administrative experience, age, and sex characteristics. The school buildings of respondents were described by size, racial and socio-economic characteristics of their student populations, by grade level organizational characteristics, and by principals' estimates of the incidence of school-aged pregnancy. The school systems of respondents
TABLE 17  
DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPATING SUPERINTENDENTS AND OF  
THE TOTAL POPULATION OF SUPERINTENDENTS WITHIN  
THE EIGHT SMSA'S OF NORTH CAROLINA*  
ACCORDING TO SCHOOL SYSTEM STUDENT  
SOCIO-ECONOMIC COMPOSITION  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Composition (Percent Low)</th>
<th>31 Superintendents Participating</th>
<th>34 Superintendents Surveyed*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response/ Information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOURCE: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, ESEA Title I Office. Reports of Principals; School Food Services Data. (Raleigh, N.C., 1980).

were described by size, racial, and socio-economic characteristics of their student populations.

Data which report existing literature-identified programs for pregnant students in the systems participating in the study are presented in the next section.
Existing Literature-Identified Programs for Pregnant, School-Aged Students

One of the purposes of this study was to describe the extent to which literature-identified educational and support services needed by pregnant, school-aged students are provided in existing special programs for pregnant students in the thirty-four public school systems within the eight SMSA's of North Carolina.

A special program is one of several school system program options identified in the literature for pregnant students. Section B of the questionnaire was derived from the following literature-identified program options for pregnant, school-aged students: regular classes only; a special class; home instruction; exemption; and a special program. Defined in the questionnaire as more than one course specially designed for pregnant students, a special program is addressed in items #17 through #20 as it may exist in the following ways: (a) during the regular school day in the regular school building; (b) after the regular school day in the regular school building; and (c) in a special school located away from the regular school administered by the school system.

In this section, existing program options for pregnant students in the systems participating in the study are presented within two frameworks. First, data are presented which describe characteristics of both systems which have special programs for pregnant students and systems which do not have such special programs. Secondly, data are presented which
report administrative, evaluative, and funding patterns of existing special programs for pregnant students in participating systems.

**Characteristics of Systems with Special Programs and Systems without Special Programs for Pregnant Students**

Examinations are made of systems with special programs and those without special programs regarding the participation of respondents in the study, the existence of a non-discriminatory policy for pregnant students, and program options provided for pregnant students.

Participation of respondents according to the existence of a special program. Respondents reported the non-existence of special courses or programs for pregnant students in their systems throughout Section C of the questionnaire (items #23 through #58). The second part of each item in Section C of the questionnaire asked respondents about the practice of a specific literature-identified educational or support service for pregnant students in the respondents' systems. A possible questionnaire response to each item was: "There are no special courses or programs in my system." On the basis of the responses to item #28 (arbitrarily selected), respondents were categorized into two groups: those from systems with special programs for pregnant students, and those from systems without special programs for pregnant students.
Of the thirty-one responding superintendents or designees (91 percent of the total survey population of superintendents), 48.4 percent reported that their systems have special programs for pregnant, school-aged students. A special program was defined as more than one course specially designed for this student population. Of the 202 responding principals (59.6 percent of the total population of principals surveyed), 59.4 percent reported that their systems have special programs for pregnant, school-aged students. A summary of respondents with respect to the existence of special programming for pregnant students in their systems is presented in Table 18.

**TABLE 18**

**BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS FROM SYSTEMS BOTH WITH AND WITHOUT SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS ACCORDING TO THEIR QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES TO: "THERE ARE NO SPECIAL COURSES OR PROGRAMS IN MY SYSTEM"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>31 Superintendents</th>
<th>202 Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of participating principals who are from systems with special programming for pregnant students (59.4 percent) was greater than the percentage of participating
principals who are from systems without special programming (40.6 percent). This was true even though only 48 percent of the participating systems were reported to have special programs by their superintendents or superintendents' designees. A standard error calculation determined that the difference between the response percentages of the two subgroups of principals is statistically significant at the .01 level of significance. The null hypothesis, that there is no difference between principals from systems with special programming for pregnant students and principals from systems without special programming regarding participation in the study, is rejected at the .01 probability level.

Policy for non-discrimination of pregnant students.

The difference between systems with special programming and systems without special programming regarding the practice of a policy for non-discrimination of pregnant students was examined by the superintendents' positive responses ("yes") to the question: "Does your system have a non-discriminatory policy regarding educational services for pregnant, school-aged students?" Eighty-seven percent of the superintendents or designees and 61 percent of the principals from systems with special programming reported the existence of such a policy. Sixty-nine percent of the superintendents or designees and 61 percent of the principals from systems without special programming reported the existence of such a
policy. The numbers and percentages of respondents who reported system non-discriminatory policies is presented in Table 19.

### TABLE 19

**POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES INDICATING THE EXISTENCE OF A NON-DISCRIMINATORY POLICY REGARDING EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR PREGNANT, SCHOOL-AGED STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Superintendents' Positive Response</th>
<th>Principals' Positive Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The populations of the sub groups of superintendents are insufficient to detect significance or insufficiency regarding a difference between them with respect to a non-discriminatory policy. A standard error calculation determined that the difference between the positive response percentages of the two subgroups of principals is significant at the .01 level of significance. The null hypothesis, that there is no difference between school systems with special programs for pregnant students and systems without such programs regarding the existence of a non-discriminatory policy for pregnant students, is rejected at the .01 probability level.
Program options provided for pregnant students. Reported program options provided for pregnant students in systems with special programming for them and in systems without such special programming vary in kind and in frequency.

Of the ninety-eight respondents from systems without special programming, 44 percent of the superintendents or designees and 40 percent of the principals responded positively to the questionnaire item: "Pregnant students in my system do attend regular classes as the only program option available to them." Thirty-one percent of the responding superintendents or designees and 27 percent of the responding principals from systems without special programs responded positively to the questionnaire item: "Pregnant students in my system do have the ability to choose to attend regular classes or to attend special classes or a special program designed for them." There is a need to understand what was designed for them in the absence of a special program. Thirteen percent of these superintendents or designees and 7 percent of these principals responded positively to the questionnaire item: "A special school administered by another agency is available to pregnant students in my system as an option."

Sixty-nine percent of these superintendents or designees and 56 percent of these principals responded positively to the questionnaire item: "Home instruction (homebound teacher) is provided for pregnant students in my system." Thirty-one percent of these superintendents or designees and
38 percent of these principals from systems without programs responded positively to the questionnaire item: "In my system, pregnant girls under 16 years of age are able to be exempt from school attendance." A summary of these responses is presented in Table 20.

On the basis of the data reported in Table 20, the researcher assumed that in response to the questionnaire item regarding choice of a special program for pregnant students, those administrators from systems with no special programs who reported a choice for one were perceiving home instruction, exemption, or a special school run by another agency to be a special program.

Differences between systems with special programs for pregnant students and systems without such special programs were examined in relation to the options of home instruction, exemption (for those under sixteen years) and a special school run by another agency for pregnant students. Principals' questionnaire responses were used for these comparisons. Fifty-six percent of the eighty-two principals from systems with no special programs reported the practice of home instruction as an option, whereas only 38 percent of the 120 principals from systems with special programs reported this option. Twenty-six percent of the principals from systems with special programs reported a special school for pregnant students run by an agency other than the school system as an option, whereas only 7 percent of the principals from systems with no special
TABLE 20

POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES INDICATING
PROGRAM OPTIONS FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS IN
SYSTEMS WITH NO SPECIAL PROGRAMS
FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</th>
<th>Regular Classes As Only Option</th>
<th>Home Instruction As Option</th>
<th>Special School Run by Another Agency as Option</th>
<th>Exemption As Option to Those Under 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 %</td>
<td>69 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
programs reported this option. Thirty-eight percent of the principals from systems with no special programs reported the practice of exemption for pregnant students under sixteen years of age, whereas only 28 percent of the principals from systems with special programs reported this option. A summary of these responses is presented in Table 21.

Standard error calculations were made of the differences between the percentages of response to each item on the part of the two subgroups of principals. The null hypotheses, that there are no differences between school systems with special programs for pregnant students and systems without such special programs regarding (a) the practice of home instruction as a program option for pregnant students, and (b) the program option of a special school run by another agency, are both rejected at the .01 level of significance. The null hypothesis, that there is no difference between school systems with special programs for pregnant students and systems without such special programs regarding the practice of school exemption for pregnant students under sixteen years, is accepted.

Of the 120 participating principals from systems with special programs, 88 percent responded positively to the questionnaire item: "Pregnant students in my system do have the ability to choose to attend regular classes or to attend special classes or a special program designed for them." Three percent responded negatively to this item, 8 percent responded that they did not know and 1 percent did not respond. The
TABLE 21

POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES INDICATING THE PRACTICE OF THEEE PROGRAM OPTIONS FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS IN THE SYSTEMS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>202 Responding Principals</th>
<th>Home Instruction</th>
<th>Special School Run By Another Agency</th>
<th>School Exemption For Those Under 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>46 38</td>
<td>31 26</td>
<td>33 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Systems With No Special Programs</td>
<td>46 56</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>31 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
researcher assumes that if pregnant students do not have the ability to choose to attend regular classes or to attend special classes or a special program in a system which has special programming, then pregnant students are required to attend either the regular classes or the special programming.

Literature-identified, special programs for pregnant, school-aged students in public schools which are practiced in systems participating in the study are: (a) special schools administered by the school systems, (b) special programming in the regular school building after the regular school day, and (c) special programming in the regular school building during the regular school day. By far the largest percentage of the 120 responding principals from systems with special programs (72 percent) gave positive responses to the questionnaire item: "In my system, a special school administered by the school system is provided for pregnant students as an option." Seven percent of the principals gave positive responses to the questionnaire item: "In my school, a special program designed for pregnant girls is offered in the regular school during the regular school day as an option." Nine percent of the principals gave positive responses to the questionnaire item: "In my school, a special course or program designed for pregnant girls is offered after the regular school day in the regular school as an option." A summary of the responses regarding program options for pregnant, school-aged students in the surveyed systems which have special programs for pregnant students is presented in Table 22.
TABLE 22

POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES INDICATING THE PRACTICE OF THREE PROGRAM OPTIONS FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS IN SYSTEMS WITH SPECIAL PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Special School Run by System</th>
<th>Special Programming in Regular School After Regular Day</th>
<th>Special Programming in Regular School During Regular Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N   %</td>
<td>N   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>86  72</td>
<td>11  9</td>
<td>8   7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A standard error calculation was made to determine if there is a significant difference between the percentage of reported system-run, special schools for pregnant students and reported special programming in the regular school during or after the regular day. It was determined that a system-run, special school for pregnant students is practiced significantly more than special programming in the regular school in systems with special programs for this student population. This difference is significant at the .01 level of significance.

**Administration, Evaluation, and Funding of Existing Special Programs**

Section E of the questionnaire is comprised of three items. These three items on the questionnaire were only for those recipients from systems with special programs for pregnant students. These items asked participants in the study to report the people responsible for administration and evaluation and to report sources of funding pertinent to the special programs. There was a high percentage of non-response to these items on the part of participants in the study from systems with special programs. From 20 percent to 26 percent of them did not respond to the three questionnaire items on administration, evaluation and funding of their special programs for pregnant students. The researcher examined the percentages of response to the three questionnaire items of Section E on administration, evaluation and funding in relation to the percentages of response to the questionnaire items.
preceding and following Section E for the same group of participants in the study. Standard error calculations at the .01 level of significance determined that principals from systems with special programs responded to the questionnaire items regarding the evaluation and funding of the special programs in their systems significantly less than they responded to the items preceding and following Section E of the questionnaire. A standard error calculation at the .05 level of significance determined that principals from systems with special programs responded to the questionnaire item regarding the administration of the special programs in their systems significantly less than they responded to the items preceding and following Section E of the questionnaire. There are no significant differences among the percentages of superintendents' responses to the questionnaire items regarding administration, evaluation, and funding. A summary of these findings is presented in Table 23.

Of the principals and superintendents or designees from systems with special programs who participated in this study, the following observations regarding the administration, evaluation, and funding of special programs in their systems can be made:

1. 78 percent of the principals and 67 percent of the superintendents or designees reported on-site administration of special programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Item Preceding The Item On Administration</th>
<th>Item On Administration</th>
<th>Item on Evaluation</th>
<th>Item on Funding</th>
<th>Item Following The Item On Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. 38 percent of the principals and 40 percent of the superintendents or designees reported that the on-site administration is the responsibility of the principal of the building in which the special program is located

3. 35 percent of the principals and 53 percent of the superintendents or designees reported that special program administrators or special program administrators and their staffs are involved in evaluating their programs

4. 35 percent of the principals and 20 percent of the superintendents or designees reported involvement of students in the evaluation of special programs

5. 21 percent of the principals and 13 percent of the superintendents or designees reported involvement of community in the evaluation of special programs

6. Superintendents or designees reported three sources of funding for special programs—60 percent reported state and local funding and 20 percent reported federal, state and local funding

7. A small percentage of principals (8 percent) and no superintendents or designees reported state funding as the only source

8. Private funding, as reported in this study, seems negligible.

Summaries of the responses of those who answered the items on administration, evaluation and funding are presented in Tables 24, 25, and 26 respectively.
TABLE 24

NUMBERS AND PERCENTATES OF ADMINISTRATORS' RESPONSES
TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM: "WHO IS DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>The Principal Of The Building Located In Which It Is</th>
<th>An On-Site Coordinator, Teacher, Director, Or Support Staff</th>
<th>A Central Office Staff Member</th>
<th>Other Member</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>46 38</td>
<td>37 31</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>1 1 24 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>6 40</td>
<td>4 27</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 13</td>
<td>0 0 3 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 TOTAL</td>
<td>52 39</td>
<td>41 30</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>11 8</td>
<td>1 1 27 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 25

NUMBERS AND PERCENTATES OF ADMINISTRATORS' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM: "WHO IS INVOLVED IN THE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Program Administrator</th>
<th>Program Administrator, Staff, and Students</th>
<th>Program Administrator, Staff, Student, and Community</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 26

Numbers and Percentages of Administrators' Responses to the Questionnaire Item: "What are the Funding Sources of the Program?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
<th>State and Local Funding</th>
<th>Questionnaire Federal, State and Local Funding</th>
<th>Responses Private, State and Local Funding</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard error calculations based upon superintendents' responses (N=15) and upon principals' responses (N=120) determined the following significant differences at the .01 level of significance among the percentages of responses to the questionnaire items regarding administration, evaluation and funding of special programs for pregnant students:

1. On-site administration is practiced significantly more than central office, off-site administration

2. Use of a teacher, counselor or support staff member as the on-site administrator is practiced significantly less than use of an on-site principal, coordinator, director or supervisor

3. Exclusive involvement of the program administrator in the evaluation of the program occurs significantly less than the inclusion of others in evaluation involvement

4. Private funds are not significant as a source for program funding

5. A combination of state and local funds is significant as the funding for special programs.

Standard error calculations based upon superintendents' responses (N=15) and upon principals' responses (N=120) determined, at the .05 level of significance, that federal funds are used significantly less than state and local funds as sources of program funding.
This section examined existing literature-identified programs for pregnant students in the surveyed school systems. Data was presented regarding the practice of program options in systems with special programs and in systems without them. Data was presented regarding the administration, evaluation and funding of special programs. The next section presents the preferences of questionnaire respondents regarding program options for pregnant, school-aged students.

Preferences of Respondents Regarding Literature-Identified Program Options for Pregnant, School-Aged Students

One of the purposes of the study is to report existing preferences and perceptions of superintendents and of principals serving seventh through twelfth graders regarding the provision of literature-identified educational and support services for pregnant, school-aged students. In this section, positive responses to questionnaire items which asked respondents to indicate those program options which should serve pregnant students are examined. Hence, preferences and perceptions of respondents refer to their positive responses to "should" statements regarding the provision of literature-identified program options for pregnant, school-aged students. Preferences of respondents regarding program options and program approaches for pregnant, school-aged students are presented within the following frameworks: the preferences of the total group of respondents, and the comparison of preferences among subgroups of respondents.
Total Group of Respondents

The total group of respondents, 233 individuals, is comprised of: 202 principals, of whom 120 are from systems which have special programs for pregnant students and 82 are from systems which do not have such programs; and 31 superintendents or designees, of whom 15 are from systems which have special programs and 16 are from systems which do not have such programs. Among the superintendents or designees and principals, 203 are males and 28 are females.

Respondents were asked to give their opinions regarding different types of school system programs and options for pregnant students. Questionnaire instructions clarified that there was no minimum and no maximum number of responses to options sought from respondents.

The following preferences and perceptions describe the total group of respondents:

1. Very few (9 percent) think that the regular school program should be the only program available to pregnant students

2. Most (86 percent) think that pregnant students should be able to choose to attend regular classes or to attend a special class or a special program designed for them

3. More than half (61 percent) think that a special school, located away from the regular school and administered by the school system, should be provided for pregnant students as an option
4. About half (53 percent) think that a special school, with transferable credit, administered by another agency should be available to pregnant students as an option.

5. Forty-one percent think that a special course (one class period) for pregnant girls should be offered during the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

6. Approximately one-third (32 percent) think that a special program (more than one course) for pregnant girls should be offered during the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

7. About half (45 percent) think that a special course or program designed for pregnant girls should be offered after the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

8. More than half (61 percent) think that home instruction (a homebound teacher) should be provided for pregnant students as an option.

9. About half (48 percent) think that pregnant girls under sixteen years of age should be able to be exempt from school attendance.

Summaries of data regarding these preferences and perceptions of the total group of the study are presented in Tables 27, 28, and 29.
TABLE 27

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR TWO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: (A) PREGNANT STUDENTS SHOULD ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES AS THE ONLY OPTION; (B) PREGNANT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO CHOOSE TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES OR SPECIAL PROGRAMMING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Attend Regular Classes as Only Option</th>
<th>Choose to Attend Regular Classes or Special Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>21 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>201 86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 28

POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR THREE PROGRAM OPTIONS FOR PREGNANT GIRLS: (A) A SPECIAL SCHOOL ADMINISTERED BY ANOTHER AGENCY SHOULD BE AVAILABLE; (B) HOME INSTRUCTION SHOULD BE PROVIDED; AND (C) PREGNANT GIRLS UNDER 16 YEARS OF AGE SHOULD BE ABLE TO BE EXEMPT FROM SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Special School Run by Other Agency</th>
<th>Exemption for Under 16 Year Olds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>123 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 29

POSITIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR FOUR SCHOOL-SYSTEM PROVIDED PROGRAM OPTIONS FOR PREGNANT GIRLS: (A) A SPECIAL SCHOOL SHOULD BE AN OPTION; (B) A SPECIAL COURSE DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL DAY IN THE REGULAR SCHOOL SHOULD BE AN OPTION; (C) A SPECIAL PROGRAM DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL DAY IN THE REGULAR SCHOOL SHOULD BE AN OPTION; AND (D) A SPECIAL COURSE OR PROGRAM AFTER THE REGULAR SCHOOL DAY IN THE REGULAR SCHOOL SHOULD BE AN OPTION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Special School</th>
<th>Special Course During the Regular Day</th>
<th>Special Program During the Regular Day</th>
<th>Special Course or Program After Regular Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A standard error calculation determined that the difference between the percentage of respondents who think pregnant students should attend regular classes as their only program option and the percentage of respondents who think these students should be able to choose to attend regular classes or special programming is significant at the .01 level of significance. Hence, a choice for pregnant students between regular and special programming is significantly preferred by participants in the study to the alternative of regular programming only.

Standard error calculations were performed regarding the differences among the percentages of administrators' responses to all of the literature-identified program options. Respondents' preferences for the public school provision of a special school and of home instruction are significantly greater than their preferences for the other program options at the .01 level of significance.

The average number of options which each respondent thought should be provided to pregnant students in the public schools was computed. The following procedures were taken to compute this average: responses to those items which address program options and approaches that can be provided in the schools (choice of regular program, special school, special course in regular school, special program in regular school, special programming in regular school after the regular day, home instruction) were added together and divided by the
number of total respondents. The mean number of program options which each respondent thought should be available to pregnant students in schools was 3.35. The maximum number of program options for which a respondent could indicate preference was six. Administrators' preferences are indicated for the provision of multiple options and choices in schools for pregnant girls to continue their education. Further analysis will compare subgroups of the total population with one another regarding preferences for different types of program options for pregnant, school-aged students.

Comparisons of Preferences Among Subgroups of Respondents

Comparisons of preferences among subgroups of respondents are presented for the following program options and approaches for pregnant students: (a) regular classes as the only option; (b) choice between regular and special classes; (c) special school; (d) special programming in regular school; (e) home instruction; and (f) exemption from school for those students who are under sixteen years of age.

Regular classes as the only program option. In each subgroup, a small percentage of respondents reported a preference for attendance in regular classes as the only program option for pregnant students. However, a standard error calculation determined that superintendents or designees and principals from systems which have special programs for pregnant students were significantly less receptive to this no-choice
approach than their counterparts from systems which do not have special programs at the .05 level of significance. A summary of these responses is presented in Table 30.

TABLE 30

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF SUBGROUPS OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM: PREGNANT STUDENTS SHOULD ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES AS THE ONLY PROGRAM OPTION AVAILABLE TO THEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item: Regular Classes Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Females</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choice between regular and special classes. In each subgroup, most respondents reported a preference for pregnant students being able to choose to attend regular classes or to attend special classes or a special program designed for them.
There are no significant differences among their responses regarding this preference. A summary of these responses is presented in Table 31.

**TABLE 31**

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF SUBGROUPS OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM: PREGNANT STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO ATTEND SPECIAL CLASSES OR A SPECIAL PROGRAM DESIGNED FOR THEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item Choice Between Regular Classes and Special Programming</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Superintendents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special schools. In the total group of respondents, 61 percent indicated preference for a special school run by the school system and 53 percent indicated preference for one
run by another agency as program options for pregnant students. Response percentages of subgroups of the population indicate differences within subgroups and between subgroups regarding their preferences for these two kinds of special schools for pregnant students.

Administrators most receptive to a school system-administered, special school were the principals from systems which have special programs (77 percent); those least receptive were the superintendents from systems which do not have such programs (38 percent). Those most receptive to a special school run by another agency were the female respondents (61 percent); those least receptive were the superintendents from systems with special programs (20 percent). A summary of these responses is presented in Table 32.

The following significant differences were determined on the basis of standard error calculations at the .01 level of significance:

1. The preference for a school system-administered special school for pregnant students on the part of administrators from systems with special programs is significantly greater than their preference for a special school administered by another agency.

2. The preference for a special school for pregnant students administered by another agency on the part of administrators from systems without special programs is significantly greater than their preference for a school system-administered special school.
### TABLE 32

**POSITIVE RESPONSES OF SUBGROUPS OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR TWO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING PROGRAM OPTIONS FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS: (A) A SPECIAL SCHOOL ADMINISTERED BY THE SCHOOL SYSTEM; AND (B) A SPECIAL SCHOOL ADMINISTERED BY ANOTHER AGENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A School System</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administered</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Programs</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Programs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Males</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Administrators from systems with special programs prefer a school system-administered special school significantly more than do administrators from systems without special programs

4. Superintendents from systems without special programs for pregnant students prefer a special school administered
by another agency significantly more than do superintendents from systems with special programs.

Standard error calculations of the differences between the proportions of subgroups' responses determined the following results of comparisons:

1. There is no significant difference between principals from systems with special programs and principals from systems without special programs regarding their preferences for a special school for pregnant students administered by another agency.

2. There is no significant difference between all participating superintendents and all participating principals regarding their preferences for special schools for pregnant students.

3. There is no significant difference between male administrators and female administrators regarding their preferences for special schools for pregnant students.

Special programming in regular schools. Comparisons were made of the preferences of subgroups among respondents regarding literature-identified school program options for pregnant students which involve utilizing the regular school buildings. The percentages of their positive responses to each of three questionnaire items revealed differences regarding preferences for the three program options within each subgroup as well as differences regarding preferences for each program option among subgroups.
The option of one special course for pregnant students during the regular day in the regular school was preferred more by female administrators (64 percent) than by any other subgroup. It was preferred less by principals from systems with special programs (36 percent) than by any other subgroup. The option of a special program for pregnant students during the regular day in the regular school was not preferred by more than 46 percent of any subgroup. The option of special programming after the regular day in the regular school was preferred by principals from systems without special programs (54 percent) more than by any other subgroup. It was preferred less by female administrators (36 percent) than by any other subgroup. A summary of the responses is presented in Table 33.

The following significant differences regarding preferences for program options for pregnant students were determined on the basis of standard error calculations at the .01 level of significance:

1. The preference of principals for special programming after the regular day in the regular school is significantly greater than their preference for a special program during the regular day in the regular school.

2. The preference of female administrators for one special course during the regular day in the regular school is significantly greater than their preference for special programming after the regular day in the regular school.
TABLE 33

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF SUBGROUPS OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR THREE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING PROGRAM OPTIONS FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS IN REGULAR SCHOOLS: (A) ONE SPECIAL COURSE DURING THE REGULAR DAY; (B) A SPECIAL PROGRAM DURING THE REGULAR DAY; AND (C) SPECIAL PROGRAMMING AFTER THE REGULAR DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>One Special Course During the Regular Day</th>
<th>Special Program During the Regular Day</th>
<th>Special Programming After the Regular Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Superintendents</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 From Systems With</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 From Systems Without</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 From Systems With</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 From Systems Without</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>One Special Course During the Regular Day</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Special Program During the Regular Day</th>
<th>Special Programming After the Regular Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 Total Population</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Superintendents, irregardless of the existence of a special program for pregnant students in their systems, prefer one course for pregnant students in the regular school during the regular school day significantly more than do principals.

4. Female administrators prefer one course for pregnant students in the regular school during the regular school day significantly more than do male administrators.

Home instruction. Sixty-one percent of the total group of participants in the study responded positively to home instruction as a program option for pregnant students. One subgroup, principals from systems with special programs, preferred home instruction (52 percent) significantly less than other subgroups of respondents, at the .01 level of significance based on a standard error calculation of differences in subgroup proportions. A summary of these responses is presented in Table 34.

Regarding home instruction as a program option for pregnant students, it was determined that principals from systems with special programs are significantly less receptive than principals from systems without special programs and superintendents from both systems with and without special programs. Based on the differences between percentages of response in relationship to the standard error, these differences are significant at the .01 level of significance.
Table 34

Positive responses of subgroups of respondents indicating preferences for the questionnaire item: home instruction should be provided to pregnant students as an option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Superintendents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption from school for those under age sixteen. The literature cites exemption from school for pregnant students who are under sixteen years of age as a practice which was common in the past and which currently exists in some school systems. The respondents most receptive to exempting pregnant students under age sixteen were the principals from systems without special programs (57 percent).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents least receptive to exemption were the superintendents from systems with special programs (27 percent). A summary of the positive responses to the questionnaire item on exemption is presented in Table 35.

TABLE 35

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF SUBGROUPS OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM: PREGNANT GIRLS UNDER SIXTEEN YEARS OF AGE SHOULD BE ABLE TO BE EXEMPT FROM SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item Exemption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A standard error calculations determined the following significant difference at the .05 level of significance; Principals from school systems without special programs
are significantly more receptive to exempting pregnant students under sixteen years of age from school than are superintendents from systems with special programs.

No significant differences between subgroups of principals or between males and females were found to be associated with their preferences for exemption of pregnant students. The populations of the subgroups of superintendents were insufficient to determine any significant difference between them.

In this section, findings were presented which describe existing preferences and perceptions of respondents regarding literature-identified program options which serve pregnant, school-aged students. Findings were presented within the frameworks of: (a) the preferences of the total group of respondents; and (b) the comparison of preferences among those subgroups of respondents whose responses indicated attitudinal differences.

The next section deals with specific literature-identified practices which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students. Findings are presented regarding relationships between preferences of respondents and practices of existing special programs in their systems in relation to literature-identified criteria for serving pregnant students.

Relationships Between Preferences of Respondents and Practices of Existing Special Programs in Their Systems in Relation to Literature-Identified Criteria for Serving Pregnant Students

One of the purposes of this study was to examine any existing relationships, selected on the basis of data
gathered in this study, regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students which address:
(a) attitudinal differences between groups of public school administrators; (b) discrepancies between literature-identified criteria and both the preferences and practices of public school administrators; and (c) discrepancies between the preferences and practices. In this section, data are presented which relate specific, literature-identified criteria for serving pregnant, school-aged students to the preferences of respondents and to the practices of existing special programs in respondents' systems.

Literature-identified criteria for serving the educational and support needs of pregnant, school-aged students are the bases for Section C of the questionnaire. Each of the thirty-six items in Section C describes a specific practice or service which responds to a specific need of pregnant, school-aged students. For each item, participants of the study were asked to give two responses: (a) do they think the specific practice or service described should be provided in a special program for pregnant students (preferences); and (b) does the specific practice or service described exist in the special programs of their systems (practices), or are there no special programs in their systems.

The thirty-six items in Section C, descriptive of specific practices and services for pregnant, school-aged students, address instructional, support, organizational, and community areas of concern. The instructional area of concern.
includes regular, academic instructional services (AIS) and special instructional services (SIS) responsive to the special needs of pregnant students. The support area of concern includes regular and special health services (HS), counseling and psychological services (C/PS), and social welfare services (SWS). The organizational area of concern includes school procedures which address the special needs of pregnant students. The community area of concern includes procedures which involve the community in school programming for pregnant, school-aged students.

Positive responses of participants in the study ("Yes") to the items in Section C of the questionnaire indicate their preferences and their system's practices in relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the needs of pregnant students. These responses are the data presented in this section. Positive responses are presented as numbers and percents of subgroups of respondents who prefer and whose system's special program practices each specific literature-derived practice or service. Scores representing mean positive responses for clusters of specific practices or services which represent different areas of concern were computed. These scores are presented as overall descriptions of the preferences and system practices of subgroups of respondents regarding the following services for pregnant students: AIS (academic instruction); SIS (special
Academic Instructional Services (AIS)

For the purpose of gathering data about the preferences of respondents and about special program practices in their systems regarding specific academic instructional services for pregnant students, there were five items in Section C of the questionnaire referred to as AIS. These five items refer to five services derived from the literature on special programs for pregnant students. Preferences of respondents and special program practices in their systems were indicated by positive responses for each of the following AIS practices for pregnant students in special programs: (a) the availability of all required and elective courses of the regular program; (b) remedial instruction in the basics for those performing below grade level; (c) instruction in self-contained classrooms; (d) individualized instruction; (e) in-service staff development activities regarding needs of pregnant students for the academic teachers.

Of the total population of the study, the following percentages of positive responses indicating preferences were made regarding the five AIS items: (a) 76 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should include the availability of all required and elective courses of the regular program; (b) 89 percent indicated that they think remedial instruction in the basics for those
performing below grade level should be included in special programs; (c) 30 percent indicated that they think special programs should provide instruction in self-contained classrooms; (d) 76 percent indicated that they think special programs should provide instruction in individualized ways; and (e) 92 percent indicated that they think in-service staff development activities regarding the needs of pregnant students should be provided for teachers in special programs. These preference responses for all respondents and the preference responses for the subgroups of respondents are summarized in Table 36.

Of the 135 respondents from systems with special programs for pregnant students, the following percentages of positive responses indicating system practices were made regarding the five AIS items: (a) 57 percent indicated that all required and elective courses of the regular program are included in their special programs; (b) 76 percent indicated that remedial instruction is included in their special programs; (c) 22 percent indicated that instruction in self-contained classrooms is provided in their special programs; (d) 56 percent indicated that their special programs provide individualized instruction; and (e) 60 percent indicated that in-service staff development activities regarding the needs of pregnant students are provided for teachers in their special programs. In Table 37 these AIS practices of systems with special programs are summarized together with the AIS
### TABLE 36

**Positive Responses of the Population of the Study Indicating Preferences for Five AIS Questionnaire Items: All Required and Elective Courses (A); Remedial Instruction (B); Self-Contained Classrooms (C); Individualized Instruction (D); and Staff Development Activities (E)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 37

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS FROM SYSTEMS WITH SPECIAL PROGRAMS INDICATING PREFERENCES AND PRACTICES REGARDING FIVE AIS QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: ALL REQUIRED AND ELECTIVE COURSES (A); REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION (B); SELF-CONTAINED CLASSROOMS (C); INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION (D); AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents: Preferences and Practices</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135 Superintendents and Principals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preferences of the administrators who reported them in order to compare administrators' preferences with the practices in their systems.

Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among response percentages for the AIS questionnaire items at the .01 level of significance:

1. The total population of the study prefers individualized instruction (76 percent) significantly more than self-contained classrooms (30 percent) for special programs for pregnant students.

2. The total population of the study prefers remedial instruction (89 percent) significantly more than offering all regular program required and elective courses (76 percent) to pregnant students in special programs.

3. The total population is significantly more positive about providing in-service staff development activities (92 percent) regarding the needs of pregnant students to the teachers in special programs than about the other AIS items.

4. The preferences of the 135 administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in special programs for pregnant students in their systems for four AIS items: the offering of all regular program courses (77 percent prefer and 57 percent practice); the provision of remedial instruction (92 percent prefer and
76 percent practice); the provision of individualized instruction (81 percent prefer and 56 percent practice); and the provision of staff development activities regarding the needs of pregnant students (95 percent prefer and 60 percent practice).

The difference between the preferences of administrators from systems with special programs for providing instruction to pregnant students in self-contained classrooms (33 percent) and the practices in their systems (22 percent) is not significant at the .01 level of significance.

Differences between the preferences of administrators from systems with special programs and the preferences of those from systems without such programs regarding all AIS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance. Differences between the preferences of superintendents or their designees and the preferences of principals regarding all AIS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance. Differences between the preferences of male administrators and the preferences of female administrators regarding all AIS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the regular academic learning needs of pregnant students, the population of the study is receptive to four of the five literature-derived academic instructional services presented in the questionnaire as components of special programs for pregnant students. These four services are: provision of all regular program courses (76 percent); provision of remedial instruction (89 percent); provision of
individualized instruction (76 percent) and provision of staff
development activities regarding the needs of pregnant students
(92 percent). The population of the study is not receptive
to one of the five literature-derived academic instructional
services: 33 percent indicated preferences for providing in-
struction in self-contained classrooms.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for
serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged students, from
57 percent to 76 percent of the respondents from systems with
special programs reported system practice of four of the five
literature-derived academic instructional services presented
in the questionnaire as components of special programs for
pregnant students. These four services are: provision of all
regular program courses (57 percent); provision of remedial
instruction (76 percent); provision of individualized in-
struction (56 percent); and provision of staff development
activities regarding the needs of pregnant students (60 per-
cent). Respondents from systems with special programs re-
ported a low percentage of practice (22 percent) of one of the
five literature-identified academic instructional services:
provision of instruction in self-contained classrooms.

Special Instructional Services (SIS)

For the purpose of gathering data about the preferences
of respondents and about special program practices in their
systems regarding specific special instructional services for
pregnant students, there were six items in Section C of the
questionnaire referred to as SIS. These six items refer to six services derived from the literature on special programs for pregnant students. Preferences of respondents and special program practices in their systems were indicated by positive responses for each of the following six SIS practices for pregnant students in special programs: (a) instruction in sex education and birth control; (b) instruction in nutritional needs of pregnancy and infancy; (c) instruction in child development; (d) instruction in parenting skills; (e) instruction in recreational, leisure time activities; (f) instruction in job preparation and in a vocation.

Of the total population of the study, the following percentages of positive responses indicating preferences were made regarding the six SIS items: (a) 93 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should include instruction in sex education and birth control; (b) 95 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should include instruction in nutrition; (c) 95 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should include instruction in child development; (d) 95 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should include instruction in parenting skills; (e) 73 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should include organized recreational, leisure time activities; and (f) 82 percent indicated that they think special programs
should include vocational, job preparatory instruction. These preference responses for all respondents and the preference responses for the subgroups of respondents are summarized in Table 38.

Of the 135 respondents from systems with special programs for pregnant students, the following percentages of positive responses indicating system practices were made regarding the six SIS items: (a) 57 percent indicated that instruction in sex education and birth control is included in their special programs; (b) 67 percent indicated that instruction in nutrition is included in their special programs; (c) 65 percent indicated that instruction in child development is included in their special programs; (d) 61 percent indicated that instruction in parenting skills is included in their special programs; (e) 61 percent indicated that organized recreational, leisure time activities are included in their special programs; and (f) 56 percent indicated that their special programs do include vocational, job preparatory instruction. In Table 39, these SIS practices of systems with special programs are summarized together with the SIS preferences of the administrators who reported them in order to compare administrators' preferences with the practices in their systems.

Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among the response percentages for the SIS questionnaire items at the .01 level of significance:
TABLE 38
POSITIVE RESPONSES OF THE POPULATION OF THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR SIX SIS QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: SEX EDUCATION (A); NUTRITION (B); CHILD DEVELOPMENT (C); PARENTING SKILLS (D); RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES (E); JOB PREPARATION (F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>13 87</td>
<td>13 87</td>
<td>13 87</td>
<td>13 87</td>
<td>11 73</td>
<td>9 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>115 96</td>
<td>117 98</td>
<td>117 98</td>
<td>117 98</td>
<td>92 77</td>
<td>100 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>14 88</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>11 69</td>
<td>14 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>74 90</td>
<td>75 91</td>
<td>75 91</td>
<td>75 91</td>
<td>56 68</td>
<td>70 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 Males</td>
<td>189 93</td>
<td>192 95</td>
<td>192 95</td>
<td>192 95</td>
<td>148 73</td>
<td>169 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>25 89</td>
<td>27 96</td>
<td>27 96</td>
<td>27 96</td>
<td>20 71</td>
<td>22 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td>216 93</td>
<td>221 95</td>
<td>221 95</td>
<td>221 95</td>
<td>171 73</td>
<td>791 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents: Preferences and Practices</td>
<td>Questionnaire Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Superintendents and Principals From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The total population of the study prefers instruction in sex education (93 percent), nutrition (95 percent), child development (95 percent), and parenting skills (95 percent) significantly more than instruction in job preparation (82 percent) and recreational activities (73 percent) as components of special programs for pregnant students.

2. The preferences of the 135 administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in special programs for pregnant students in their systems for five SIS items: instruction in sex education (87 percent prefer and 57 percent practice); instruction in nutrition (96 percent prefer and 67 percent practice); instruction in child development (96 percent prefer and 65 percent practice); instruction in parenting skills (96 percent prefer and 61 percent practice); and vocational instruction and job preparation (81 percent prefer and 56 percent practice).

The difference between the preferences of administrators from systems with special programs for providing organized recreational, leisure time activities to pregnant students (76 percent) and the practices in their systems (51 percent) is not significant.

Differences between the preferences of administrators from systems with special programs and of those from systems without special programs regarding all SIS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance. Differences between the preferences of the superintendents or their designees and
those of principals regarding all SIS items are not signifi-
cant at the .05 level of significance. Differences between the
preferences of male administrators and those of female admin-
istrators regarding all SIS items are not significant at the
.05 level of significance.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for
serving the instructional needs of pregnant, school-aged
students related specifically to their pregnancy, the pop-
ulation of the study is receptive to all six of the literature-
derived special instructional services presented in the
questionnaire as components of special programs for pregnant
students.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for
serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged students, from 56
percent to 67 percent of the respondents from systems with
special programs reported system practice of all six of the
literature-derived instructional services which address in-
structional needs specifically related to their pregnancies
and to preparing for parenthood presented in the questionnaire
as components of special programs for pregnant students.

**Health Services (HS)**

For the purpose of gathering data about the prefer-
ences of respondents and about special program practices in
their systems regarding specific health services for pregnant
students, there were three items in Section C of the question-
naire referred to as HS. These three items refer to three
services derived from the literature on special programs for pregnant students. Preferences of respondents and special program practices in their systems were indicated by positive responses for each of the following three HS practices for pregnant students in special programs: (a) the services of a medical doctor; (b) the services of a nurse; (c) information about labor and delivery.

Of the total population of the study, the following percentages of positive responses indicating preferences were made regarding the three HS items: (a) 51 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should require or provide the services of a medical doctor; (b) 69 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should require or provide the services of a nurse; and (c) 85 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should include information about labor and delivery. These preference responses for all respondents and the preference responses for the subgroups of respondents are summarized in Table 40.

Of the 135 respondents from systems with special programs for pregnant students, the following percentages of positive responses indicating system practices were made regarding the three HS practices: (a) 24 percent indicated that the services of a medical doctor are required or provided in their special programs; (b) 52 percent indicated that the services of a nurse are required or provided in their
TABLE 40

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF THE POPULATION OF THE STUDY
INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR THREE HS QUESTIONNAIRE
ITEMS: MEDICAL DOCTOR (A); NURSE (B); LABOR
AND DELIVERY INFORMATION (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N   %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>4 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>62 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>6 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>47 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>108 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>10 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td>119 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

special programs; and (c) 48 percent indicated that information about labor and delivery is included in their special programs. In Table 41, these HS practices of systems with special programs are summarized together with the HS preferences of the administrators who reported them in order to compare administrators' preferences with the practices in their systems.
TABLE 41

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS FROM SYSTEMS WITH SPECIAL PROGRAMS INDICATING PREFERENCES AND PRACTICES REGARDING THREE HS QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: MEDICAL DOCTOR (A); NURSE (B); LABOR AND DELIVERY INFORMATION (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents:</th>
<th>Preferences and Practices</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135 Superintendents and Principals From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among response percentages for the HS questionnaire items at the .01 level of significance:

1. The total population of the study prefers the provision of information about labor and delivery (85 percent) significantly more than the provision of a doctor's services (51 percent) or the provision of a nurse's services (69 percent) as components of special programs for pregnant students which address pregnancy-related needs.

2. The total population of the study prefers the provision of a nurse's services (69 percent) significantly
more than the provision of a doctor's services (51 percent) as components of special programs for pregnant students.

3. The preferences of the 135 administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in special programs for pregnant students in their systems for all three of the HS items: the provision of a doctor's services (49 percent prefer and 24 percent practice); the provision of a nurse's services (73 percent prefer and 52 percent practice); and the provision of information about labor and delivery (87 percent prefer and 48 percent practice).

Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among response percentages of subgroups of respondents for the HS questionnaire items at the .05 level of significance:

1. Principals' positive preference responses for the services of a doctor (54 percent) were significantly higher than those of superintendents (32 percent)

2. Male administrators' positive responses for the services of a doctor (53 percent) were significantly higher than those of female administrators (36 percent).

Differences between the preferences of administrators from systems with special programs and the preferences of those from systems without such programs regarding all HS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged students, the
population of the study is receptive to preparing them for giving birth by providing information about labor and delivery (85 percent) as a component of a special program. Serving the medical needs of these pregnant students in school system special programs is acceptable to 69 percent of the respondents regarding the services of a nurse and to 51 percent of the respondents regarding the services of a doctor.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the medical needs of pregnant, school-aged students in systems with special programs, the component most preferred by administrators (87 percent) is reported practiced by only 48 percent of them: information about labor and delivery. The provision of a nurse, preferred by 73 percent, is reported practiced by 52 percent of them. The provision of a doctor, preferred by 49 percent of them, is reported practiced by 24 percent of them.

Counseling and Psychological Services (C/PS)

For the purpose of gathering data about the preferences of respondents and about special program practices in their systems regarding specific counseling and psychological services for pregnant students, there were six items in Section C of the questionnaire referred to as C/PS. These six items refer to six services derived from the literature on special programs for pregnant students. Preferences of respondents and special program practices in their systems were indicated by positive responses for each of the following six C/PS
practices for pregnant students in special programs: (a) course selection counseling; (b) personal decision-making counseling; (c) therapeutic psychological services; (d) vocational or career development counseling; (e) support groups for peer counseling; (f) post partum counseling.

Of the total population of the study, the following percentages of positive responses indicating preferences were made regarding the six C/PS items: (a) 96 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide school counseling services such as course selection counseling; (b) 94 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide personal counseling services such as decision-making, especially about problems related to pregnancy; (c) 88 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide psychological, therapeutic services to those students who are not able to function effectively; (d) 93 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide vocational or career development services; (e) 75 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should organize students in support groups so they can help one another; and (f) 83 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide counseling to enrollees after their babies are born (post partum). These preference responses for all respondents and the preference responses for the subgroups of respondents are summarized in Table 42.
TABLE 42

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF THE POPULATION OF THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR SIX C/PS QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: COURSE SELECTION (A); PERSONAL DECISION-MAKING COUNSELING (B); THERAPEUTIC COUNSELING (C); VOCATIONAL COUNSELING (D); SUPPORT GROUPS (E); AND POST PARTUM COUNSELING (F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroups of Respondents</td>
<td>A N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>B N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>C N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>D N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 (continued)
Of the 135 respondents from systems with special programs for pregnant students, the following percentages of positive responses indicating system practices were made regarding the six C/PS practices: (a) 80 percent indicated that school counseling services such as course selection counseling is provided in their special programs; (b) 66 percent indicated that personal decision-making counseling is provided in their special programs; (c) 49 percent indicated that therapeutic counseling is provided in their special programs; (d) 59 percent indicated that vocational counseling is provided in their special programs; (e) 27 percent indicated that support groups are organized in their special programs; (f) 41 percent indicated that post partum counseling is provided in their special programs. In Table 43 these C/PS practices of systems with special programs are summarized together with the C/PS preferences of the administrators who reported them in order to compare administrators’ preferences with the practices in their systems.

Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among response percentages of subgroups of respondents for the C/PS questionnaire items at the .01 level of significance:

1. The total population of the study has significantly less preference for organizing support groups (75 percent) than for providing course counseling (95 percent), for providing personal decision-making (94 percent),
TABLE 43

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS FROM SPECIAL PROGRAMS
INDICATING PREFERENCES AND PRACTICES FOR SIX C/PS
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: COURSE SELECTION (A);
PERSONAL DECISION-MAKING COUNSELING (B);
THERAPEUTIC COUNSELING (C); VOCATIONAL
COUNSELING (D); SUPPORT GROUPS (E);
AND POST PARTUM COUNSELING (F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents:</th>
<th>Preferences and Practices</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135 Superintendents and Principals</td>
<td>From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for providing psychological therapy (87 percent), and for providing vocational counseling (93 percent).

2. The preferences of the 135 administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in special programs for pregnant students in their systems for five of the six C/PS items: the provision of personal decision-making (93 percent prefer and 66 percent practice); the provision of psychological therapy (87 percent prefer and 49 percent practice); the provision of vocational therapy (92 percent prefer and 59 percent practice); the organization of support groups (71 percent prefer and 27 percent practice); and the provision of post partum counseling (84 percent prefer and 41 percent practice).

A standard error calculation determined the following significant difference between preference and practice response percentages for the C/PS questionnaire items at the .05 level of significance: the preferences of the 135 administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in special programs for pregnant students in their systems for the provision of school counseling services such as course selection (95 percent prefer and 80 percent practice).

Differences between the preferences of administrators from systems with special programs and those of administrators from systems without special programs regarding C/PS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance. Differences between the preferences of superintendents or their designees
and those of principals are not significant at the .05 level of significance. Differences between the preferences of male administrators and those of female administrators are not significant at the .05 level of significance.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged students, the population of the study is highly receptive to serving their needs for counseling in school-related objectives (96 percent), for counseling in personal matters, especially those related to having a baby (94 percent), and for counseling in preparing to be able to earn a living (93 percent). The population of the study is receptive to serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged students regarding deep problems which require therapy (88 percent) or problems which require counseling after the baby is born (83 percent). The total population is also receptive to the effectiveness of pregnant, school-aged girls helping one another in support groups (75 percent).

In relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the needs of pregnant, school-aged students, one C/PS practice is reported practiced in most special programs. The provision of counseling for school-related objectives is reported to be provided in special programs by 80 percent of the respondents from systems which have special programs. The other C/PS practices serving the problem-solving, decision-making, and therapeutic needs of pregnant, school-aged students are reported practiced by smaller percentages of these
respondents: personal counseling (66 percent); vocational-career development counseling (59 percent); psychological therapeutic counseling (49 percent), post partum counseling (41 percent); and support group counseling (27 percent).

Social Welfare Services (SWS)

For the purpose of gathering data about the preferences of respondents and about special program practices in their systems regarding specific social welfare services for pregnant students, there were five items in Section C of the questionnaire referred to as SWS. These five items refer to five services derived from the literature on special programs for pregnant students. Preferences of respondents and special program practices in their systems were indicated by positive responses for each of the following five SWS practices for pregnant students in special programs: (a) infant care; (b) social work with families of students; (c) transportation; (d) job placements; and (e) provision of lunch.

Of the total population of the study, the following percentages of positive responses indicating preferences were made regarding the five SWS items: (a) 61 percent of the total population indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide infant care services; (b) 83 percent of the total population indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide the services of a social worker to work with enrollees and their significant family members; (c) 47 percent of the total
population indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide transportation services to enrollees; (d) 61 percent of the total population indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide job placements and on-the-job training; and (e) 58 percent of the total population indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide lunch for the students. These preference responses for all respondents and the preference responses for the subgroups of respondents are summarized in Table 44.

Of the 135 respondents from systems with special programs for pregnant students, the following percentages of positive responses indicating system practices were made regarding the five SWS practices: (a) 27 percent indicated that infant care services are provided in their special programs; (b) 37 percent indicated that their special programs provide the services of a social worker to work with enrollees and their significant family members; (c) 25 percent indicated that transportation service for enrollees is provided in their special programs; (d) 24 percent indicated that their special programs provide job placements and on-the-job training; and (e) 48 percent indicated that their special programs provide lunch to enrollees. In Table 45, these SWS practices of systems with special programs are summarized together with the SWS preferences of the administrators who reported them in order to compare administrators' preferences with the practices in their systems.
### TABLE 44

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF THE POPULATION OF THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR FIVE SWS QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS: INFANT CARE (A); SOCIAL WORK WITH FAMILIES (B); TRANSPORTATION (C); JOB PLACEMENT (D); AND LUNCH (E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>203 Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 Males</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28 Females</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 No Sex Identification</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>233 TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences and Practices</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among response percentages of subgroups of respondents for the SWS questionnaire items at the .01 level of significance:

1. The total population of the study has a significantly greater preference for providing a social worker to work with enrollees and their families (83 percent) than for providing infant care (61 percent), job placements (61 percent), lunch (58 percent) or transportation (47 percent).

2. The total population of the study has significantly less preference for providing transportation (47 percent) than for providing lunch (58 percent), job placement (61 percent), or infant care (61 percent).

3. The preferences of the 135 administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in special programs for pregnant students in their systems for each of the five SWS items: the provision of infant care (63 percent prefer and 27 percent practice); the provision of a social worker to work with pregnant students' families (85 percent prefer and 37 percent practice); the provision of transportation (50 percent prefer and 25 percent practice); job placement (57 percent prefer and 24 percent practice); and the provision of lunch (65 percent prefer and 48 percent practice).

A standard error calculation determined the following significant difference between response percentages of subgroups
of respondents for the SWS questionnaire items at the .05 level of significance: the administrators from systems with special programs have a significantly higher preference for providing lunch (65 percent) to pregnant students in a special program than do the administrators from systems without special programs (48 percent).

Differences between the preferences of superintendents or their designees and those of principals regarding SWS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance. Differences between the preferences of male administrators and those of female administrators regarding SWS items are not significant at the .05 level of significance.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the social needs of pregnant, school-aged students, the population of the study is receptive to providing a social worker to work with the students' families (83 percent); accepting of components which provide infant care (61 percent), job placements (61 percent), and lunch (58 percent); and not receptive to providing transportation.

In relation to literature-identified criteria for serving the social needs of pregnant, school-aged students, SWS program components, whether more or less preferred, are not commonly practiced in the special programs of the systems participating in the study (infant care—27 percent reported practice; transportation—25 percent reported practice; job placement—24 percent reported practice; social work with families—37 percent reported practice; lunch—48 percent reported practice).
**Comprehensive Services**

Data about the overall degree of positiveness in administrators' preferences and about the extent of school practices regarding the provision of educational and support services to pregnant, school-aged students in special programs is presented in the form of scores. Scores for subgroups of the population represent the mean number of positive responses per respondent per questionnaire item. In addition to examining scores for descriptions of overall degrees of positiveness and extent of practices for each educational and support service area, examining service area scores with one another reflects the overall degree of comprehensiveness which exists either in school administrators' perceptions or in school system practices regarding the role of public schools in providing services to pregnant, school-aged students. In Table 46, overall scores are presented for superintendents and for principals from systems with and without special programs.

Overall, respondents indicated that the most preferred specific services for pregnant students are: special instruction which addresses special needs unique to pregnant, school-aged girls (.87), and counseling and psychological services (.86). The least preferred specific services are: social welfare services (.61) and health services (.63). The most practiced services indicated by principals are: special instructional services (.62). The most practiced services indicated by superintendents are: academic instructional services (.65). The least practiced reported by both principals and superintendents are: social welfare services (.32).
### TABLE 46

OVERALL SCORES OF RESPONDENTS REGARDING PUBLIC SCHOOL
PROVISION OF EDUCATIONAL AND SUPPORT SERVICES FOR
PREGNANT, SCHOOL-AGED STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comprehensive score, computed by combining all instructional and support scores indicates that those respondents who were most receptive to the full range of comprehensive services including both the instructional and support areas for pregnant students were the principals from systems with special programs (.80). Those least receptive to the full range of services were the superintendents or designees from systems with special programs (.72). In relation to 1.0 representing all practices derived from the literature for this study, these scores indicate that all subgroups of respondents were receptive (.72 to .80) to providing comprehensive services in special programs to pregnant, school-aged students.

For the purpose of examining the possible existence of overall differences between subgroups of the population which would address degrees of positiveness on the basis of the overall preference scores for each educational and support area, Hotelling's T-square multi-variate analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences. Preference scores of respondents from systems with programs were compared with those of respondents from systems without programs separately according to their roles as superintendents or principals. Among principals this yielded a T-square of 9.83 which proved to be not significant at the .05 level when converted to the F-statistic of 1.35 with five and 196 degrees of freedom. The F-statistic did not exceed the corresponding tabled value of 2.21 for alpha = .05. Among superintendents, this yielded a T-square of 7.47 and corresponding F statistic of 1.29 with
five and 25 degrees of freedom, which also proved to be not significant at the .05 level. The F-statistic did not exceed the corresponding tabled value of 2.60 for alpha = .05. Since the existence of a program was insignificant, respondents with programs were combined with respondents without programs for comparing superintendents and principals. The Hotelling's T-square statistic of 5.86 and corresponding F-statistic of 1.15 with five and 227 degrees of freedom proved to be not significant at the .05 level. The F-statistic did not exceed the corresponding tabled value of 2.21 for alpha = .05. Therefore, neither differences of administrative role (central office; building level) nor differences based on the existence of a special program for pregnant students in administrators' systems are significant regarding administrators' overall degree of positiveness towards school services for pregnant, school-aged students in special programs.

Organizational and Community Involvement Concerns

Certain organizational and community involvement concerns have been cited either in literature or in interviews as problematic and controversial regarding special programs for pregnant, school-aged students. These concerns are reflected in the following questions:

1. Should the organizational pattern of regular school accommodate the need for the pregnant student to transfer in and out of the regular program according to her calendar needs
2. Should the organizational pattern of regular school accommodate the practice of flexible scheduling which would serve the needs of pregnant students?

3. Should a special program for pregnant students be administered by an on-site administrator?

4. Should pregnant students continue to participate in special programs after their babies are born?

5. Should special programs reach out to enroll pregnant, school-aged girls who have dropped out of school?

6. Should a special program have mutual referral arrangements with other community agencies, such as family service and medical agencies?

7. Should special programs have community advisory committees?

For the purpose of gathering data about school administrators' attitudes and school system special program practices regarding these organizational and community involvement concerns, items were included on the questionnaire which addressed them.

Regarding organizational concerns, respondents indicated preferences for four organizational characteristics: (a) allowing pregnant students to transfer to and from the regular program at any time appropriate to their pregnancies; (b) flexible scheduling for pregnant students; (c) on-site administration of special programs; and (d) participation of students in special programs after their babies are born.
Of the total population, the following percentages indicate preferences for the four organizational characteristics: (a) 47 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should allow the students to transfer to and from the regular program at any time appropriate to their pregnancies; (b) 59 percent indicated that they think special programs for pregnant students should provide flexible scheduling allowing students to choose their hours of school attendance; (c) 61 percent indicated that they think special programs should provide an on-site administrator; and (d) 45 percent indicated that they think pregnant students should be allowed to remain in special programs as long as they wish after their babies are born. These responses are summarized in Table 47 together with the positive preference responses of subgroups of the population.

Of the 135 superintendents and principals from systems with special programs for pregnant students, the following percentages indicate existing practices regarding the four organizational characteristics in their systems: (a) 36 percent indicated that special programs for pregnant students in their systems do allow the students to transfer to and from the regular program at any time appropriate to their pregnancies; (b) 37 percent indicated that special programs for pregnant students in their systems do provide flexible scheduling; (c) 60 percent indicated that special programs for pregnant students in their systems do provide an on-site administrator; and (d) 29 percent indicated that pregnant
TABLE 47

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF THE POPULATION OF THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR FOUR QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING ORGANIZATIONAL CONCERNS: STUDENT TRANSFERRING (A); FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING (B); ON-SITE ADMINISTRATION (C); AND POST PARTUM PARTICIPATION (D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>8 53</td>
<td>7 47</td>
<td>9 60</td>
<td>4 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>56 47</td>
<td>75 63</td>
<td>88 73</td>
<td>56 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>10 63</td>
<td>12 75</td>
<td>7 44</td>
<td>9 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>37 45</td>
<td>14 55</td>
<td>39 48</td>
<td>38 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>94 46</td>
<td>123 61</td>
<td>123 61</td>
<td>90 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>16 57</td>
<td>15 54</td>
<td>18 64</td>
<td>17 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td>110 47</td>
<td>137 59</td>
<td>143 61</td>
<td>106 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students in their systems' special programs are allowed to remain in the special programs as long as they wish after their babies are born. In Table 48y these practice responses of administrators from systems with special programs for pregnant students are summarized together with their preference responses in order to compare practices with preferences.

Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among response percentages of subgroups of respondents for the questionnaire items on organizational characteristics of special programs at the .01 level of significance:

1. The total population of the study is significantly more receptive to on-site administration (61 percent) and flexible scheduling (59 percent) than to transfers to and from the regular program at any time convenient to students' pregnancies (47 percent) or to post partum participation in the program (45 percent)

2. The preferences of administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in their systems regarding: (a) students' participation in the program as long as they wish after their babies are born (44 percent indicated preference; 29 percent reported practice), and (b) provision of flexible scheduling for pregnant students (59 percent indicated preference; 37 percent reported practice)
### TABLE 48

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS FROM SYSTEMS WITH SPECIAL PROGRAMS INDICATING PREFERENCES AND PRACTICES FOR FOUR QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING ORGANIZATIONAL CONCERNS: STUDENT TRANSFERRING (A); FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING (B); ON-SITE ADMINISTRATION (C); AND POST PARTUM PARTICIPATION (D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents:</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Superintendents and Principals From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Principals from systems with special programs for pregnant students prefer on-site administration of special programs (73 percent) significantly more than principals from systems without special programs (48 percent).

A standard error calculation determined the following significant difference between response percentages of subgroups of respondents for the questionnaire items on organizational characteristics of special programs at the .05 level of significance: female administrators prefer allowing students' participation in the special program as long as they wish after their babies are born (61 percent) significantly more than male administrators (44 percent).

In relation to literature-identified and interview-identified concerns regarding organizational characteristics which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students in special programs, the total population of the study is not receptive to both post partum participation (45 percent) and transferring to and from the regular program at any time convenient to the pregnancy (47 percent). It is accepting of flexible scheduling (59 percent) and of on-site administration (61 percent).

In relation to literature-identified and interview-identified concerns regarding organizational characteristics which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students, existing special programs do not commonly include: post partum participation (29 percent); transfers convenient to pregnancies (36 percent); or flexible scheduling (37 percent).
On-site administration is practiced in 60 percent of the existing special programs.

Regarding community involvement concerns, respondents indicated preferences for three community involvement characteristics of special programs for pregnant students: (a) mutual referral arrangements with other community agencies; (b) recruitment of pregnant girls who have dropped out of school; and (c) community advisory committees.

Of the total population, the following percentages indicate preferences for the three community involvement characteristics: (a) 88 percent indicated that they think special programs should have mutual referral arrangements with other community agencies such as hospitals and family services; (b) 81 percent indicated that they think special programs should reach out to enroll pregnant girls who have dropped out of school; and (c) 63 percent indicated that they think special programs should have community advisory committees. These responses are summarized in Table 49 together with the positive preference responses of subgroups of the population.

Of the 135 superintendents and principals from systems with special programs for pregnant students, the following percentages indicate existing practices regarding the three community involvement characteristics in their systems: (a) 53 percent indicated that special programs in their systems do have mutual referral arrangements with other community agencies; (b) 30 percent indicated that special programs in their systems do reach out to enroll pregnant girls who
TABLE 49

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF THE POPULATION OF THE STUDY INDICATING PREFERENCES FOR THREE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT:
COMMUNITY REFERRALS (A): DROP-OUT RECRUITMENT (B): COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEES (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups of Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Administrators From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Superintendents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Principals</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Administrators From Systems Without Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Superintendents</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Principals</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 Males</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Females</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 No Sex Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 TOTAL</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have dropped out of school; and (c) 29 percent indicated that special programs in their systems do have community advisory committees.

In Table 50, these practice responses of administrators from systems with special programs for pregnant students are
TABLE 50

POSITIVE RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS FROM SYSTEMS WITH SPECIAL PROGRAMS INDICATING PREFERENCES AND PRACTICES FOR THREE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS REGARDING COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT: COMMUNITY REFERRALS (A); DROP-OUT RECRUITMENT (B); COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents: Preferences and Practices</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Superintendents and Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Systems With Special Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

summarized together with their preference responses in order to compare practices with preferences.

Standard error calculations determined the following significant differences among response percentages of subgroups of respondents for the questionnaire items on community involvement characteristics at the .01 level of significance:

1. The total population of the study is significantly less receptive to community advisory committees (63 percent) than to mutual community referrals (88 percent) or to recruitment of drop-outs (81 percent).

2. The preferences of administrators from systems with special programs significantly exceed the practices in
their systems with respect to each of the three characteristics: (a) mutual community referrals (87 percent indicated preference, 53 percent reported practice); (b) drop-out recruitment (77 percent indicated preference, 30 percent reported practice); and (c) community advisory committees (65 percent indicated preference, 29 percent reported practice).

Standard error calculations examined the response percentages among subgroups of respondents for potential significant differences regarding their preferences for the questionnaire items on community involvement characteristics. Results of these calculations are:

1. There is no significant difference between administrators from systems with special programs for pregnant students and administrators from systems without such programs regarding their attitudes towards the community involvement characteristics of special programs which have been discussed.

2. There is no significant difference between superintendents or their designees and principals regarding their attitudes towards the community involvement characteristics of special programs which have been discussed.

3. There is no significant difference between male administrators and female administrators regarding their attitudes towards the community involvement characteristics which have been discussed.

In relation to literature-identified and interview-identified concerns regarding community involvement
characteristics which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students in special programs, the total population is receptive in varying degrees to mutual community referrals (87 percent), to drop-out recruitment (77 percent), and accepting of community advisory committees (65 percent).

In relation to literature-identified and interview-identified concerns regarding community involvement characteristics which serve the needs of pregnant, school-aged students, existing special programs do not commonly include: community advisory committees or drop-out recruitment (30 percent). Mutual community referrals are practiced in 53 percent of the existing special programs.

In this section, preferences of participants in the study and practices of existing special programs in their school systems were presented and compared in relation to literature-identified criteria for comprehensively serving pregnant students. Data were presented within the following areas: academic instructional services; special instructional services; health services; counseling and psychological services; social welfare services; comprehensive services; and organizational and community involvement characteristics. The next section presents data regarding the reasons for the non-existence of special programs for pregnant students as reported by school administrators from systems without special programs.
Reasons for the Non-Existence of Special Programs for Pregnant Students as Reported by Respondents from Systems Without Special Programs

The purpose of this section is to present reasons for the non-existence of special programs for pregnant students as reported by superintendents or their designees and by principals from systems without special programs.

Respondents from systems without special programs for pregnant students ranked nine suggested reasons, extracted from literature sources, for the non-existence of special programs in their systems. They ranked the reasons in order from the most responsible reason to the least responsible reason for the absence of special programs in their systems. A normalized ranking procedure determined the composite rank for all respondents within each of two groups: the superintendents or designees and the principals. The average rank for each reason for each group illustrates the relative significance of each reason as a deterrent to public school provision of special program services for pregnant students.

Principals from systems with no special programs for pregnant students ranked the suggested reasons as follows:

One—Availability of funds
Two—Establishment of interest
Three—Attitudes of community and parents
Four—Establishment of need
Five—Attitudes of school board
Six—Attitudes of pregnant students
Seven—Attitudes of central office administrators
Eight—Attitudes of schools' staffs
Nine—Attitudes of building principals
Superintendents or their designees from systems with no special programs for pregnant students ranked the suggested reasons as follows:

One--Attitudes of community and parents
Two--Availability of funds
Three--Establishment of interest
Four--Attitudes of building principals
Five--Attitudes of schools' staffs
Six--Establishment of need
Seven--Attitudes of school board
Eight--Attitudes of central office administrators
Nine--Attitudes of pregnant students

This section has presented the average rank for each of nine reasons for the non-existence of special programs for pregnant students as reported by superintendents or their designees from systems without special programs and as reported by principals from systems without special programs. The two groups of administrators attached similar high ranking significance to three reasons for the absence of special programs in their systems: availability of funds, attitudes of community and parents, and establishment of interest.

The next section presents responses to the open-ended question of the questionnaire. These responses are personal observations about providing services to pregnant, school-aged students in public schools.

Personal Insights of Respondents Regarding Public School Services for Pregnant Students

The last item (#72) of the questionnaire was titled Optional Question; respondents were asked to share any insights they might have on either problems or successes in
public school programs and services for pregnant students. Of the 233 superintendents or designees and principals who participated in the study, fifty-five (24 percent) shared their insights.

Shared insights were categorized into five major themes:

1. Those which supported the concept of serving the special needs of pregnant students in a special program

2. Those which supported the concept of serving the special needs of pregnant students in the regular programs

3. Those which did not support the concept of serving special needs of pregnant students in the public schools

4. Those which supported the concept of serving the special needs of pregnant students in existing Extended School Day programs which are designed for working students

5. Those which were general and analytical.

The numbers and percentages of shared insights in each theme are presented in Table 51.

Among those shared insights which supported the concept of serving the special needs of pregnant students in special programs separate from the regular program, the following are some of the program ideas or experiences given:

A special program away from the regular school better meets their needs and takes away the strain at the regular school.

New young mothers need to know more about infant care and stimulation.
### TABLE 51

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF SHARED INSIGHTS OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO THEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should serve special needs in a special program</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should serve special needs in the regular program</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should not serve special needs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should serve special needs in Extended School Day Programs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General analytical comments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social work services are important and funds need to be available for special classes, a nursery, transportation.

From 1,000 to 1,200 sixteen year olds and over become pregnant in this county each year; a special program is needed.

Our program has been successful in getting the girls to return to school and to graduate.

When they remain in the regular school there is too much disruption; they fight over the fathers of their babies.

They're a bad influence in the regular program.

Among those shared insights which supported the concept of serving the special needs of pregnant students in the regular program, the following are some of the reasons, program ideas, or experiences given:
The regular Health Ed program has courses, especially the one on Child Care, which can serve the pregnant students.

They shouldn't be isolated; the regular guidance department can provide special services.

Homebound instruction, right before and right after delivery, serves their needs.

Special attention can be provided by regular program staff.

Group counseling for pregnant students is provided during the regular schedule.

Among those shared insights which did not support the concept of serving special needs of pregnant students in the public schools, the following are some of the reasons given:

We should treat them like all the other students.

Why should money be spent on problems? We should spend it on the good, average kid.

Those who cause teen-aged pregnancy should be neutered. Most are blacks, anyways.

Systems can't afford to support a special program for pregnant students. There aren't enough to make it feasible.

Specialized and comprehensive services are not the function of the public schools; they should be provided in the community.

Among those shared insights which supported the concept of serving the special needs of pregnant students in the Extended School Day programs, the following are some of the reasons given:

The services of a special school are available in the Extended Day program.

Pregnant students are more willing to express feelings and accept guidance in the personal atmosphere of the Extended School Day program.
Though not primarily for them, ESD works for them. They choose ESD and stay; they become part of the family.

ESD offers all students an alternative, including the pregnant ones.

Among those shared insights which were general and analytic in nature, there follow some examples:

I'm concerned about the lack of values regarding premarital sex.

We need more attention on prevention of causes and not on treating the effects.

The major problem is the refusal to acknowledge the problem.

The cause of the problem is the changing values of society.

An effort to start a special program by the Technical Institute failed; one of the school systems didn't want to be a party to immorality.

Schools are for academics.

The personal observations, insights and opinions presented in this section covered the full range of viewpoints expressed by respondents regarding their personal insights and experiences with respect to providing services to pregnant, school-aged students in public schools.

Chapter Four has presented and examined the data of the study within seven frameworks: (a) confidence in the population of the study as a representative sample of the total population; (b) description of the population of the study; (c) existing literature-identified programs for pregnant students as reported by respondents; (d) preferences of respondents regarding program options for pregnant students;
(e) relationships among preferences, practices and literature-identified criteria regarding existing special programs for pregnant students; (f) reasons for the non-existence of special programs for pregnant students as reported by respondents from systems without special programs; and (g) personal insights of respondents regarding public school services for pregnant students.

Chapter Five presents a summary and conclusions of the study and recommendations resulting from the study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has been concerned with the role of public schools in North Carolina regarding the provision of educational and support services for school-aged, pregnant students.

The rationale for undertaking this research developed from four bases of information and awareness. One basis is the documentation of societal problems related to school-aged pregnancy and parenthood. A second basis is the goal of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction to meet a wider range of student needs in secondary schools. This goal is associated with an effort to decrease the statewide dropout population which includes a considerable number of pregnant and parenting teenagers. A third basis is the body of literature which identifies criteria for serving the needs of pregnant students. A fourth basis is the lack of knowledge regarding the status and nature of existing programs, practices and attitudes in North Carolina public schools relative to serving the needs of pregnant students.
Summary

The Problem

The purposes of the research were: (a) to describe the extent to which literature-identified educational and support services needed by pregnant, school-aged students are provided in existing programs of the thirty-four public school systems within the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina; (b) to report existing preferences and perceptions of superintendents and principals serving seventh through twelfth graders in the thirty-four public school systems; and (c) to examine any existing relationships, selected on the basis of data gathered in this study, regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students which address: (1) attitudinal differences between groups of public school administrators, (2) discrepancies between literature-identified criteria and both the preferences and practices of public school administrators, and (3) discrepancies between the preferences and practices of public school administrators.

The questions guiding each of the three purposes of the study determined the nature of the methods utilized to investigate the problem. The guiding questions for each purpose of the study were:

1. What is the general status and scope of services provided for pregnant, school-aged students in the thirty-four public school systems of the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina?
(a) Do the school systems provide the special programs, courses, or services for pregnant students which are described in the literature as responsive to their needs?

(b) Do the school systems have local policies which govern services for pregnant, school-aged girls?

(c) Do the school systems provide pregnant students with the ability to choose between regular and special program options?

(d) How comprehensively do special programs for pregnant students provide literature-identified academic and special instructional services, counseling and guidance services, health services, and social services?

(e) How do the school systems organize their special programs for pregnant students?

(f) How is the community involved in school system-administered special programs for pregnant students?

(g) Do the school systems provide special services for pregnant students in the regular schools or in special schools?

(h) How do the school systems administer, evaluate, and fund special programs for pregnant students?

What are the preferences and perceptions of the superintendents or their designees and of the principals of public schools serving seventh through twelfth graders in the thirty-four public school systems of the eight standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina regarding public school provision of educational and support services for pregnant, school-aged students?

(a) Do the administrators think that public schools should provide special programs, courses or services for pregnant, school-aged students which are described in the literature as responsive to their needs?
(b) Do the administrators think that pregnant students should have the ability to choose between regular and special program options?

(c) To what extent do the administrators think that public schools should provide for pregnant students comprehensively with academic and special instruction, counseling and guidance, health and social services?

(d) How do the administrators think that public schools should organize services for pregnant students?

(e) How do administrators think that public schools should involve the community in services for pregnant students?

(f) What are the administrators' preferences regarding the provision of special services to pregnant students in the regular schools or in special schools?

(g) What are the perceptions of administrators from school systems which have no special programs for pregnant students regarding the reasons for the non-existence of special programs?

(h) What are the personal insights of some questionnaire respondents about serving pregnant students in public schools?

3. Do the data gathered in this study suggest any existing relationships among literature-identified program criteria, school system practices, and the perceptions of school administrators regarding public school services for pregnant, school-aged students?

(a) Are there attitudinal differences between central office and building level administrators regarding school services for pregnant students?

(b) Are there attitudinal differences between administrators from school systems which have special programs and administrators from school systems which do not have special programs for pregnant students regarding school services for them?
(c) Are there discrepancies between literature-identified program criteria for pregnant students and the practices in those systems which have special programs?

(d) Are there discrepancies between literature-identified program criteria and administrators' preferences regarding public school services for pregnant students?

(e) What are the discrepancies between the preferences of public school administrators and the practices in their school systems regarding public school services for pregnant students?

The Methodology

Data were obtained for this study through the use of survey research methodology. The questionnaire was deemed to be the appropriate data-gathering instrument for attaining the purposes of the study. The content of the questionnaire was determined by the results of a literature search, a pilot study, and interviews with the pilot study participants and appropriate State Department of Public Instruction administrators.

The population surveyed in this study included: (a) all superintendents of the thirty-four public school systems within the standard metropolitan statistical areas of North Carolina; and (b) all principals (339) who administer school buildings which serve students in the seventh through twelfth grades within these thirty-four systems. The total group of participants in the study numbered 233 superintendents or their designees and principals; this was 62.5 percent of the total population. The subgroup of superintendents (or their
designees) numbered thirty-one, 91.2 percent of the total population of superintendents. The subgroup of principals numbered 202, 59.6 percent of the total population of principals.

Confidence in the representativeness of the study's population was established through interviews with randomly sampled non-respondents and through rank order correlations between characteristics of the respondents and the total population surveyed. Responses of respondents were presented through the use of descriptive statistics. Data were analyzed in the following ways: the significance of differences was tested by the use of standard error calculations and multivariate analysis of variance; composite ranks were determined by a normalized ranking procedure; and personal insights were examined through the use of content analysis.

The Findings

Major findings of this research are presented in the context of the three purposes of the study.

Existing literature-identified programs for pregnant, school-aged students. Data gathered from participating superintendents indicate that 48 percent of their school systems have special programs for pregnant students whereas 59 percent of the participating principals were from systems with special programs. A significant relationship exists between participation of principals in the study and the existence of special programs for pregnant students in their systems.
Eighty-seven percent of the school systems with special programs have policies which govern services for pregnant students, whereas only 69 percent of the school systems without special programs have such policies. A significant relationship exists between policy and practice.

Systems without special programs provide regular educational services to pregnant students in the regular program and through the services of a homebound teacher; exemption of pregnant students under age sixteen in these systems is not rare. Home instruction for pregnant students in these systems is used significantly more than in systems with special programs.

Eighty-eight percent of the school systems with special programs for pregnant students provide them with the ability to choose between attending the regular program or the special program designed for them. The special programs designed for them include the following literature-identified types of programs: special schools; courses in the regular school during the regular school day; and courses in the regular school after the regular school day. The special school is provided in these systems significantly more than the other types of programs.

Existing special programs for pregnant students do not typically provide comprehensive educational and support services. Of twenty-five educational and support services examined, seven were reported to be practiced by more than 65 percent of the respondents from systems with programs.
The instructional services reported to be provided by more than 65 percent of respondents from systems with programs are: remedial instruction; instruction in nutrition; and instruction in child development. The support services reported to be provided by more than 65 percent of respondents from these systems are: sex education and birth control information; the services of a nurse; counseling in course selection; and personal decision-making counseling. No social service was reported practiced in special programs by more than 48 percent of respondents from systems with special programs.

Existing special programs for pregnant students are not typically organized to meet the needs of these students. Organizational arrangements for pregnant students to transfer to and from the regular program and the special program at times appropriate to their pregnancies, to have flexible schedules, or to be able to stay in the special program after their babies are born are reported to be practiced by 37 percent and less of the respondents from systems with programs.

Existing special programs for pregnant students do not typically involve the community in their programs, though over half of the respondents (53 percent) reported that their special programs have mutual arrangements with community agencies to accommodate referral services for their students.

Existing special programs for pregnant students are reported to be administered by an on-site administrator significantly more than by a central office administrator. The on-site administrator is likely to be a principal, coordinator
or director rather than a teacher, counselor, or other support staff member. Existing special programs are reported to be funded by a combination of state and local funds significantly more than by any other one source or combination of sources. The program administrator of existing special programs is likely to include others in the evaluation of the program, though not the community.

**Existing preferences and perceptions of superintendents and principals.** Superintendents and principals participating in the study typically think that public schools should provide special programming for pregnant, school-aged students. Only 9 percent of them think that these students should be served only by the regular program. Those administrators from systems with special programs were significantly less receptive than those from systems without them to the regular program only concept.

Participating superintendents and principals typically think that pregnant students should be able to choose between the regular program and a special one designed for them; 86 percent of them indicated this preference.

The type of program for pregnant students preferred significantly more than others is the school system-administered special school; 61 percent of all participants think it should be provided. Preferences were also high for the option of a special school administered by another agency. Administrators from systems with special programs prefer system-
administered special schools significantly more than other agency-administered ones; administrators from systems without special programs prefer other agency-administered special schools significantly more than system-administered ones; and administrators from systems with special programs prefer system-run special schools significantly more than do administrators from systems without special programs.

The type of program for pregnant students preferred significantly less than others is the special program in the regular school during the regular day; only 32 percent of all participants indicated a preference for this option. Principals prefer special programming in the regular schools after the regular day significantly more than during the regular day. Female administrators are significantly less receptive to providing special programming for pregnant students in the regular school after regular hours than during regular hours. Female administrators (principals and superintendents' designess) are significantly more receptive to having special programming for pregnant students in the regular school during regular hours than are male principals.

Female administrators have a more positive attitude than male administrators about the need for special programs to allow girls to stay in them after their babies are born, a service which relates to literature regarding the positive effects such a program can have on the direction of the young mother's life.
Another significant difference relating to male and female administrators is that the males have a more positive attitude than the females about the need for the services of a medical doctor in special programs for pregnant students, a service which relates to literature regarding the high incidence of medical problems associated with young mothers primarily due to their physical and emotional immaturity.

Another difference which is significant and which has to do with the services of a medical doctor is the difference between principals and superintendents: principals’ attitudes are more positive than superintendents’ attitudes towards this service.

Administrators from systems with special programs have significantly more positive attitudes towards providing lunch to pregnant, school-aged students in special programs than do administrators from systems without special programs.

The attitudes of participating superintendents and principals regarding the comprehensiveness of special programs for pregnant, school-aged students are positive. They typically think that special programs should include: regular academic and special instruction, with emphasis on remedial instruction and instruction in nutrition, child development, parenting skills and sex education; health information more than health services; school, personal, therapeutic, vocational and post partum counseling; and social work services for the pregnant, school-aged students and their immediate families.
The participating superintendents and principals are not receptive to organizing their special programs for pregnant students in ways which would serve their needs. Such organizational arrangements as flexible scheduling, allowing pregnant students to transfer in and out of the regular program at times appropriate to their pregnancies, and allowing these students to remain in the special programs for as long as needed after the baby is born, are not typically preferred.

The participating superintendents and principals typically have positive attitudes about using community referrals and about recruiting pregnant "drop-outs" in special programs for pregnant students. They are significantly less positive about having community advisory committees.

The perceptions of superintendents or their designees and those of principals in systems without special programs agree regarding the major reasons why there are no special programs in their systems: availability of funds, attitudes of community and parents, and establishment of interest. They disagree regarding the relative importance of the attitudes of building principals and their staffs: superintendents think that the attitudes of principals and their staffs are more responsible for the absence of special programs for pregnant students than do the principals.

The personal insights which 24 percent of the participants shared with the researcher regarding public school
programs and services for pregnant students represent the full range of existing perceptions. Those who felt the special needs of these girls should be served in schools were similarly distributed between thinking they should be served in special programs and thinking they should be served through the regular programs (existing guidance services, existing health services, existing instructional services). A small percentage of these shared insights (9 percent) reflected the perception that public schools should not serve the special needs of pregnant students.

Existing relationships among literature-identified criteria, school system practices, and the perceptions of school administrators. In light of the literature and interview-identified criteria, discrepancies between practices and administrators' preferences are excessive. Regarding the extent of overall attitudinal positiveness towards providing instructional and support services for pregnant, school-aged students in school-administered special programs, there are no significant differences between any of the subgroups among the population of the study. The extent of positiveness on the part of superintendents and principals is high for academic instruction, special instruction, health and counseling; it is moderate for the social welfare area. The extent of practice, however, is low. Over half the school systems (52 percent) have no special programs at all; and those systems which do have special programs have practices in half the identified services though their
building administrators would like to have practices in 80 percent of them.

Of the thirty-two specific services for pregnant students which were on the questionnaire and which address instructional, health, counseling, social welfare, organizational, and community involvement areas, only five do not exhibit significant (at the .01 level) discrepancies which reflect preferences of administrators from systems with special programs far exceeding the practices in their systems. Two of the specific services for which the discrepancy is not excessive are services which are not highly preferred: self-contained classrooms for academic instruction (most prefer individualized instruction) and allowing pregnant students to transfer to and from the regular program at times convenient to their pregnancies. The other three specific services for which there are no significant differences between preferences and practices are: recreational activities in special programs; regular school counseling; and on-site administration.

In this section, a summary of the problem, the methodology, and the findings of the study were presented. In the next two sections, the researcher presents her conclusions, her recommendations, and her suggestions for further research.

Conclusions

The findings of this research point to certain conclusions about existing practices and administrators' attitudes in the school systems of the standard metropolitan statistical
areas of North Carolina regarding educational and support services for school-aged, pregnant students.

1. The extent to which services for pregnant students exist does not correspond with literature-identified and administrator-identified criteria for serving the special needs of school-aged, pregnant students.

It is evident that a gap between research and practice exists in the school systems of North Carolina. Reported practices from the systems surveyed do not serve the instructional and support needs of school-aged, pregnant students.

2. The attitudes of superintendents (or their central office representatives), and secondary school principals are, for the most part, receptive to the concept of the school system providing special instructional and support services to school-aged, pregnant students.

Reported preferences of participating administrators for specific instructional and support services make it clear that most of them are aware of the special needs of school-aged, pregnant students and would like to provide more services to those girls than they do.

3. The establishment of a priority to implement special comprehensive programs providing special services to school-aged, pregnant students is not commensurate with the need for such services.

Highly ranked reasons reported for the non-existence of special programs and the shared insights of participants make it clear that community attitudes and the allocations of funds are perceived to obstruct the acknowledgment of the need to implement programs to serve pregnant teenagers.

4. Most superintendents (or their central office representatives), and secondary school principals think that school-aged, pregnant students should be able to choose between regular classes and special programming designed to meet their needs. However, there are differences among their attitudes regarding which types of programs should be provided as options.
Reported opinions about appropriate program options reveal an absence of clarity and direction regarding the kind of program to implement as an alternative to regular school. There is moderate receptivity to the concept of special programming in the regular school and much receptivity to the concept of a special school as vehicles for providing the services which can meet the needs of pregnant students. These attitudes correspond with research-reported effective programs for both those pregnant students who need comprehensive, special services separate from regular school and those who need the regular school program and special services as resources.

The findings of the review of literature in preparation for this research point to certain conclusions about what a special program for pregnant, school-aged students should look like. There follows a general description of a literature-derived model program.

A special program for pregnant, school-aged girls which would meet the literature-identified needs of these girls would be designed to comprehensively provide educational, medical, social, and psychological services. It would be designed so as to tap into whatever community resources exist, be they educational, medical, social, or psychological, in order to accommodate the wide range of individual needs which characterizes this student population. The community would be a partner in its design. The individualized approach would be central to this hypothetical
program because of the predictable consequences for both the students and society should they drop out of school. Though the individualized approach would be central, the program would require certain group experiences, especially for the younger, pregnant, school-aged students whose adolescent or pre-adolescent social needs require peer support. Counseling services would serve two major needs of these students: to understand and accept self, especially if there is a history of self-perceived problems; and to focus on establishing a future orientation and developing decision-making, problem-solving skills needed to reach the future goals. The future orientation of the counseling services would be reinforced by academic instruction, special instruction, and a career development curriculum and vocational preparatory opportunities, either in the program or in the community. The future orientation would also serve as an effort to prevent early recidivism. A major component of this hypothetical program would be its provision of social services. It would have an infant care facility, in cooperation with the community, for three reasons: (a) to give these students realistic experiences regarding the responsibility of parenthood; (b) to give these students "hands-on" experiences in learning parenting skills and child development; and (c) to provide a day care facility so that after their babies are born, they can continue to prepare for self-sufficient futures, either in the special program or in other programs. Follow-through services
would be provided to meet the social and psychological needs of the most critical period, the post partum period. Fathers of the babies, if appropriate, and the support families of the students would be brought into special instructional or counseling components as early as possible. Medical services would be available, either in the program or in another agency. The organization of the program (enrollment, grading, instructional modes) would accommodate the continuous transfers. The program would be funded by as broad a base of funding as possible and would not necessarily be administered by the school system, though if that were the case, the school system would be responsible for providing the educational and school guidance services. The program would be a coordinated community-wide effort, utilizing existing resources. This hypothetical, literature-derived model of a special program suggests that there is disagreement between the criteria of the literature and the criteria of existing school-administered special programs for serving pregnant, school-aged students. The data of this study regarding the preferences and perceptions of superintendents and principals suggest that there is agreement between the criteria of the literature and the attitudes of school administrators regarding appropriate provision of services to pregnant, school-aged students.
Recommendations and Suggestions
For Further Research

Recommendations

This study results in the following recommendations to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction:

1. To coordinate statewide efforts with other statewide agencies for the purpose of clarifying the role of public schools and the roles of other agencies regarding societal expectations for the provision of comprehensive services to pregnant and parenting school-aged girls.

2. To examine and coordinate existing sources of funds in its own agency regarding the use of those funds for the provision of educational and support services to pregnant and parenting school-aged students.

3. To provide guidelines and staff development activities to local school systems which would increase the understandings and skills of administrators and teachers regarding the wide range of needs on the part of pregnant and parenting school-aged students.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study has described what exists and has presented and analyzed data which suggest what should exist. This study has laid the groundwork for further research into the problem of clarifying the role of public schools in providing instructional and support services to pregnant, school-aged students. This study has generated the following suggestions for research:
1. Research studies should be conducted to determine the nature and scope of community expectations of the public schools and of other public agencies in providing comprehensive services to pregnant teenagers in order to provide information to statewide decision-making and planning.

2. Detailed case studies should be made of effective programs for pregnant teenagers to provide information about organizational procedures which facilitate the continued education of these students in order to provide guidelines to special programs for pregnant students.

3. Statewide experiments should be made manipulating variables in staff development activities for administrators, teachers, and other professionals to determine the influence of staff development activities on the provision of special services to pregnant students.

4. Comparisons should be made of different types of special programs (special schools administered by school systems, special schools administered by other agencies, special programs in regular schools) regarding such hoped-for results as decreased recidivism, increased self-sufficiency, and educational gains on the part of school-aged students who have given birth to babies.

5. Studies should be made of the extent of teenaged pregnancy and parenthood among school dropouts in order to identify any existing need for reaching out to recruit them into special programs.
6. Studies which replicate the methodology of this study in gathering data about practices, preferences, and literature criteria should be performed for the purpose of clarifying the role of the public schools in serving other exceptional student populations.
SURVEY OF NORTH CAROLINA SUPERINTENDENTS AND
PRINCIPALS WITHIN STANDARD METROPOLITAN
STATISTICAL AREAS: PERCEPTIONS AND
PRACTICES REGARDING PUBLIC SCHOOL
SERVICES FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS

Section A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION—In the following
questions, you are asked to provide in­
formation about yourself, about your school
system and, if you are a principal, about
your school. These questions are included
because interpretations of existing research
indicate that demographic information about
school administrators, school systems, and
school populations relate to school programs
and services for pregnant students.

1. I am
   a) _____ a superintendent of schools.
   b) _____ a central office administrator,
      designated to answer this question­
      naire.
   c) _____ a school principal.

2. I have been an educational administrator for
   a) _____ one to five years.
   b) _____ six to ten years.
   c) _____ eleven to fifteen years.
   d) _____ over fifteen years.

3. My age is
   a) _____ under twenty-five years.
   b) _____ between twenty-six and thirty-five
      years.
   c) _____ between thirty-six and forty-five
      years.
d)_____ between forty-six and fifty-five years.

e)_____ over fifty-five years.

4. My sex is
   a)_____ male.
   b)_____ female.

5. My school system serves a total population of students numbering
   a)_____ under 5,000.
   b)_____ 5,000 to 10,000.
   c)_____ 10,000 to 20,000.
   d)_____ 20,000 to 40,000.
   e)_____ over 40,000.

6. The percentage of students in my system who are white is
   a)_____ over 80%.
   b)_____ between 60% and 80%.
   c)_____ between 40% and 60%.
   d)_____ between 20% and 40%.
   e)_____ under 20%.

7. My school system has the following number of school buildings serving all students in grades 7-12:
   a)_____ one.
   b)_____ two or three.
   c)_____ four or five.
   d)_____ six or seven.
   e)_____ more than seven.
8. The percentage of students in my system who are either eligible for free and reduced lunch or are, by some other measure, from low socio-economic homes is
   a)____ over 40%.
   b)____ from 30% to 40%.
   c)____ from 20% to 30%.
   d)____ from 10% to 20%.
   e)____ under 10%.

9. For principals: My school building serves
   a)____ under 500 students.
   b)____ 500 to 1,000 students.
   c)____ 1,000 to 1,500 students.
   d)____ 1,500 to 2,000 students.
   e)____ over 2,000 students.

10. For principals: My school serves grades
    a)____ 10, 11, 12.
    b)____ 9, 10, 11, 12.
    c)____ 7, 8, 9.
    d)____ 6, 7, 8, or 7, 8 as highest grade levels.
    e)____ other.

11. For principals: The percentage of students in my school who are white is
    a)____ over 80%.
    b)____ 60% to 80%.
    c)____ 40% to 60%.
    d)____ 20% to 40%.
    e)____ under 20%.
12. For principals: The percentage of students in my school who are either eligible for free and reduced lunch or are, by some other measure, from low socio-economic homes is

a) ___ over 40%.
b) ___ from 30% to 40%.
c) ___ from 20% to 30%.
d) ___ from 10% to 20%.
e) ___ under 10%.

13. For principals: Based on recent years and on my awarenesses, an estimate of the number of girls who are students in my school who became pregnant each year is

a) ___ over 15.
b) ___ 10 to 15.
c) ___ 5 to 10.
d) ___ 1 to 5.
e) ___ ).
Section B. TYPES OF PROGRAMS: PROGRAM OPTIONS—In the following questions, you are asked to give your opinion (line a) and to describe your school system (line b) regarding different types of school system programs and options for pregnant students. Line (a) asks you if you think a certain program option should be provided; line (b) asks if that program option is provided. You may think none of the options should be provided or you may think all of them should be provided; there is no minimum and no maximum number of options which could be provided in any system. (Attention Superintendents: If line (b) asks for information about a school, you provide information for your system as a whole.)

14. (a) Pregnant students should attend regular classes as the only program option available to them.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) Pregnant students in my system do attend regular classes as the only program option available to them.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

15. (a) Pregnant students should be able to choose to attend regular classes or to attend special classes or a special program designed for them.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) Pregnant students in my system do have the ability to choose to attend regular classes or to attend special classes or a special program designed for them.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

16. (a) A special course designed for pregnant girls (one class period) should be offered during the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.
(b) In my school, a special course designed for pregnant girls is offered during the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.

17. (a) A special program designed for pregnant girls (more than one course) should be offered during the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.

(b) In my school, a special program designed for pregnant girls is offered during the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.

18. (a) A special course or program designed for pregnant girls should be offered after the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.

(b) In my school, a special course or program designed for pregnant girls is offered after the regular school day in the regular school as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.

19. (a) A special school (located away from the regular school) administered by the school system should be provided for pregnant students as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.

(b) In my system, a special school administered by the school system is provided for pregnant students as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.

20. (a) A special school, with transferable credit, administered by another agency (examples: hospital, community center) should be available to pregnant students as an option.

____ Yes ______ No __ I do not know.
(b) A special school administered by another agency is available to pregnant students in my system as an option.

____ Yes  ______ No  ______ I do not know.

21. (a) Home instruction (Homebound teacher) should be provided for pregnant students as an option.

____ Yes  ______ No  ______ I do not know.

(b) Home instruction is provided for pregnant students in my system.

____ Yes  ______ No  ______ I do not know.

22. (a) Pregnant girls under 16 years of age should be able to be exempt from school attendance.

____ Yes  ______ No  ______ I do not know.

(b) In my system, pregnant girls under 16 years of age are able to be exempt from school attendance.

____ Yes  ______ No  ______ I do not know.
Section C: PROGRAM AND COURSE COMPONENTS; SPECIFIC SERVICES—In the following questions, you are asked to give your opinion (line a) and to describe your system (line b) regarding specific services of special programs and courses for pregnant students. These specific services have been identified in a thorough search of pertinent literature and are grouped in seven categories: (1) academic instructional services, (2) special instructional services, (3) health services, (4) counseling and psychological services, (5) social welfare and support services, (6) organizational arrangements, (7) community involvements.

Academic Instructional Services

23. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include instruction in all required and elective courses available in the regular program.

____ Yes  _____ No  _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do include instruction in all required and elective courses available in the regular program.

____ Yes  _____ No  _____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

24. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include remedial instruction in the basics for performing below grade level.

____ Yes  _____ No  _____ I do not know.

(b) Special courses or programs for pregnant students do include remedial instruction in the basics for those performing below grade level in my system.

____ Yes  _____ No  _____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.
25. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide instruction in self-contained classrooms.

____ Yes   ____ No  ____ I do not know.

(b) Special courses or programs for pregnant students, in my system do provide instruction in self-contained classrooms.

____ Yes   ____ No  ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

26. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide instruction in individualized ways (examples: learning center or learning lab, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching).

____ Yes   ____ No  ____ I do not know.

(b) Special courses or programs for pregnant students, in my system, do provide instruction in individualized ways (examples: Learning center or learning lab, diagnostic-prescriptive teaching).

____ Yes   ____ No  ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

27. (a) Teachers who staff special courses or programs for pregnant students should participate in in-service staff development activities which address the unique needs of pregnant students.

____ Yes   ____ No  ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, teachers who staff special courses or programs for pregnant students do participate in in-service staff development activities which address the unique needs of pregnant students.

____ Yes   ____ No  ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.
Special Instructional Services

28. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include instruction in sex education and birth control.

____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) Special courses or programs for pregnant students, in my system, do include instruction in sex education and birth control.

____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

29. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include instruction in nutrition (especially as it applies to expectant mothers and to babies).

____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do include instruction in nutrition (especially as it applies to expectant mothers and to babies).

____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

30. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include instruction in child development.

____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do include instruction in child development.

____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

31. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include instruction in parenting skills.

____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.
(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do include instruction in parenting skills.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

32. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include organized recreational, leisure time activities.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do include organized recreational, leisure time activities.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

33. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include vocational, job preparatory instruction.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do include vocational, job preparatory instruction.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

Health Services

34. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should require or provide the services of a medical doctor.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.
(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do require or provide the services of a medical doctor.

[Blank]

Yes No I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

35. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should require or provide the services of a nurse.

[Blank]

Yes No I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do require or provide the services of a nurse.

[Blank]

Yes No I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

36. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should include information about labor and delivery.

[Blank]

Yes No I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do include information about labor and delivery.

[Blank]

Yes No I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

Counseling and Psychological Services

37. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide school counseling services (course selection, post high school direction).

[Blank]

Yes No I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide school counseling services (course selection, post high school direction).

[Blank]

Yes No I do not know

There are no special courses or programs in my system.
38. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide personal counseling services (examples: decision making, especially about problems related to the expected baby and to the expected new status of the mother-to-be).

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide such personal counseling services (examples: decision making, especially about problems related to the expected baby and to the expected new status of the mother-to-be).

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

39. (a) Special programs or courses for pregnant students should provide psychological services (therapy) for those enrollees who are not able to function effectively.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special programs or courses for pregnant students do provide such therapeutic psychological services.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

40. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide vocational or career development services.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide vocational or career development services.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

There are no special courses or programs in my system.

41. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should organize students in support groups (small groups of those with similar concerns) so they can help one another.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.
(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do organize students in support groups.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

42. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide counseling to enrollees after their babies are born.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide counseling to enrollees after their babies are born.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

Social Welfare Services

(Provision of support services to address some real needs which frequently interfere with school attendance)

43. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide infant care services.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide infant care services.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

44. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide the services of a social worker or other qualified person to work with enrollees and their significant family members (examples: mothers and fathers of pregnant girls, fathers of expected babies).

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.
(b) In my system, special courses or programs do provide special services for significant members of enrollees' families.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

45. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide transportation services to enrollees.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide transportation services to enrollees.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

46. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide job placements and on-the-job training services.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide job placements and on-the-job training services.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

47. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide lunch.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide lunch.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.
Organizational Procedures

48. (a) Enrollment in special courses or programs for pregnant students should require parental consent for those under 16 years of age.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do require parental consent for those under 16 years of age.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

49. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide flexible scheduling (allow students to choose hours of school attendance).

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide flexible scheduling (allow students to choose hours of school attendance).

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

50. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should provide an on-site administrator.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do provide an on-site administrator.

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

51. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should allow enrollees to transfer to and from the regular classes or programs only at the beginning and end of semesters (not quarters; not at any time).

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.
(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do allow enrollees to transfer to and from the regular classes or program only at the beginning and end of semesters (not quarters; not at any time).

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

52. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should allow enrollees to transfer to and from the regular courses or program at the beginning and end of quarters (not at any time).

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do allow enrollees to transfer to and from the regular courses or programs at the beginning and end of quarters (not at any time).

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

53. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should allow enrollees to transfer to and from the regular courses or programs at any time appropriate to the enrollees' pregnancies.

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do allow enrollees to transfer to and from the regular courses or programs at any time appropriate to the enrollees' pregnancies.

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

54. (a) Pregnant students should be allowed to remain in special courses or programs as long as they wish after their babies are born.

____ Yes  ____ No  ____ I do not know.
(b) In my system, pregnant students are allowed to remain in special courses or programs as long as they wish after their babies are born.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

Community Involvement

55. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should have community advisory committees.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do have community advisory committees.

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

56. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should have visibility in the community (the community should be aware of them).

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do have visibility in the community (the community is aware of them).

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.

____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

57. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should have mutual referral arrangements with other community agencies (examples: hospitals, family services, etc.).

____ Yes ____ No ____ I do not know.
(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do have mutual referral arrangements with other community agencies (examples: hospitals, family services, etc.).

_____ Yes   _____ No   _____ I do not know

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.

58. (a) Special courses or programs for pregnant students should reach out to enroll pregnant girls who have dropped out of school.

_____ Yes   _____ No   _____ I do not know.

(b) In my system, special courses or programs for pregnant students do reach out to enroll pregnant girls who have dropped out of school.

_____ Yes   _____ No   _____ I do not know.

_____ There are no special courses or programs in my system.
If your system has a special course or a special program for pregnant students, please skip to Section E.

Section D: REASONS FOR NON-EXISTENCE OF SPECIAL PROGRAMMING FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS—If your system has no special course or program for pregnant students, please rank order the following reasons for the non-existence of such programming. The reasons listed are based on the results of other studies. In ranking, use "1" for the reason most responsible for non-existing programming and "9" for the reason for the reason least responsible. When you are through with this section, please skip to Section F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Establishment of need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Establishment of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Availability of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Attitudes of community and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Attitudes of school board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Attitudes of central office administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Attitudes of building principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Attitudes of schools' staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Attitudes of pregnant students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section E: ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES OF EXISTING SCHOOL PROGRAMMING FOR PREGNANT STUDENTS—If your system has special courses or a special program for pregnant students, please answer the following questions.

68. Who is directly responsible for the administration of the program?
   a) ___ The principal of the building in which it is located.
   b) ___ An on-site coordinator, director, or supervisor.
   c) ___ An on-site teacher, counselor, or other support staff member.
   d) ___ A central office (off-site) staff member.
   e) ___ Other ________________________________

69. Who is involved in the evaluation of the program?
   a) ___ Program administrator.
   b) ___ Program administrator and staff.
   c) ___ Program administrator, staff, and students.
   d) ___ Program administrator, staff, students, and community.
   e) ___ Other ________________________________

70. What are the funding sources of the program?
   a) ___ State.
   b) ___ State and local.
   c) ___ Federal, state and local.
   d) ___ Private, state and local.
   e) ___ Other ________________________________
71. Does your system have a non-discriminatory policy regarding educational services for pregnant school-aged students?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ I do not know.

72. Optional Question

Have you had any experiences which might shed light on either problems or successes in public school programs and services for pregnant students? If so, please briefly share your gained insights so that this study can reflect them; thank you.

If you want me to send you the results of this study, please indicate your name and address.
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTERS
September 8, 1980

Dear Principal:

This is a request for fifteen precious minutes of your time in the interest of clarifying the role of the public schools in serving pregnant, school-aged girls.

As you know, the rising number of increasingly younger girls in North Carolina becoming pregnant and choosing to keep their babies poses a societal problem and challenge. Though our public schools offer educational services to these students, many questions exist about the appropriate role of school systems in serving their special needs.

The purposes of the enclosed anonymous questionnaire are to describe the preferences of North Carolina school administrators and to describe the existing practices in North Carolina schools regarding school services for pregnant, school-aged girls. The information collected will not be identified with any school or any school administrator. It will be related to socio-economic and school organizational variables. The information will be shared with the N.C. Department of Public Instruction for consideration in providing program guidelines and staff development. The study will be submitted to a doctoral faculty committee at the Ohio State University, chaired by Dr. Jack Frymier.

With full awareness of your busy schedule, I trust that you will be able to return it to me by September 20.

Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation. As a local school system administrator, I can identify with both your time restraints and your genuine interests in organizing our schools to best serve the educational needs of all school-aged youngsters.

Very truly yours,

Marcia Epstein, Director
Department of Support Services
Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools

ME/bjs

Enclosure
September 8, 1980

Dear Superintendent:

This is a request for fifteen precious minutes of your time in the interest of clarifying the role of the public schools in serving pregnant, school-aged girls.

As you know, the rising number of increasingly younger girls in North Carolina becoming pregnant and choosing to keep their babies poses a societal problem and challenge. Though our public schools offer educational services to these students, many questions exist about the appropriate role of school systems in serving their special needs.

The purposes of the enclosed anonymous questionnaire are to describe the preferences of North Carolina school administrators and to describe the existing practices in North Carolina schools regarding school services for pregnant, school-aged girls. The information collected will not be identified with any school or any school administrator. It will be related to socio-economic and school organizational variables. The information will be shared with the N.C. Department of Public Instruction for consideration in providing program guidelines and staff development. The study will be submitted to a doctoral faculty committee at the Ohio State University, chaired by Dr. Jack Frymier.

With full awareness of your busy schedule, I trust that you will be able to return it to me by September 20.

Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation. As a local school system administrator, I can identify with both your time restraints and your genuine interests in organizing our schools to best serve the educational needs of all school-aged youngsters.

Very truly yours,

Marcia Epstein, Director
Department of Support Services
Winston-Salem,/Forsyth County Schools

ME/bjs

Enclosure
APPENDIX C

LETTER OF SUPPORT
Ms. Marcia Epstein, Director
Planning and Development
Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Dear Marcia:

As you are aware, the State Department of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education have identified the improvement of instructional programs in the high schools as a top priority. Our major thrust is to improve the total program in the comprehensive high schools in order to meet the wide range of needs of our high school students.

For this reason, I was delighted to see that you are presently making a study of the role of the public schools regarding appropriate instructional and support programs for pregnant/parenting students. We also know that pregnancy and related problems contribute to the number of students dropping out of school each year.

We will follow your study with interest as you look at the needs of this student population and would appreciate your sharing the findings of the study with us.

If I may assist you in this matter, please do not hesitate in letting me know.

Sincerely,

Jerry T. Beaver
Deputy Assistant Superintendent
Secondary Education
TO: Superintendents and Principals

It has undoubtedly been a busy week for you; I understand! If you have returned the questionnaire on "Perceptions and Practices Regarding Public School Services for Pregnant Students," thank you very much! If not, please fill it out and return it so that your responses can be included in the analysis used in interpretation presented to the State Department of Public Instruction.

Thanks again.

Marcia Epstein
Director, Support Services
Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools
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