Factors affecting chronically tardy students in a selected elementary school of the DeKalb County school system

Alexander Russell Jr.
Clark Atlanta University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/dissertations
Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation
http://digitalcommons.auctr.edu/dissertations/2186

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Collection for AUC Robert W. Woodruff Library by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center. For more information, please contact cwiseman@auctr.edu.
FACTORS AFFECTING CHRONICALLY TARDY STUDENTS IN A SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF THE DEKALB COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION

BY
ALEXANDER RUSSELL, JR.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

MAY 1990
ABSTRACT
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

RUSSELL, ALEXANDER B. BENEDICT COLLEGE, 1974
M.Ed. GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY, 1984

FACTORS AFFECTING CHRONICALLY TARDY STUDENTS IN
A SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF THE
DEKALB COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Advisor: Dr. Trevor Turner
Thesis dated May, 1990

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which the following factors may differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students: Parental attitudes, family structure, socioeconomic status, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence. The population of this study was the students at an elementary school in the Dekalb County School System, Georgia. Thirty students participated in the study. The ages of the participants ranged from 8 through 13.

The instrument used in this study is entitled The Home and School Environment Questionnaire. Of the five variables analyzed, only two proved to have significant differences as perceived by the two groups of students. The two variables were: (1) Family structure in terms of the presence of the father in the home, and (2) teacher attitude.

Along with the findings, conclusions, and implications, it was recommended that the following initiatives be developed: (1) Parenting Workshops for the parents of those students identified as chronically tardy; (2) Schoolwide strategies that encourage students to arrive at school on time; (3) A Big Brother program in which male adult figures spend time with chronically tardy students; (4) A communication system that will inform parents of tardies on a daily basis; (5) Workshops to enhance positive teacher-student interactions that will improve students' perceptions of teachers; and (6) rewards for students and praise parents for maintaining good attendance records in school.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

This study examines the problem of tardiness in students. It examined it from the point of view of factors such as parental attitudes, family structure and socioeconomic status, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence. However, tardiness could be a problem in this case because the tardy student misses the opportunity to be exposed to these concepts.

Many important concepts are taught at the beginning of the school day. The tardy student misses the opportunity of being exposed to these concepts. The problem of tardiness has, by and large, been historically viewed in a casual manner. Caldwell, Huitt, and Graeber (1982) found that "the amount of time spent in learning is an important factor in determining a student's achievement" (p. 17). Chronic tardiness takes away time from lessons, resulting in failure to grasp necessary concepts and developing inconsistencies in learning and building upon the next lesson.

Factors in both the home and school environments contribute greatly to the development of a student's attitude towards tardiness. The majority of the student's learned behavior is initiated by persons at home and subsequently at school. These persons are usually parents.
and teachers. Parents are normally the first teachers in a child's life. They influence children psychologically, physiologically, and sociologically. When teachers receive students, they will educationally challenge them in an effort to broaden their perceptions of the world. Additionally, most students enjoy social interaction with their schoolmates and because of this interaction, schoolmates influence each other.

**Background Information**

According to the Dekalb County School System Position Description for Elementary School Personnel (1982), a new role was established to serve as a liaison between the home and school environments. This role is called the Lead Teacher for Student Services (LTSS). Reducing students' tardiness was cited as a key responsibility of the Lead Teacher for Student Services.

After interviewing parents and students, this investigation found that many academic and behavioral problems at school were linked to the home environment. According to the Rainbow Elementary School records of the Lead Teacher for Student Services (1989), a daily account of student tardiness revealed that parental attitudes surfaces as a factor in explaining chronic tardiness.

Upon interviewing parents and students, it was found that planning in the home environment was poor and was exhibited in several ways. Parents and children did not prepare clothing or lunches
the night prior to a school day. In addition, there were problems with a lack of money from parents. Further, both students and parents talked about alarm clocks not working properly. Moreover, there were many cases of home evictions because of financial problems. Poor planning caused great instability as a result of unfamiliar conditions in which the families found themselves. Besides residing under a stressful temporary environment such as a motel room, transportation was also a chief factor of student tardiness in these situations. Also, many students stated that they had a late start which was due to a wide range of socioeconomic problems. Among those socioeconomic problems was the fact that breakfast was served late because "we waited for daddy to come home with some money." Another explanation was that a student missed the school bus because of parent misinformation regarding the bus drivers' usual arrival and departure time. A final explanation was that a student arrived late because of the father and mother experiencing a domestic quarrel at home.

**Significance of the Study**

It is hoped that this study will add to the body of knowledge on student tardiness in the field of education, specifically, educational leadership. During the past decade researchers have examined student dropouts and student absenteeism as viable means of predicting student success or failure. Caldwell, Huitt, and Graeber (1982) found that little mastery of skills can be achieved by a student when the
record reflects a high level of absences. Upon investigation of the subject of student tardiness, it was found that few authors have examined factors impacting on student tardiness.

Revelations of the impact of tardiness, may give parents, teachers, and students a new weapon in the effort to increase academic success. With the findings from this study, administrators, parents, teachers, and students may be able to develop strategies that are desired to alleviate or minimize tardiness. This study, therefore, could also reveal information that will be beneficial in changing students' attitudes towards tardiness.

**Statement of the Purpose**

This study was based on fourteen chronically tardy students and sixteen non-tardy students in an elementary school in the Dekalb County School System. The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which the following factors may differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students: parental attitudes, family structure, socioeconomic status, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence.

**Research Questions**

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the difference between the perception of chronically tardy and non-tardy students with respect to parental attitudes?
2. How does family structure—in terms of the number of persons in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?

3. How does family structure—in terms of the number of children in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?

4. How does family structure—in terms of the presence of the father in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?

5. How does family structure—in terms of the presence of the mother in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?

6. How does socioeconomic status differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?

7. What is the difference between the perception of chronically tardy and non-tardy students with respect to teacher attitudes?

8. Do schoolmates' influence differ between the perceptions of chronically tardy and non-tardy students?

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to the following groups and situations:

1. An elementary school in a large metropolitan school district.
2. Students in that elementary school.
Definition of Terms

The following definitions are derived from information found in Dekalb County School System records:

1. A tardy student is defined as one who arrives at school after 8:15 in the morning.
2. Chronically Tardy Student-- is a student that is tardy at least five times per month.
3. Non-Tardy Student-- is a student with one tardy or no tardies per month.
4. Students' Perceptions of Parental Attitudes-- are the views of students with respect to their parents' posture and feelings about coming to school on time and obeying school rules and regulations.
5. Family Structure-- The composition of the family in terms of the number of parents or guardians in the home, e.g., single parent, two parents, step-parents, and the number of siblings.
6. Socioeconomic Status-- The income level of the parents.

Students' Perceptions of Teacher Attitudes-- The views of the student relative to teacher encouragement and the ability to create a positive environment in the classroom.

7. Students' Perceptions of Schoolmates' Influence-- The views of the student relative to schoolmates' influence on the number of times a student is tardy.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Literature

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine the differences between non-tardy and chronically tardy students with respect to parental attitudes, family structure, socioeconomic status, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence. The review of literature will begin with an investigation into the issue of tardiness as it relates to time on task for instruction. Next, the following factors will be investigated: Family Structure and Socioeconomic Status, Parental Attitudes, Teacher Attitudes, and Schoolmates' Influence. Finally, a summary of the review of literature is provided.

Student Tardiness and Time on Task

Caldwell, Huitt, and Graeber (1982) stated that "Common sense suggests that the amount of time spent in learning is an important factor in determining a student's achievement." In order to increase the amount of time in the classroom, the State Superintendent of Georgia, Dr. Werner Rogers (1989), proposed an idea of adding two additional days to every school year until the year 2000, extending the school year to 200 days.

Dr. Rogers suggests that Japanese students have a greater opportunity for more time on task. According to Rogers (1989):
Asian students have performed better in math and science areas than our American students, and one key element seems to be that Asian students spend more minutes of the day and more days of the year in the school setting (p. 54).

While Asian students spend more time in school and by virtue of that fact must spend more time in the classroom, there is a different picture in American public schools. According to the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) in its study, A Nation at Risk..., there is a difference in terms of the amount of time on task as shown in the following statement:

The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), in their study, stated the following in terms of the amount of time on task:

The time available for learning should be expanded through better classroom management and organization of the school....Additional time should be found to meet the needs of slow learners, the gifted, and others who need more instructional diversity than can be accommodated during a conventional school day or year (p. 29).

When the states began to implement plans to meet the demands of the National Commission on Education (1983), tardiness was one component that needed attention in order to increase time on task. In light of that, Dr. Rogers began to use strategies to increase time spent in the classroom. The decision by Dr. Rogers to extend the Georgia Public
school day to 200 days is supported by the findings of the researchers at the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983).

The amount of time spent on task daily is also a factor directly related to student achievement. Brophy (1986) found that teachers' management styles relate directly to the amount of time spent of learning in the classroom. The teacher's ability to organize the classroom effectively and to keep learning as a priority allows for allocation of the largest amount of the school day to learning (Brophy, 1986). Student tardiness could also be affected by family structure and socioeconomic status.

**Family Life**

The student tardiness problem has farther reaching effects than may be seen for many years to come through generations of families. Stutman (1985) found that "Family theorists and practitioners have long recognized that struggles inherent in family life may be carried forth from one generation to another" (p. 5). Therefore, family history has an impact on a student's success or failure at school.

Within the home environment, every family is unique in its own make-up of family characteristics. These family characteristics are a reflection of how each family handles physical, social, and psychological variables of the family environment. Maykut (1984) investigated the relationship between the physical, social, and psychological variables of the family environment and children's
developmental performance on measures of cognition, academic achievement and affective characteristics. This study strongly suggested through its findings that family environment or home environment has a great impact on a student's achievement. This also implies that the family practices or habits may have a strong impact on chronically tardy students and non-tardy students.

In many cases, it is hoped that parents aren't being negligent in their responsibilities as parents. Roscoe, Peterson, and Shaner (1983), in their elaboration on the problems of absenteeism stated, "... children who are frequently late to classes, for example those who typically arrive at 10:00 a.m., are experiencing a form of neglect which needs to be remedied" (p. 398). The authors stated that more children are neglected at least 2 to 3 times more than children are abused.

As stated earlier, tardiness has a great effect on student achievement. Michals, Cournoyer, and Pinner (1979) also found that this effect is greater for low income families. The authors stated that:

Lateness has a negative effect on achievement growth. The effect is greatest for low income pupils. Five more latenesses per year mean 2.9 months less growth to pupil whose family income is $5,000 and 1.2 months less achievement growth for a student whose family income is $8,000 (p. 140).

The home environment cannot afford to allow human resources to be wasted as these statistics have indicated. When these students miss important skills, the student suffers, the family suffers.
Maslow (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1982) found that every individual travels through a hierarchy of needs that begins at birth. In many homes, parents cannot provide basic necessities for their children. The mother and father cannot keep up with the cost of living and it is difficult for them to compete in the workforce. They may lack education or highly specialized skills. This causes great emotional stress for parents trying to help their family to meet their basic needs of food, shelter, and clothing. This causes parents to expend great energy and time; therefore, parents in these situations have a tendency to overlook the higher level needs of their children including academic and behavioral needs at school.

Some parents have recognized how values may assist their families’ needs in terms of long range goals. In many cases, these parents have some frame of reference to develop a value system that will assist their family in meeting their basic needs and move to higher levels of the hierarchy structure described by Maslow (cited in Hoy & Miskel, 1982).

**Parental Attitudes**

Bloom (1986) suggests that the home environment has a strong influence on school achievement at the elementary school level. One study revealed that parental indifference significantly affected student tardiness (Goodall, 1983). An example of an indifferent mother's school expectations of her child can be seen in the following quotation,
"I'll wake her up in the mornings when she gets to regular school" (Goodall, 1983, p. 14). According to the idea stated in quotations, the promptness of her child was not important to the mother. That attitude makes the superintendent's resolve to increase time spent in the classroom more consequential.

Another example of parental influence might be seen in family structure. According to Richardson, Abramowitz, Elliot, and Peterson (1986) spacing of children is more conducive to family interaction. In addition, under spacing allows for more affection and less disciplinary tactics. Kidwell (1981) agrees and states that under spacing of children assures that there will be less pressure on parents during the time of heavy demands in their children's development as well as more parental attention throughout childhood. Larger and closely spaced families provide less supportive and more restrictive environments for children than do smaller families. A larger number of children may drain the parent emotionally, physically, and economically so that each child receives less parental attention than would be received in a smaller family. That means that the attention and support needed by children as far as education is concerned would not be as great in the large family structure. The stress of a larger family seems to be exacerbated by close spacing.

Cohen (1987) found that parents effect their children's educational aspiration through modeling and defining influences. There are two different types of interpersonal influence, namely
comparative and informative type. In light of that, parents influence their children through defining what behaviors are appropriate. They also influence through encouragement and education. Both attainments and aspirations are more influenced by parents defining than by modeling.

In a discussion of parental attitudes Cooper, Holman, and Braithwaite (1983) stated that parental attitude regarding their children have to be reflected in behavior in order to be perceived by their children and affect the children's self-esteem. Parental support and control are especially important. If parental behavior demonstrates positive evaluation of the children, that support, participation and interest shown in the children are positively related to the children's self-esteem. Teacher attitudes as well as parental attitudes could also have an effect on student tardiness.

**Teacher Attitudes**

Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) suggest that teachers must make themselves aware of the symptoms and circumstances surrounding students' family life in order to prepare themselves for caring and teaching specific students.

Lee Canter (1987), the author of the Parent Conference book, suggests that parents look for these two good qualities in an effective teacher: (1) Does this teacher care about my child? and (2) Is this person a competent teacher? Teachers must establish a sincere relationship
with their students and maintain the professional practices of competent teachers. According to Canter (1987) teachers should establish classroom standards, communicate these standards to parents and students, establish positive communication, document all problems pertaining to students, contact parents at the first sign of a problem, and if all else fails, take action.

Canter (1987) found that in the process of establishing standards, teachers must plan with high expectations in mind. These high expectations, as they relate to the student's need to be in school on time, should be communicated to both parents and teachers during the beginning of the school year and periodically during the school year.

Purvis and Leonard (1985) suggest that prior to class, teachers should stand at the door which enables them to observe students in the hallways. As soon as the bell rings, teachers should immediately close the door. The gesture will send a message to students about arriving to class on time.

Parket (1973), found that tardy students experience negative feelings as social isolation, feelings of powerlessness, academic frustration, and lack of confidence. These feelings may be a result of both the home and school environment. Therefore, teachers may examine the background of the student's failures and successes at both home and school. This assessment may set the basis to establish a plan of action to counter these negative feelings, consequently which may impact student tardiness.
Koehler (1988), examined whether labelling students as at-risk, affects the expectations of teachers. Teachers were given two sets of questions to answer. The first set of questions was used to elicit their public beliefs and the second set of questions was used to elicit their more private beliefs. Teachers were asked later during the year if their concept of at-risk students had changed. Among the major findings of Koehler's study, teachers' definitions changed from a sociocultural perspective to a more specific definition of a student's ability to learn at the conclusion of the school session. Koehler also found teachers referring students to special education were based on the teachers' expectation level rather than the students' behavior, that at-risk students could be situational from one classroom to another, that teachers tend to blame the parents and homelife rather than the shortcomings of the student or the shortcomings of an ineffective teacher. This study is highly related to student tardiness, in which Koehler defined the tardy student as an at-risk student.

Casanova (1988) examined whether the teacher's perceptions may differ from the parents perception of an at-risk student. The cases of twelve student labelled at-risk by their teachers were examined. Interviews were administered to parents, teachers, and students, and school records were examined. The findings with this study revealed that discrepancies existed with the perceptions of parents and school personnel in regards to the child, school personnel did not often inform parents of the child's status, the school personnel perceptions
were more important than the perceptions of parents with respect to the child, parents relied on the judgement of the school personnel's judgement, and the size of the class may affect the development of strong home and school relationships based on effective communication. This study is relevant to the student tardiness problem as Koehler earlier defined the at-risk student.

**Schoolmates' Influence**

Julius and Zelda Segal (1986) found that children tend to parallel themselves closely with the value system of their parents. They also found that peers, in most cases, will not relate to peers of the opposite value system. Children from environments lacking adequate stability, direction, and warmth are eager to be accepted by any peer group. Peers from stable home environments have a tendency to align themselves with peers of a similar value system. In regards to tardy students, the authors have implied that students from unstable home environments have a higher probability of relating to students who tend to arrive at school late or attend class late. Simply, as stated previously, children from unstable environments will identify with any peer group.

Further evidence indicates the association of peers with similar value systems. Berndt (1986) states there is evidence to suggest that adolescents are often influenced more by close friends than by other peers. Newman and Newman (1976) gives supportive data and state
"The adolescent's circle of friends, his interests and style of dress quickly link him to a subgroup which has continuity and meaning within the content of his neighborhood or school. There are demands from within this group to conform to the norms of the group and to demonstrate commitment and loyalty to the other group members."

Davies and Kandel (1981) differ with Newman and Newman (1976) as they state "Parents' influences on their adolescent childrens' aspirations are much stronger than the influence of best friends. Depending upon which measure of parental aspirations is used, the ration of parental to peer effects varies by a factor of two or eight." This study is indicative of Julius and Zelda Segals' (1986) study, which indicates that children tend to parallel their value system with their parents value system. Therefore, children with values systems that are parallel with the value system of their parents may have a greater chance to follow good habits. In contrast, as stated by Berndt (1976) children with value systems that resemble their peers value system may have less of a chance to follow good habits.

Summary

This chapter contains the purpose of the study and the related literature. The purpose is to determine the differences between non-tardy and chronically tardy students with respect to parental attitudes, family structure and socioeconomic status, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influences. The literature is reviewed in several areas:
Family life and Socioeconomic Status, parental attitudes, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influences.

Tardiness is a problem which causes administrative concern and may be impacted by several sources. According to Stutman (1985), problems in the family can be carried from one generation to another, and that means that tardiness in one child can appear in others.

Likewise, parental attitudes, according to Bloom (1986) strongly affect the achievement of elementary school children. Moreover, teacher attitudes and the school environment play a role in meeting the needs of individual students. While Julius and Zelda Segal (1986) stated that children usually imitate the value system of their parents, children however, from environments without adequate stability usually relate themselves with any peer group that will accept them. The next chapter will give the theoretical framework upon which this study is based.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology and Design

The purpose of this descriptive study was to examine the extent to which the following factors may differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students: parental attitudes, family structure, socioeconomic status, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was the students at an elementary school in the Dekalb County School System, Georgia. One homeroom class was randomly selected from a group of homeroom classes on each grade level. Chronically tardy and non-tardy participants were identified from school attendance records. And they were randomly selected from their homeroom classes. These participants represented the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades from an enrollment of 480 students, with ages ranging from 8 through 13. Thirty students participated in this study because two chronically tardy students were absent on the day that the questionnaire was administered. The following table gives the grade and number of males and females classified as either chronically tardy or non-tardy students.
Table 1
The Number of Boys and Girls Surveyed by Category of Non-Tardy and Chronically Tardy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Chronically Tardy Students</th>
<th>Non-Tardy Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 girls</td>
<td>2 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 girls</td>
<td>2 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 girls</td>
<td>2 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
<td>2 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 girls</td>
<td>2 girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 14 students         n = 16 students

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study is entitled as The Home and School Environment Questionnaire. The instrument was developed by the researcher and given face validity by professors in educational leadership who are familiar with the Dekalb County School System as well as educational research.

This instrument was designed by the researcher to collect demographic data such as: Sex of students, ethnic group of students, age of students, students' grades, number of persons in the household of students, number of sisters and brothers of students, fathers' and
mothers' educational level, and whether the father or mother live in the same household. Also, this instrument was designed to collect and measure the perceptions of students as they relate to elementary school tardiness, parental attitudes, teacher attitudes, and the influence of schoolmates in the home and school environments.

The Home and School Environment Questionnaire is divided into four sections. The sections are: Demographic data, parental attitudes, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence. The demographic section was designed to display the similarities of participants in this study. The parental attitudes section was designed to collect the perceptions of students as they relate to elementary school tardiness. The teacher attitudes section was designed to collect the perceptions of students as they relate to elementary school tardiness. The schoolmates' influence section was designed to collect the perceptions of students as they relate to elementary school tardiness.
Data Collection Procedures

1. Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the principal of the elementary school. The names of participants were not revealed during the study.

2. Parents of the participants were asked to allow their children to participate in the study.

3. The participants were identified based upon the definitions of chronically tardy students and non-tardy students.

4. The school attendance records and information concerning family income levels were approved by parents and utilized as data.

Data Analysis

One basic statistical tool was utilized: the t-Test was used to test the differences between the chronically tardy and the non-tardy students with respect to parental attitudes, family structure, socioeconomic status, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence.
CHAPTER 4

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences in the perceptions of non-tardy and chronically tardy students with respect to parental attitudes, teacher attitudes, family structure, schoolmates' influence, and socioeconomic status. Additionally, factors as sex, ethnic group, age, and grade were examined in terms of quantitative data.

Participants in this study were students in grades 4-7 that were randomly selected. The students in this study were 16 black males, 11 black females, 1 white female, 1 eight year old, 5 ten year olds, 4 eleven year olds, 12 twelve year olds, 3 thirteen year olds, and 3 fourteen year olds. The t-Test was used to determine the significant difference between the means of non-tardy students and chronically tardy students.

Results

The following data will be presented in an effort to analyze the research questions previously posed:

1. What is the difference between the perception of chronically tardy and non-tardy students with respect to parental attitudes?
Table 2
Differences Between the Perception of Chronically Tardy and Non-Tardy Students with Respect to Parental Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.1250</td>
<td>7.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47.9286</td>
<td>10.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom 22.06  
T-Value 0.95  
2-Tail Probability 0.354  
P > .05  
Critical value of t = 2.074

This question investigated the perceptions of chronically tardy students and non-tardy students with respect to parental attitudes. As shown in table 2, the mean score in terms of parental attitudes is 51.1250 for non-tardy students and 47.9286 for chronically tardy students.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the mean score of perception of chronically tardy and non-tardy students, a t-Test was performed. Table 2 shows that the degrees of freedom were set at df = 22.06. The level of significance was at p = .05. The calculated value of t was .95 and the critical value of t was found to be t = 2.074. Since
the calculated value of $t$ is less than the critical value of $t$, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the perception of chronically tardy and non-tardy students with respect to parental attitudes.

2. How does family structure—in terms of the number of persons in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?
Table 3
Differences Between Non-Tardy and Chronically Tardy Students with Respect to Number of Persons Living in the Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4286</td>
<td>1.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 25.14, T-Value: -0.51, 2-Tail Probability: 0.617, P > .05, Critical value of t = 2.060

This question investigated the number of persons living in the household of non-tardy and chronically tardy students. As shown in Table 3, the mean number of persons living in the households of non-tardy students was 4.1250. The mean number of persons living in the households of chronically tardy students was 4.4286.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the number of persons living in the households of non-tardy and chronically tardy students, a t-Test was performed. Table 3 shows that the degrees of freedom were set at df = 25.14, and the level of significance was set at p = .05. The calculated value of t was -0.51 and the critical value of t was
found to be $t = 2.060$. Since the calculated value of $t$ is less than the critical value of $t$, there is no significant difference in the number of persons living in the households of non-tardy and chronically tardy students.

3. How does family structure differ—in terms of the number of children in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?
Table 4
Differences Between Non-Tardy and Chronically Tardy Students with Respect to Number of Children in the Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean No. of Children</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>1.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom 22.27
T-Value -0.76
2-Tail Probability 0.455
P > .05
Critical value of t = 2.074

This question investigated the number of children living in the household of non-tardy and chronically tardy students. As shown in Table 4, the mean number of children in the families of non-tardy students was 2.3750. The mean number of children in the families of chronically tardy students is 3.000.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the number of children in the families of non-tardy and chronically tardy students, a t-Test was performed. Table 4 shows that the degrees of freedom were set at df = 22.27, and the level of significance was set at p = .05. The
calculated value of $t$ was -0.76 and the critical value of $t$ was found to be $t = 2.074$. Since the calculated value of $t$ is less than the critical value of $t$, there is no significant difference in the number of children in the families of non-tardy and chronically tardy students.

4. How does family structure—in terms of the presence of the father in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?
Table 5

Differences Between Non-Tardy and Chronically Tardy Students with Respect to the Presence of a Father or Male Guardian Living in the Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6429</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom = 22.61
T-Value = 3.28
2-Tail Probability = 0.003
P > .05
Critical value of t = 2.074

This question investigated the presence of a father or male guardian in the home of each of the groups investigated for this study. The presence or absence of a father or male guardian in the home was represented by responses of either yes = 1, indicating presence, or no = 2, for absence. The mean score of the presence of a father or guardian in the home of chronically tardy students is 1.6429, and for non-tardy students, 1.125.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the presence of a father or male guardian in the home of non-tardy and chronically
tardy students, a t-Test was performed. Table 5 shows that the degrees of freedom were set at df = 22.61 and the level of significance was set at p = .05. The calculated value of t was 2.074. Since the calculated value of t is greater than the critical value of t, there is a significant difference in the presence of fathers or a male guardian living in the homes of non-tardy and chronically tardy students.

5. How does family structure—in terms of the presence of the mother in the home—differ between chronically tardy and non-tardy students?
Table 6
Differences Between Non-Tardy and Chronically Tardy Students with Respect to the Presence of Mother or Female Guardian Living in the Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1429</td>
<td>0.535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 13.00
T-Value: -1.00
2-Tail Probability: 0.336
P > .05
Critical value of t = 2.160

This question investigated the presence of a mother or female guardian in the home of each of the groups investigated for this study. The presence or absence of a mother or female guardian in the home was represented by responses of either yes = 1, indicating presence, or no = 2, for absence. The mean score for the presence of a mother in the home of non-tardy students is 1.0000 and for chronically tardy students, 1.1429. To determine if there was a significant difference in the presence of a mother or female guardian in the home of non-tardy and chronically tardy students, a t-Test was performed. Table 6
shows that the degrees of freedom were set at \( df = 13 \) and the level of significance was set at \( p = .05 \). The calculated value of \( t \) was -1.00 and the critical value of \( t \) was found to be \( t = 2.160 \). Since the calculated value of \( t \) is less than the critical value of \( t \), there is no significant difference in the presence of a mother or female guardian in the homes of non-tardy and chronically tardy students.

6. How does socioeconomic status differ between chronically tardy students and non-tardy students?
Table 7
Differences Between Non-Tardy and Chronically Tardy Students with Respect to the Family Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Income</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,635.78</td>
<td>148708.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,384.15</td>
<td>140860.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees of Freedom: 28.00
T-Value: .474
2-Tail Probability: 0.999
P > .05
Critical value of t = 2.048

This question investigated the difference between the socioeconomic status of chronically tardy and non-tardy students. As shown in Table 7, the mean income for the families of non-tardy students is $12,635.78. The mean income level for the families of chronically tardy students is $12,384.15.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the income levels of non-tardy and chronically tardy students a t-Test was performed. Table 7 shows that the degrees of freedom were set at df = 28 and the level of significance was set at p = .05. The calculated value of t was .474 and the critical value of t was found to be t = 2.048. Since the calculated value of t is less than the critical value of t, there is no
significant difference in the socioeconomic status of non-tardy and chronically tardy students.

7. What is the difference between the perception of chronically tardy students and non-tardy students to teacher attitudes?
Table 8
Differences Between Non-Tardy Students and Chronically Tardy
Students with Respect to Teacher Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.6875</td>
<td>4.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.6429</td>
<td>6.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Value</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Tail Probability</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical value of t =</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question investigated the perception of non-tardy and chronically tardy students in terms of teacher attitudes. As shown in Table 8, the mean score for the perception of non-tardy students in terms of teacher attitudes is 40.6875. The mean score for the perception of chronically tardy students in terms of teacher attitudes is 35.6429.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the perception of non-tardy and chronically tardy students a t-Test was performed. Table 8 shows that the degrees of freedom were set at df = 21.75 and the level of significance was set at p = .05. The calculated value of t was 2.33 and the critical value of t was found to be t = 2.080. Since the calculated value of t is greater than the critical value of t,
there is a significant difference in the perception of non-tardy and chronically tardy students in terms of teacher attitudes.

8. Do schoolmates’ influences differ between the perceptions of chronically tardy students and non-tardy students?
Table 9

Differences Between Non-Tardy and Chronically Tardy Students' Perceptions of Schoolmates' Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Categories</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tardy Students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.3750</td>
<td>4.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronically Tardy Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5714</td>
<td>2.901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Degrees of Freedom | 26.96 |
| T-Value            | -0.15 |
| 2-Tail Probability | 0.879 |
| P > .05            |       |

Critical value of t = 2.056

This question investigated the perception of non-tardy and chronically tardy students in terms of schoolmates' influences. As shown in Table 9, the mean score for the perception of non-tardy students by their schoolmates is 16.3750. The mean score for the perception of chronically tardy students by their schoolmates is 35.6429.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the perception of non-tardy and chronically tardy students by their schoolmates, a t-Test was performed. Table 9 shows that the degrees of freedom were set at df = 26.96 and the level of significance was set at p = .05. The calculated value of t is t = 2.056. Since the calculated value of t
is less than the critical value of $t$, there is no significant difference in the perception of non-tardy and chronically tardy students by their schoolmates.
CHAPTER 5
Summary of Findings, Conclusions, Implications
And Recommendations

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences between chronically tardy and non-tardy students as they perceive family structure, socioeconomic status, parental attitudes, teacher attitudes, and schoolmates' influence. The study involved surveying 16 non-tardy and 14 chronically tardy students utilizing The Home and School Environment Instrument and determining the differences in student perceptions by performing a t-Test.

Of the five variables analyzed, only two proved to have significant differences as perceived by the two groups of students. The two variables were: (1) Family structure in terms of the presence of the father in the home, and (2) teacher attitude.

With respect to the presence of a father in the home, the mean score for non-tardy students was 1.1250 and the mean score for chronically tardy students was 1.6429, using a Likert-type scale in which (1) represented yes and (2) represented no. Based on this fact, non-tardy students, on an average, had a father present in the home and the chronically tardy students, on an average, did not have a father present in the home. The t-Test further documented the differences in the two
groups by revealing a statistically significant difference in the presence of a father in the home of the two groups. Teacher attitudes was found to significantly affect student performance as stated by Brophy (1986). The results of this study further document this fact as the t-Test revealed a significant difference in the perception of teacher attitudes by the two groups of study. The non-tardy students yielded a mean score of 40.6875 and the chronically tardy students yielded a mean score of 35.6429 on The Home and School Environment Instrument with the highest possible score for the section on teacher attitudes being 60. The t-Test documented the difference in the perception of teachers' attitudes by the two groups as being significant. The other variables tested in this study did not prove to have a significant difference in terms of the perceptions of the two groups of study.

Conclusions

1. The chronically tardy and non-tardy students with respect to parental attitudes share similar perceptions as they relate to parental-child training, home rules, and parental values.

2. The number of persons living in the household with respect to family structure of the chronically tardy and non-tardy students, was not a factor in student tardiness.

3. The number of children in families of the chronically tardy and non-tardy appear to have no bearing on student tardiness.
4. There are more fathers present in the homes of non-tardy students than chronically tardy students. There is a clear indication that the father's absence from the home is a factor which may affect the chronically tardy student's school attendance. The presence of both parents in the home could have a positive impact on student tardiness.

5. The presence of the mother in the home of chronically tardy and non-tardy students is similar.

6. The financial income in the home of chronically tardy and non-tardy students displayed no bearing on student tardiness.

7. Non-tardy students perceived teachers as being more positive than the chronically tardy students with respect to teachers' attitudes.

8. The perceptions of non-tardy and chronically tardy students are similar with respect to schoolmates' influences.

**Implications**

Based on the conclusions, the following implications are suggested:

1. The attitudes of teachers could have a positive or negative impact on student tardiness. There is an indication that a teacher's negative attitude could impact on a student's promptness to class during the first period of the morning. The negative attitude of the teacher could establish a negative perception of the student with respect to the teacher.
2. Teachers must practice positive interactions with students to impact student perceptions with respect to student tardiness. Increased positive interactions with chronically tardy students may, in fact, decrease the rate of tardiness for this group of students.

3. The presence of the father or male guardian in the home should be considered an important factor that could impact student tardiness.

4. The presence of both parents in the home will increase a student's chances in maintaining a good school attendance record.

Recommendations

From the conclusions, the following recommendations can be drawn that will apply to school administrators:

1. Develop workshops on parenting for the parents of those students identified as chronically tardy.

2. Develop and implement strategies—schoolwide—that encourage students to come to school on time. The rewards could include recognition on a hallway display, popcorn parties, stickers, etc.

3. Develop a Big Brother program in which male adult figures spend time with chronically-tardy students.

4. Develop a communication system that will inform parents of tardies on a daily basis.

5. Develop workshops to enhance positive teacher-student interactions that will improve students' perceptions of teachers.
6. Develop rewards for students and praise parents for maintaining good attendance records in school.
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APPENDIX

Home and School Environment Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to collect the perceptions of students as it relates to elementary school tardiness. Also, this questionnaire is designed to obtain the various perceptions of students as they relate to home environment, school environment, and schoolmates' influence. The names of students will not be identifiable. Students will not be required to place their names on the questionnaire. School names are needed to match various sections of information in the study. School names will not be identified. Please respond to each item as honestly as possible and work independently of others.

Part A -- Directions

Please complete Part A by placing a check in the appropriate brackets for each item. Write in the name of your school in the space provided below. There are no right and wrong answers to these questions. When completed, stop and raise your hand. Further directions will be given for Part B.

SCHOOL NAME: _______________________________________

Check only one (1) response for each item.

1. Sex:
   A. Male [ ]
   B. Female [ ]

2. Ethnic group:
   A. Black [ ]
   B. White [ ]
   C. Hispanic [ ]
   D. Asian [ ]
   E. Other [ ]
3. Age at last birthday:

   A. 9  [  ]
   B. 10 [  ]
   C. 11 [  ]
   D. 12 [  ]
   E. 13 [  ]
   F. 14 [  ]

4. Grade:

   A. 4th [  ]
   B. 5th [  ]
   C. 6th [  ]
   D. 7th [  ]

5. Number of persons living in your household? [  ]

6. How many children are in your family?

   A. Sisters [  ]
   B. Brothers [  ]

7. Indicate your father's or male guardian's educational level.

   A. Below 8th grade [  ]
   B. Below 12th grade [  ]
   C. High School Graduate [  ]
   D. Two years College [  ]
   E. College Graduate [  ]
   F. Attends Graduate School [  ]
   G. Completed Professional/Graduate Degree [  ]

8. Is your father or male guardian living in the home?

   A. Yes [  ]
   B. No [  ]
9. What is the highest formal education of your mother or female guardian?

A. Below 8th grade [ ]
B. Below 12th grade [ ]
C. High School Graduate [ ]
D. Two years College [ ]
E. College Graduate [ ]
F. Attends Graduate School [ ]
G. Completed Professional/Graduate Degree [ ]

10. Is your mother or female guardian living in the home?

A. Yes [ ]
B. No [ ]
Part B -- Directions

Respond to each of the statements by placing a check in the brackets. Place only one check for each set of brackets. Look over the sample below.

How often are you happy?

Always [ ] Most of the time [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]

Parental Attitudes

11. Do you prepare yourself for school each morning without the help of a parent?

Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time

12. Did your parents train you how to dress for school?

Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time

13. Do your parents check the way you dress for school in the morning?

Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time

14. Do your parents insist that you leave home on time to get to school?

Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time

15. Do your parents make you obey rules at school?

Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time
16. Do your parents make you feel good?
   Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
   the time

17. Do your parents talk to you about school?
   Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
   the time

18. Do your parents say good things about your teacher?
   Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
   the time

19. Do your parents say bad things about your teacher?
   Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
   the time

20. Do your parents check your homework?
   Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
   the time

21. Do your parents insist that you do your homework?
   Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
   the time

22. Do your parents keep others from interfering you with your homework?
   Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ]
   the time
**Teacher Attitudes**

23. Does your teacher remind you to arrive at school on time?
   - Always [ ]
   - Most of [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Rarely [ ]
   - Never [ ]

24. Does your teacher make you obey school rules?
   - Always [ ]
   - Most of [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Rarely [ ]
   - Never [ ]

25. Does your teacher make you feel good about yourself?
   - Always [ ]
   - Most of [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Rarely [ ]
   - Never [ ]

26. Does your teacher act happy?
   - Always [ ]
   - Most of [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Rarely [ ]
   - Never [ ]

27. Does your teacher act sad?
   - Always [ ]
   - Most of [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Rarely [ ]
   - Never [ ]

28. Does your teacher laugh?
   - Always [ ]
   - Most of [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Rarely [ ]
   - Never [ ]

29. Does your teacher become angry?
   - Always [ ]
   - Most of [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Rarely [ ]
   - Never [ ]
30. Does your teacher care about you?
   Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
   the time

31. Does your teacher teach you well?
   Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
   the time

32. Does your teacher call your parents?
   Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
   the time

33. Does your teacher send letters home?
   Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
   the time

34. Does your teacher visit your parents?
   Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
   the time

Schoolmates' Influence

35. Do schoolmates help you to reach school on time?
   Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
   the time

36. Do schoolmates cause you to be late for school?
   Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
   the time
APPENDIX

Home and School Environment Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to collect the perceptions of students as it relates to elementary school tardiness. Also, this questionnaire is designed to obtain the various perceptions of students as they relate to home environment, school environment, and schoolmates' influence. The names of students will not be identifiable. Students will not be required to place their names on the questionnaire. School names are needed to match various sections of information in the study. School names will not be identified. Please respond to each item as honestly as possible and work independently of others.

Part A – Directions

Please complete Part A by placing a check in the appropriate brackets for each item. Write in the name of your school in the space provided below. There are no right and wrong answers to these questions. When completed, stop and raise your hand. Further directions will be given for Part B.

SCHOOL NAME: ________________________________________________

Check only one (1) response for each item.

1. Sex:
   A. Male [ ]
   B. Female [ ]

2. Ethnic group:
   A. Black [ ]
   B. White [ ]
   C. Hispanic [ ]
   D. Asian [ ]
   E. Other [ ]
3. Age at last birthday:
   A. 9 [   ]
   B. 10 [   ]
   C. 11 [   ]
   D. 12 [   ]
   E. 13 [   ]
   F. 14 [   ]

4. Grade:
   A. 4th [   ]
   B. 5th [   ]
   C. 6th [   ]
   D. 7th [   ]

5. Number of persons living in your household? [   ]

6. How many children are in your family?
   A. Sisters [   ]
   B. Brothers [   ]

7. Indicate your father's or male guardian's educational level.
   A. Below 8th grade [   ]
   B. Below 12th grade [   ]
   C. High School Graduate [   ]
   D. Two years College [   ]
   E. College Graduate [   ]
   F. Attends Graduate School [   ]
   G. Completed Professional/Graduate Degree [   ]

8. Is your father or male guardian living in the home?
   A. Yes [   ]
   B. No [   ]
9. What is the highest formal education of your mother or female guardian?

A. Below 8th grade [ ]
B. Below 12th grade [ ]
C. High School Graduate [ ]
D. Two years College [ ]
E. College Graduate [ ]
F. Attends Graduate School [ ]
G. Completed Professional/Graduate Degree [ ]

10. Is your mother or female guardian living in the home?

A. Yes [ ]
B. No [ ]
Part B -- Directions

Respond to each of the statements by placing a check in the brackets. Place only one check for each set of brackets. Look over the sample below.

How often are your happy?

Always [ ]  Most of the time [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]

Parental Attitudes

11. Do you prepare yourself for school each morning without the help of a parent?
    Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
    the time

12. Did your parents train you how to dress for school?
    Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
    the time

13. Do your parents check the way you dress for school in the morning?
    Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
    the time

14. Do your parents insist that you leave home on time to get to school?
    Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
    the time

15. Do your parents make you obey rules at school?
    Always [ ]  Most of [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Rarely [ ]  Never [ ]
    the time
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Do your parents make you feel good?</td>
<td>Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do your parents talk to you about school?</td>
<td>Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Do your parents say good things about your teacher?</td>
<td>Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Do your parents say bad things about your teacher?</td>
<td>Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Do your parents check your homework?</td>
<td>Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Do your parents insist that you do your homework?</td>
<td>Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Do your parents keep others from interfering you with your homework?</td>
<td>Always [ ] Most of [ ] Sometimes [ ] Rarely [ ] Never [ ] the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>