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Abstract

This thesis explains some of the challenges elite American boarding schools, and their evolving high-school age student population, experience in regards to adapting to the unique cultures that these residential educational environments possess. One of the most significant changes that elite boarding schools have undergone in relatively recent history is a socioeconomic shift. Once founded as places for the aristocracy to send their male children for college preparation and life, the modern era has transformed a significant portion of the boarding school population in many ways. I consider the rise of financial aid, and the subsequent access to these institutions that rise brings, as a major contributor to a significant socioeconomic demographic shift at these schools. With this demographic shift of lower socioeconomic students enrolling, cultural adaptation issues arise at schools that have long built their cultures on serving an affluent population.

In order to understand the function that socioeconomic status has on boarding school cultural adaptation, I incorporate the results and analysis of a survey I developed specifically for this thesis. Boarding school cultural adaptation is defined by this thesis as the ability to adjust to new surroundings and navigate the cultural changes that are experienced when enrolling in a residential high school setting. The survey asked boarding school students a series of questions about both their cultural adaptation and their socioeconomic status. My hypothesis is there is a connection between some areas of cultural adaptation and socioeconomic status and establishes some specific areas of concern.
My research found that students of lower socioeconomic status at boarding schools have lower cultural adaptation levels for learning new skills and behaviors and handling personal difficulties. My research also compared the use of two different measures of socioeconomic status and showed different amplitudes of effect. My analysis indicates that when looking at cultural adaptation, there may be a stronger connection between one’s perception of socioeconomic status than one’s actual measurable condition.

In support of my research, I review data on changing school demographics, comparison research on the similarities that higher education has encountered dealing with cultural adjustment, and studies on how high school aged students are developmentally different. I also review various literature regarding how school cultures and socioeconomic status both affect schools and students, and how methods of cultural transmission occur. My research explores an intersecting area of educational culture, developmental age, and contemporary social importance that has previously been lightly investigated.
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Introduction

This thesis explores the interplay between socioeconomic status and individual student cultural adaptation to elite American boarding school culture. This exploration is important, as lives are largely shaped by the cultural and social forces that interact with an individual’s attributes and their efforts.\textsuperscript{1} With the use of financial aid, residential boarding schools have spent several decades increasing their access to families from different backgrounds. These schools have found a ready pool of eager potential applicants, as interest in elite schools has permeated the greater American culture, and for good reason: one’s level of education is a strong predictor of their future earnings, and graduating from an elite institution amplifies that effect even more.\textsuperscript{2} With this increased interest, students with a lower socioeconomic background have had to navigate a historically unfamiliar culture. If boarding schools are to not just welcome students from all backgrounds, but support them as well, understanding school cultural transmission to all socioeconomic groups is important. This understanding may be currently lacking, for “class matters quite a lot, but in our particular American moment it is easier for the elite to ignore.”\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{2} Khan, \textit{Privilege}, 111.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{3} Khan, \textit{Privilege}, 111.
\end{flushleft}
With aided populations increasing, how do different socioeconomic backgrounds adjust to boarding school culture, and are the school cultures adjusting as well? What kind of environment do students encounter on these campuses? Do students encounter a mass acculturation upon enrollment, or do some students exist outside the dominant school culture? Secondarily, do students that have already been acculturated due to school connections have an advantage? It has already been argued that “There is a good deal of evidence demonstrating that your life chances are highly determined by the wealth of your parents—that children more often than not seem to inherit advantages or poverty.” Does the wealth of your parents prepare you for life an elite but enlightened boarding school?

I hypothesize that students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds attending elite boarding schools will have more difficulty in adjusting to the school culture and that schools currently fall short in addressing the problem. In order to test my hypothesis, I surveyed boarding students currently enrolled at three historically elite schools and assessed, by socioeconomic level, each student’s sense of cultural belonging. I then analyzed survey answers to look for associations.

My analysis suggests there is a connection between socioeconomic status and some areas of cultural adaptation. There were five areas of cultural adaptation examined and some, but not all, areas exhibited an effect due to socioeconomic status. Furthermore, my analysis of the different socioeconomic measures indicates there may be more

---

4 Table 1.

5 Khan, Privilege, 39.
research worthy of exploring the perception of socioeconomic status within a group versus the reality of one’s status.

Chapter one focuses on understanding the demographic shift that has occurred at American boarding schools and the cultural implications that might hold. Once bastions of wealthy, white connected boys and perhaps more comparable to exclusive clubs whose entry was often secured by heredity or social class than a typical high school, the racial, sex, gender, religious, sexual orientation and socioeconomic demographic make-up of these school’s populations have changed. The use of financial aid and admission diversification efforts has opened the doors to the palace in a way barely imaginable a century ago. Within these walls, talk of “community” often serves unknowingly as a surrogate for culture, and the cultural adjustment necessary to join such a community is considerably more for some than for others. Because lower social class does not have a significant identity factor, boarding schools often find themselves working to raise all to a high-class standard rather than recognizing the socioeconomic differences students bring into the community.

In Chapter two, comparisons to higher education, and the challenges and similarities to boarding school are discussed. Colleges and universities have been aggressively enrolling and pursuing first-generation college students for a considerable amount of time now, and the examination of this analogy shows similar obstacles relevant for boarding schools to study. Despite years of efforts, socioeconomic representation at elite colleges and universities is still not reflective of the greater United States population, as concepts of what is considered a middle income are actually greatly skewed towards the top quarter to top decile of income earners. Schools are also
wrestling with inadequate efforts and an insufficient understanding of the impediments to being a successful college student coming from a background where that is not the cultural norm.

Chapter three explores the teenage brain and its development, and how the age group in question is particularly susceptible to new and different cultural forces, and how early adolescence differs from late adolescence. Understanding the irrational decision making, and the response to emotionally charged situations is important when considering the cultural adjustments some students have to make when enrolling in boarding school. In comparison to their more researched college-aged equivalents, boarding school students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds likely face similar challenges as first-generation college students but lack the emotional regulation that is more developed for late adolescence.

For chapter four I examine the impact of school culture on students. School culture is shown to influence student achievement and is also correlated to school climate and research that has been done there. By connecting school culture and school climate, a bigger picture is shown that associates the health of the culture/climate to major student life development. On both a macro and micro level, a school culture/climate can have far-reaching implications for students. Perhaps most importantly for my work, a strong school culture can serve as a counterbalance to the experience of feeling marginalized due to one’s lower socioeconomic status.

Chapter five concentrates on the influence that socioeconomic status can have on school performance. There is a consistent body of research that shows a strong connection there, to the point that socioeconomic status has been noted to determine
achievement more than the school itself. Social class is overlaid with socioeconomic status in many ways, and the challenges of changing social status are discussed.

Finally, for chapter six I offer an analysis of the general methods of cultural transmission and how that transmission works in schools. The current state of boarding schools would seem to offer examples of both enculturation and acculturation operating at the same time for different populations. For traditional boarding school students, enculturation, or the process of learning one’s own culture, is well established. For lower socioeconomic students, acculturation, or changing oneself to become a part of a new culture, is likely the norm. Acculturation comes in several forms such as assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization. Integration, also known as biculturalism, is identified as a preferred method for groups to be successful and well adjusted in a new culture. By using some of the work of sociologist Shamus Khan, some ethnographic examples at St. Paul’s School are considered.

Boarding schools, with the duality of both educational and residential components to adolescent lives, offer a unique opportunity to examine the magnified impacts of these stressors on students more susceptible to irrational and emotionally charged decision making. With examples from higher education to learn from, boarding schools may have the opportunity to make significant changes both to their institutions and to their student’s experiences, that reflect a deeper and more accurate understanding of modern attitudes towards social class and poverty.
Chapter I.

Elite American Boarding School Demographic Shift

While the popular understanding of boarding schools might be decidedly stuck in the past or based on caricatured media portrayals, the reality for many boarding schools is that there has been a significant shift in student population over the past several decades. Due to in part to new financial aid policies and admission diversification initiatives, these schools are now more evolved in terms of gender enrollment, racial, ethnic and religious diversity, and the economic background of enrolled families. The population is measurably different at schools of this nature than the old caricature often portrays.

There is some early history of various schools’ progressive inclusion of different socioeconomic backgrounds, such as the headmaster at Deerfield Academy’s practice in the 1920’s and 1930’s of asking families to “Pay what you can.” However, despite the best intentions of the Gilded Age elite, the entire practice of institutional financial aid as it is now known largely arose in the 1950s in boarding schools, much like in the higher education world. After World War II “Scholarships” in independent schools began to be available mostly on a limited basis, as for example, Phillips Exeter Academy awarded

---

“approximately $115,000 in scholarship aid to worthy boys” as early as 1945.\textsuperscript{7} This century, the growth in financial aid at boarding schools has been significant:

Table 2: *Growth in Financial Aid Percentage of Student Body at Selected Boarding Schools 1999-2016*\textsuperscript{8}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1999-00 Academic Year</th>
<th>2015-16 Academic Year</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABS Member Schools – Boarding Only</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABS Member Schools – Majority Boarding</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSATB Member Schools – Boarding Only</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISANNE Member Schools – Majority Boarding</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TABS – The Association of Boarding Schools*  
*SSATB – Secondary School Admission Test Board*  
*ISANNE – Independent Schools Association of Northern New England*


As illustrated above, over the past 17 years the percentage of a school population on financial aid has increased this century among most, if not all, schools. But even with 40 or more years of financial aid history, many of these boarding schools have existed longer without a significant financial aid population than they have existed with one. The shift in demographics towards the end of the last century meant that most schools had roughly 25-30% of their student body on financial aid. A significant majority of students would, therefore, be likely to come from a higher status socioeconomically, if not from an outright higher social class.

With disproportionate positive college outcomes for their students, alumni networks that support students well beyond graduation, and the ability to still attract powerful and influential members of society to enroll their children, elite boarding schools are an environment worth examining. The evolving missions and different populations of these schools offer a glimpse into a microcosm of the potentially turbulent confluence of different cultures intersecting and interacting with the larger school culture. Boarding schools are particularly unique to examine because of the holistic nature of the education provided, and because of the adolescent age of their population. Since the students are both academic participants and community residents, the demographic shift that has taken place is also potentially a cultural shift, for one side, the other, or both.

Boarding schools pride themselves on their implementation of the idea of community, and their ability to create something uncommon for a local day, parochial or public school environment. In fact, much of the attraction to the boarding school experience is to the time spent outside of the classroom: who their peers will be, the athletic, club and social opportunities that will exist, and the general osmosis students
will experience living in such a community. Sociologist Shamus Khan noted in his book *Privilege* that looked at St. Paul’s School in Concord, N.H. that, the “true mark of the elite boarding school experience spills far beyond the classroom.” By selling “community” as one of the hallmarks to the value of a boarding school education, it could also be viewed that what is really being offered on this level is still an entry into an exclusive aristocratic culture.

Human development, of which formal and informal education is a part of, “is a cultural process and…the goals vary according to the traditions and circumstances of the community.” Seeking a place to develop and be educated, individuals joining a boarding school in their adolescent years are perhaps more than anything looking for a place to belong. The logoed school apparel, the car sticker with the school seal for the parents, or the subtle use of the school athletic water bottle or other peripheral gear, are all eager first attempts to signal belonging; and belonging is important.

Belonging to a group, or achieving status within a group, has been shown to be a cultural process and not an individual attribute. The individuals that can show they belong by “displaying tastes, styles or understandings that serve as cultural resources” enjoy group membership because they can communicate better within the culture.

---


cultural process can also be examined in the context of what works against it. Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, and Hayek’s analysis in 2006 strongly noted that even well-meaning, predominantly racially white schools have cultures that alienate others “because students get mixed messages about what is expected of them.” Kuh et al.’s emphasis on the differences in family values for first-generation college students can also serve as an example of the cultural process. If going to college has not been socialized as the family expectation, conflicting pressures about student success and rejection of family norms come into play. The same analysis may be likely true about boarding schools as well.

The socioeconomic shift in process at these schools, which is among several demographic shifts including race, sex, gender, sexual orientation and religious background, is particularly unique. Khan once again points out that “class is not a particularly salient identity in America, to give it up does not require an enormous sense of loss.” So unlike the efforts to invigorate pride in some identities, social class, and by extension, socioeconomic status, has really not been one of them. Identifying as poor or from a lesser status than the dominant class does not tend to instill a pride response for its members. In fact, quite the opposite manifests with regularity, as student fashion choices are often a point of stress for lower-income families as students seek to adopt the approved labels that signal belonging. Khan found as well that poorer students

——


14 Khan, Privilege, 112.
understood the world worked differently for students from different backgrounds, but unlike non-white students, poorer students did not offer much resistance to assimilating to the St. Paul’s perspective.\textsuperscript{15}

Schools themselves even go to great lengths to hide socioeconomic difference. Programs are developed that support students who cannot afford the ancillary and extraneous parts to a boarding school experience, such as team and dorm themed clothing, travel abroad opportunities, or summer research and internships. In this manner, well-meaning schools are signaling to their student body that giving up class is not a sense of loss, but rather an opportunity to embrace.

Khan again provides succinct insight in his writing: “But students who are comparatively disadvantaged navigate a much more bumpy terrain…. The opportunity of being at St. Paul’s comes with a catch – the adoption of an orientation that sometimes runs firmly against one’s own experiences and perhaps those of one’s family, where perhaps hard work and merit were not so strongly rewarded. This is the kind of contradiction that wealthier students don’t have to manage. And not having to manage these kinds of tensions makes ease at the school that much easier.”\textsuperscript{16} Coming of age in high school in general presents a host challenges for adolescents. The added complexity of diverse socioeconomic backgrounds intermingling in a close residential setting requires special attention from boarding schools.

\textsuperscript{15} Khan, \textit{Privilege}, 111.

\textsuperscript{16} Khan, \textit{Privilege}, 108.
Chapter II.

College Analogue

Given the relatively smaller and more regionalized market that elite boarding schools serve, it is helpful to examine and compare elite boarding schools against another residential educational environment with some similar structure, issues, and goals: higher education. Colleges and universities have been researching and discussing the issue of socioeconomic diversity and experiences for more than a decade now, often focusing on Pell Grant eligibility and first-generation college attendance as variables to determine the current state of affairs. The over-arching theme in higher education is that elite colleges lack adequate socioeconomic representation and are not prepared to serve first-generation students adequately.

One of Khan’s observations of elite college demographics delves beyond the campus populations gains made in racial diversity and strikes at the heart of the matter. He states, “Harvard’s ‘middle income’ is the richest 5 percent of our nation. This alone should tell us a lot about our elite educational institutions. While they look more open to us, this is in no small part because to us openness means diversity, and diversity means race. But class matters.”\(^{17}\) Social class inequality is starkly reflected at our nation’s elite, wealthy colleges as they serve a disproportionate number of Pell Grant eligible students. The Pell Grant population, the federal government’s grant aid program for low family

\(^{17}\) Khan, *Privilege*, 6.
incomes, lags behind the top public schools at the country’s wealthiest colleges.\textsuperscript{18}

Culturally, this continues to present issues in higher education that are tone-deaf at best, and “could end up intensifying class divisions and stymieing social mobility” at its worst.\textsuperscript{19}

Institutional tone-deafness is still a current problem, an example of which occurred in the spring of 2018 at the University of Michigan. At Michigan, a school created and sanctioned affordability guide was met with wide disapproval, and subsequently recalled, for being either “insultingly obvious or out of touch with campus living” and prompted a pair of first-generation students to create their own crowdsourced document with more appropriate advice, entitled \textit{Being Not-Rich at UM}.\textsuperscript{20} The tension there between socioeconomic perspectives highlights a core issue students have to navigate. From the institutional perspective, school officials trying to make a thoughtful “proactive step” are met by students, who are actually living the experience, wanting to cut through the diplomatic approach, and instead create “a document in which we can be honest about the barriers lower income and first-gen students face.”\textsuperscript{21}


\textsuperscript{19} Fischer, “Elite Colleges,” 8.


\textsuperscript{21} Witsil, “This University of Michigan Guide”; Lauren Schandevel and Griffin St. Onge, “Being Not-Rich at UM,” Google Docs, accessed June 15, 2018,
For first-generation students, more challenging than handling insensitive school administrations are the set of overall environmental circumstances encountered at both school and home. Sociologist Dwight Lang of the University of Michigan outlined the struggles that first-generation students have to try to fit in at a place where most students, faculty, and staff cannot relate.\textsuperscript{22} This inability to relate stems from many sources, some uniquely different than what other demographic groups have to navigate. In particular, “many students believe social class doesn’t exist or see it as the result of poor choices” and we live at a time “when it’s unacceptable to complain about supposed behaviors and attitudes of women and minority-group members, (but) few sanctions exist when working- and lower-class people are belittled.”\textsuperscript{23} In this environment, first-generation students, more likely to come from a lower social class, face the dual obstacles of first, not having their challenges acknowledged, and then second, if acknowledged, encountering no strong social mores that encourage empathy.

Looking for support, first-generation students unfortunately also find their existence bifurcated from their network at home. Parents lack college experience and may hold different values than what is being learned in school and from new peers.\textsuperscript{24}


\textsuperscript{23} Lang, “Singing the First-Generation Blues.”

\textsuperscript{24} Lang, “Singing the First-Generation Blues.”
Students, trying to fit it, exhaust themselves in the attempt to perform to others expectations. It is with these challenges that first-generation students encounter acculturation to the greater school environment, and, likely similar to the same challenges, obstacles, and expectations that younger students face when attending a historically elite boarding school.

---

25 Lang, “Singing the First-Generation Blues.”
Chapter III.

Adolescent Age Brain Development

Students in a boarding school environment are undergoing great personal developmental change due to adolescence. This long period of transformation occurs both internally and externally, as teenagers wrestle with intellectual, physical, hormonal and social maturation, influenced by several factors, including their environment and surrounding culture.26 It is now known that “significant changes occur in the limbic system, which may impact self-control, decision making, emotions and risk-taking behaviors” and that these changes are impacted “by heredity and environment” as well as “physical, mental, economical and psychological stress.”27

The neuroscience of adolescent development is important not only in its own intrinsic value towards achieving a level of understanding of the situation. It also holds true that the general reception towards explanations of youth behavior and development is stronger when neuroscience is involved.28 Given the fully residential environment of a boarding school, as well as the potential stresses of an elite school environment, both


27 Birman and Addae, “Acculturation,” 123.

social science and neuroscience indicates that the adolescent brain is being given the task of cultural adjustment within a challenging setting.

While adolescence is understood to be as wide-reaching as ages 10 to 24, especially when considering the final development of the prefrontal cortex, there are substages to this development that may inform how students in boarding schools adapt to the culture present. These substages are independent of, but also overlaid across, contemporary American society, where the various ages used to determine adulthood can be as low as 14 for trial in adult court to as high as 21 in order to legally consume alcohol.\footnote{Laurence Steinberg, “The Science of Adolescent Brain Development and Its Implications for Adolescent Rights and Responsibilities,” in Human Rights and Adolescence, ed. Jacqueline Bhabha (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 72, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1287p5q.6.} Biologically, after synaptic pruning takes place around puberty, which would often coincide with the beginning of high school, dopamine activity changes, impacting student’s experience of pleasure.\footnote{Steinberg, “Science of Adolescent Brain Development,” 63-64.}

It is in this stage of heightened sensation seeking that many 9\textsuperscript{th}-grade boarding school students embark on their school career.\footnote{Steinberg, “Science of Adolescent Brain Development,” 64.} Research by Arain has shown that a 15-year-old has little difference in reaction to a hypothetical situation than an adult, but in the real world, decisions vary greatly due to the emotional context involved.\footnote{Arain et al., “Maturation,” 455.} The difference teenagers experience takes place under a setting of “hot cognition” and “cold
cognition, where hot cognition is an environment where decisions are made under pressure or intensity. In hot cognition, teenagers face “complex feelings – such as fear of rejection, wanting to look cool, the excitement of risk, or anxiety of being caught” and they often struggle with the big picture of consequences, outcomes, and common sense.\textsuperscript{33}

Irrational decision making, highly emotional reactions to stimuli, and experimentation with identities is the normal state of being at this point in development.\textsuperscript{34} Hot cognition often rules the day for a lot of incoming high school students. So in essence, developing teenagers are given a new environment to navigate, and therefore the quality of the school culture is magnified in importance for this age group: adolescents that have detached themselves from the familiarity of home and family.

By comparison, 12\textsuperscript{th}-grade students on the downhill slope of adolescence have already begun traveling through an important third stage of myelination, where their prefrontal cortex receives an upgrade to important decision making. Finally, as compared to college students, most 12\textsuperscript{th}-grade students have not increased “the strength of connections between the prefrontal cortex and the limbic system,” important for regulating one’s emotions.\textsuperscript{35} The developmental spectrum through high school, therefore, leads from intellectual maturation to social and emotional maturity, which “helps explain

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{33} Arain et al., “Maturation,” 455.

\textsuperscript{34} Clausen, “Adolescent Competence,” 807.

\textsuperscript{35} Steinberg, “Adolescent Brain Development,” 64.
\end{footnotesize}
why teenagers who are so smart in some respects sometimes do surprisingly dumb things.\textsuperscript{36}

Given these varied states of adolescent development, the cultural adjustment that boarding school students are making compared to college students may differ significantly. Additionally, the first-generation population in either educational setting with have further challenges to acculturation, perhaps heightened by the stages of adolescent development. However, research would suggest that high school is exactly the time and place for adolescents to experience these challenges. Arain’s work actually suggests that teenagers “should not be overprotected, but be allowed to make mistakes, learn from their own experiences, and practice self-regulation.”\textsuperscript{37} If done properly, a boarding school environment might actually provide the space and support adolescents need for healthy development.

\textsuperscript{36} Steinberg, “Adolescent Brain Development,” 65.

\textsuperscript{37} Arain et al., “Maturation,” 456.
Chapter IV.

The Impact of School Culture on Students

Holistically, adolescence is a malleable time of personal evolution, where core values and competencies are “shaped by constitutional givens and by socialization experience in a particular sociocultural matrix.”38 It is this intersection of different determinants, converging with the feedback of personal decision making when encountering novel events, that ultimately informs an adult’s development. The culture at large and the society that is born from those cultural influences are what create this interplay of people and moments that make up a life.39

Research into school culture connects it to influencing student achievement. MacNeil, Prater, and Busch, in their work on the effect of school culture and achievement, noted “that school culture and climate were among the top influences in affecting improved student achievement,” and they also found that better school cultures tend to have better teachers.40 Additionally, Isakson and Jarvis have also examined academic achievement and found that during the transition to high school, different

38 Clausen, “Adolescent Competence,” 805.


stressors can negatively impact achievement.\textsuperscript{41}

When examining the specific culture that a particular school can embody, there is an established relationship between a school’s culture and the climate that it presents, as the school climate represents manifestations of the school’s cultural norms, values, and rituals.\textsuperscript{42} The significance of school culture, and by extension, school climate, on a student’s educational experience and greater adolescent development, cannot be understated. Using climate as a way to study school culture has been shown to be easier to handle, as it is a more definitive look at the circumstances of the school. Climate has less figurative descriptions to draw inferences from, and research has “concluded that climate presents fewer problems in terms of empirical measurements.”\textsuperscript{43} Given the challenges of measuring culture, a significant amount of work has been based on using climate as “the preferred construct when measuring the organizational health of a school.”\textsuperscript{44} With school climate understood as a proxy for school culture, there has been shown to be a significant connection between the health of a school’s climate and developments in major student life issues.

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{42} MacNeil, “School Culture and Climate,” 75.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{43} MacNeil, “School Culture and Climate,” 75.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{44} MacNeil, “School Culture and Climate,” 75.
\end{flushright}
The list of variables that school climate influences are both deep and wide, from the overall safety of the school to the level of students and teachers engagement seen.\footnote{Amrit Thapa, Jonathan Cohen, Shawn Guffey, and Ann Higgins-D’ Alessandro, “A Review of School Climate Research,” \textit{Review of Educational Research} 83, no. 3 (2013): 358, http://www.jstor.org/stable/24434163.} On a macro level, positive school climate prevents both dropouts and bullying, leads to higher graduation rates, teacher retention, and school connectedness.\footnote{Thapa et al., “A Review of School Climate Research,” 357.} On a personal level, overall social, emotional and mental health, along with academic achievement and healthy relationships, are associated with the quality of the school climate.\footnote{Thapa et al., “A Review of School Climate Research,” 357.}

With a strongly interconnected relationship present, a positive school climate has been shown to “affect middle school students’ self-esteem, decrease the frequency of substance abuse and psychiatric problems, impact the motivation to learn, mitigate the negative impact of the socioeconomic context on academic success, and lessen sexual harassment.”\footnote{Thapa et al., “A Review of School Climate Research,” 360.} With boarding school students spending every hour of the week in a fluid school/home environment, the amplitude that the role of school climate will have on their experience is outsized. For a boarding school student, there is no constant home culture that one returns to daily to mitigate a weaker school climate or to provide a counter-balance to a school culture that conflicts with their own upbringing.

As it pertains to students receiving financial aid or coming from non-traditional boarding school backgrounds, Avi Astor, Benbenishty, and Nuñez Estrada showed that a
strong school culture can mitigate the role of socioeconomic status on academic success.\textsuperscript{49} This will not be an easy undertaking for a boarding school, for the advantages of wealth, and the privilege of prior cultural knowledge, likely become amplified as well in a fully residential setting. Any a priori knowledge of what to expect in a boarding school is probably a major asset for a student to possess.

Consistent with my hypothesis, work by Paul Dimaggio would suggest that a student who grows up in a family that values boarding school culture should be more at home in their new setting of schooling and living. By using their understanding of expectations, and their presentation of approved tastes and styles, students can communicate more easily and present outwardly as a person of status that belongs as a member of the group.\textsuperscript{50} This easily obtained cultural capital, because of socioeconomic privilege, is a significant leg up for high school, as cultural capital greatly impacts academic achievement to a level that is almost as great as a student’s actual measured ability.\textsuperscript{51}

School culture, school climate, a student’s cultural background, and obtained cultural capital, have all been shown to impact a student’s performance academically, as well as their overall well being and safety. This impact may vary by age and by setting, along with a host of other variables to consider. Pertinent to this research, though, is the


\textsuperscript{50} Dimaggio, “Cultural Capital,” 190.

\textsuperscript{51} Dimaggio, “Cultural Capital,” 199.
major implication that living at all times within the school’s culture in a boarding school setting might have.
Chapter V.

The Role of Socioeconomic Status in School Performance

Previous research has consistently shown that the role of socioeconomic status and academic achievement are intertwined. The work of Wolfram Schulz found socioeconomic status to “consistently be an important variable in explaining variance in student achievement.” Student family backgrounds have been noted as early as 1966 in the Coleman Study to determine achievement more than what school the student went to. To this day, income inequality has created a system in the United States where an individual rising up out of poverty due to education remains the exception and not the rule.

---


When looking for a definition of socioeconomic status, the consensus is that socioeconomic status is determined by income, education, and occupation.\textsuperscript{56} In terms of income, a recent study by Hazzouri et al. showed that low income sustained over time impaired cognitive function.\textsuperscript{57} Research by Mani, Mullainathan, Shafir, and Zhao furthers the argument for poverty having an impact in terms of cognitive capacity, as the simple fact of being poor taxes mental capacity and uses up mental assets that could be used on other pursuits.\textsuperscript{58} Income advantages are persistent throughout a student’s educational career in the United States, and, importantly for this research, they matter more for precollege outcomes.\textsuperscript{59}

However, the more complex construct of socioeconomic status, and not just low-income, cannot be denied as an influential factor in school performance. Studies have shown that three of the greatest variables on educational attainment is the person’s demonstrated intellect, parent and peer support of education, and the family’s

\textsuperscript{56} Schultz, “Measuring,” 3.


socioeconomic status. Therefore the impact of social class, as well as income, has a bearing on school performance.

Khan’s work on privilege at St. Paul’s School supported the idea that “the apple does not actually fall far from the tree,” and that the class effect helped predict the outcomes of children based on parents origins. The challenges are systemic and recursive, with children from less-educated families not receiving the same encouragement to complete college as the children of their college-educated peers equal. One dominant theory to the obstacle less-educated families face is the status quo thesis, which posits that the forces in place that maintain the educational status quo are often stronger than the encouragement needed to deviate from the prescribed path, due to the risks and consequences that come with leaving the safety of your social group.

This status quo thesis unsurprisingly works reciprocally as well. For those students occupying a place of privilege, there is an unquestioning bend towards obtaining the level of education their parents have, and a sense of failure if they do not. In this way, “for many students, the ‘choice’ to continue to and complete higher education is not really a choice at all.” This status quo thesis is most likely at work in a boarding school environment as well. The idea of legacy is well entrenched in this setting, as children of
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alumni are celebrated on occasion, and alumni themselves are often specially recognized at school events. In some instances, it is even made a part of the physical fabric of the institution. In the instance of St. Paul’s School, all alumni have their names engraved on wood panels throughout the dining areas, and it is tradition to rub the names of any relatives you have who graduated from the School. While likely not an intentional cultural mechanism used to demarcate outsiders from insiders, the overall practice would in one way serve to reinforce an idea that a certain group belongs, or has ownership in the institution, that can only come from one’s cultural status.

The overall landscape of socioeconomic status and social mobility does offer two clear but somewhat opposing points to reconcile. It is without a doubt that the familial socioeconomic position will impact a child’s future position, and that relationship is a strong one with to contend.65 Concurrently, it has also been shown that education does offer an individual a path forward to improve their socioeconomic status.66 With this duality in existence, in order to be successful, educational institutions have the double-barreled responsibility of mitigating the incoming effects that socioeconomic status has on its students, while at the same time being responsible for providing the main path forward for social mobility.

65 Reisel, “Two Paths,” 262.

66 Reisel, “Two Paths,” 263.
Wading into the investigation of a school’s culture exposes, sometimes unpleasantly, the underpinnings of how schools work, and importantly, how students experience the pressures of cultural alignment. The pressures are not always obvious, and unless duly noted, can be challenging to engage, as the assumption to consider the current status quo as normal is powerful. If anything, it has been noted that “whatever in a culture is stated as if it were natural is precisely what is cultural.” Working with that supposition, many significant questions must be asked, and pseudo-sacred tenets must be challenged, in order to evaluate the operational status of a school’s culture. Since culture is a living entity, changing and evolving based upon responses to environmental pressures, the idea of cultural transmission, or the way that “values and attendant behavior are taught,” is central to educational anthropology and has a long history.

In 1978 Comitas and Dolgin’s work considered cultural transmission to be the “sine qua non of most cultural anthropologists involved with education” and to even suggest that cultural transmission could “stand as the anthropological definition of
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education itself.”69 Their work, done at a time when the theory in the field was limited and educational anthropology was considered “best described as ethnographic,” was seeking to take the field further in integrating educational study with anthropology, as well as to call to attention the underlying assumptions in Western education that were influenced by larger society.70 By looking at cultural transmission within educational settings, the disciplines intersect significantly.

When discussing cultural transmission, there are two major methods to consider. The first is enculturation or the generational transfer of culture/identity. This can happen quite easily in a boarding school, as there are students that are direct descendants of alumni, or often called legacy students. Current siblings of recent graduates are often enrolled as well, adding layers to the familial nature to boarding schools. Also importantly, the involvement of alumni can be significant in maintaining the life of the school, as they often serve on Boards of Trustees, influential committees, and support groups, and often occupy places in the school’s active administration. Long-standing school traditions, also supported by alumni, are often incorporated into daily student life, both overtly and in an underlying fashion.

The transmission of culture here can be seen as one’s own culture being learned; it is a familiar culture being passed down. This is enculturation at work. At boarding schools with this structure, some students have this direct enculturative advantage within the cultural system, i.e. because mom or dad went there, a legacy student knows some of


70 Comitas and Dolgin, “On Anthropology and Education,” 171 and 166.
what to expect. Additionally, there is a greater socioeconomic culture that can be seen as enculturative to a boarding school setting in general. Highly educated families with private school backgrounds, may also “have academic culture as their native culture and can maintain a familiar rapport with it that implies the unconsciousness of its acquisition.”71 This can be seen in ways such as knowing how to dress, how to interact on a personal level with teachers, or how to engage in a classroom. With this method of cultural transmission possible, enculturation would seem to offer significant advantages.

In addition to enculturation, there is a second major process of cultural transmission called acculturation, or the transfer of identity between cultures. By definition, “acculturation refers to changes that take place as a result of contact with culturally dissimilar people, groups, and social influences.”72 This can be seen as learning another culture from the viewpoint of one’s own, separate cultural upbringing, and the process of how the new culture transfers to the outside individual. In this type of transmission, there is an outsider that has less familiarity with the culture they are entering and they require an analysis and comparison with one’s previous culture to integrate it. In a simplistic form, encountering a new culture from an acculturative perspective, as compared to an enculturative perspective, can lead to potentially

71 Khan, *Privilege*, 83.

existential type questions such as “Who am I? To which group do I belong?”73 There are also developmental issues of cultural identity, development of self and family relationships that are complicated by acculturation.74

Acculturation fundamentally requires change, but to understand that change, context is essential. The “interactional context” that surrounds acculturation includes items such as demographics, origin, and socioeconomic status.75 For children, however, the process of acculturation is more complex, as it combines both the influences of one’s surroundings and “a deliberate process by which parents, schools…and others transmit cultural practices, beliefs, and values as well as attitudes about which culture(s) is/are more desirable to adopt.”76 Therefore children have to deal with the adult decisions and pressures within their own cultural upbringing, as well as their own challenges and opportunities when encountering cultural influences.77 With this in mind, American schools, in general have already been examined to understand the obstacles that immigrants might face upon entering their new setting.

While immigrants coming to American schools encapsulate a unique set of circumstances that are likely magnified in comparison to boarding school students, the
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body of work surrounding immigrant acculturation in educational settings nevertheless holds results worth examining in the uncommon context of boarding schools. First and foremost, it is worth noting that, culturally, similarities help in adaptation. For children coming from Western societies with similar values to America, the acculturation process is easier than those from dissimilar cultures to the United States.\textsuperscript{78} Additionally, given the pressure to acculturate that immigrant children can experience in schools, it behooves institutions to find ways to offer students paths to upholding their heritage while integrating with their new surroundings.\textsuperscript{79} Both of those concepts align with my hypothesis.

While acculturation encompasses the large concept of what happens when discordant cultures meet, there are sub-strategies of how people actually do acculturate when that contact happens. The four different methods are dependent on two main variables: the extent a person wishes to maintain their heritage culture, and the amount and quality of contact desired with the other cultural group.\textsuperscript{80} The approaches are assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization.\textsuperscript{81}

On one end of the spectrum, assimilation exists as a method to adapt to the new culture presented. Over the course of American history, detaching one’s identity from the past and adopting the host culture’s values outright was a frequent path born by many
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immigrants. Opposing assimilation would be the strategy of separation, where the new culture is completely avoided and a cultural citadel is built in a foreign land. Lost in the cultural doldrums, usually by force, would be the “strategy” of marginalization, a space of no new culture being gained nor old culture being maintained. As this is hardly a desirable position, marginalization is less of a strategy and more a state of circumstantial being.\(^{82}\) Finally, integration, also referred to biculturalism, appears to be the modern preferred method of acculturation, although coming to that determination requires a sort of analytical accord. The analytical concern surrounds actually determining what level of adaptation is desirable, and against what population should the standard be set? The crux of the matter, as articulated by David Sam and John Berry, is the potential comparison group could be as varied as “nonacculturating members of their own ethnic group, other acculturating groups in the new society, members of the new and larger society”…or some other “psychometrically and standardized instrument measuring adaptation?”\(^{83}\)

With that caveat acknowledged, biculturalism shows promise as an acculturation strategy. Once again turning to Sam and Berry, biculturalism seeks to “maintain the original culture while participating in the larger society,” but it too takes on different forms.\(^{84}\) Within biculturalism there is a method of keeping the old and new cultures separate, to be used as needed to interact with whatever culture is presenting itself. There

\(^{82}\) Sam and Berry, “Acculturation,” 476.
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is also a blended method that seeks to harmonize the two cultures into a new one.\textsuperscript{85}

Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, and Szapocznik’s work has found biculturalism to produce people with higher self-esteem, better mental health quality and more desirable behavior\textsuperscript{86} With a nod towards Sam and Berry’s comparison group dilemma, Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, and Szapocznik measured “‘blended’ bicultural individuals” against “those who kept their heritage and receiving cultural streams separate” when figuring out these results and found blended individuals did better in acculturating.\textsuperscript{87} This information should be a part of a school’s student life strategy.

Even with these acculturation strategies present, there is cultural friction involved. This friction is referred to as acculturative stress and can be considered the individual’s response to the pressures of becoming a part of the new culture. Some of the compelling factors involved are the size of the populations involved, and the disposition of the dominant culture to the outsiders. Dina Birman and Dorothy Addae have shown that dominant cultures can pressure immigrants to assimilate if they are seen as a cultural threat. Conversely, if a local cultural polity with size and resources exists, such as a Little Italy or a Chinatown, the pressure to assimilate, or even acculturate, significantly lessens.\textsuperscript{88}

When the acculturative stress is felt though, it stems from the problematic nature
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of the disparate cultures colliding. Dealing with that tension is at the core of the process of acculturation. Faced with a choice that would make one’s parents upset, but one’s native cultural peers happy, it is not as easy, or perhaps even possible, to consider a blended or bicultural answer. Acculturative stress ensues. It is important to note that “not all acculturation changes result in acculturative stress because there are a number of moderating and mediating factors,” and it is in this recognition that boarding schools must understand their role.

There is also support in the idea that a critical mass of students from a certain cultural group aids in assisting additional students from that group in acculturation. Nieri’s work with Latino students showed that the size of the already acculturated population matters when examining the acculturation process of younger students into the school. Simply put, the larger amount of students that have been acculturated, the more it positively affects individual acculturation.

Demes and Geeraert’s work show that there are many different courses for adjustment into a new culture. There are several patterns that describe the adjustment period and
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could potentially be found in this research, such as:

- an acculturative stress or “culture shock” U-curve model,
- a midpoint strain or an inverse U-curve model
- a relieved or a reverse J-curve model
- a well-adjusted or flatline group

With many potentially different adjustment patterns, it is quite possible that different socioeconomic groups could have different patterns within the same school.

In a boarding school setting, Kahn encountered at least one student at St. Paul’s who seemed to showcase the tension and challenges of acculturation within the school culture. He writes about a black girl named Carla who in an interaction stated: “‘I do really well here,’ she began, ‘but I didn’t always. I did really badly at first. And I thought it was because I was stupid or something. Like I didn’t get it. But that was the thing, I didn’t get it. I wasn’t dumb, I just didn’t know how to talk like you want me to talk.’”

As Khan further interacts with Carla, it’s clear that not only is Carla potentially showcasing her acquired biculturalism, she also has a tone of frustration that likely speaks to the acculturative stress she experienced in the process. In particular, Carla refers to this new way of talking as “bullshitting” to teachers to give them what they want.

Carla’s referencing of her newly found way of talking as using a language that “was not hers” (and therefore having the quality of “bullshit”) can be seen as a bicultural

---


individual that is keeping her heritage culture and the school culture streams separately.\textsuperscript{95}

She has not blended her old self before St. Paul’s with her newly acquired cultural knowledge of the school. Rather her identity seems more intact and defined now that it has been exposed to something else.

Comparatively, Khan writes about interacting with a white, working-class boy named George whose comes from a farm. George, too, struggled in the transition required to become a successful St. Paul’s student. He knew he was going to have to work hard coming in, but that was not enough. George talks one day of “just getting it” and understanding how the world works, and how it is definitely not “bullshit”.\textsuperscript{96} In this manner, George would appear to represent more of a blended biculturalism than Carla does.

Carla is also an example of the potential role that critical mass can play in student acculturation. Her observed interaction by Khan was that of her, a senior, interacting with a freshman black girl, Lacy. Carla’s advice and mentorship to Lacy, the freshman, is meant to assist her in the transition to St. Paul’s expectations, and in a larger sense, culture. Without students like Carla already enrolled, presumably Lacy would be left on her own to either “just get it” or find the tools to “bullshit” her way through the School.

\textsuperscript{95} Khan, \textit{Privilege}, 103.
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Chapter VII.

Findings

There was a statistically significant relationship between socioeconomic status and boarding school cultural adaptation, so I can reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis. There were numerous variables to consider, and the different correlations found possibly offer some unexpected insight into the nature of cultural adjustment issues at boarding schools. The various correlations are discussed as follows.

Foremost, there is a correlation between both measures of socioeconomic status and certain aspects of cultural adaptation at boarding schools. The measures of socioeconomic status used were the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (MacArthur Scale) and the Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS). The aspects of cultural adaptation are categorized by the different types of questions asked on my survey. The survey questions used can be grouped into the following five sections, each section assessing different dimensions of adaptation:

1. Section One deals with learning new skills and behaviors in the new culture.
2. Section Two encompasses questions about adjusting to the living conditions, including items like academic expectations and food.
3. Section Three asks about overall life satisfaction.
4. Section Four handles issues of cross-cultural interaction.
5. Section Five looks to understand personal difficulties encountered in the new culture.

A Spearman’s rank-order correlation was run to assess the relationship between both measures of socioeconomic status and the average scores in the five different survey
sections. Preliminary analysis showed three of the five different sections (Sections One, Two and Five) to be monotonic, as assessed by visual inspection of a scatterplot. There were strong positive and negative correlations between the MacArthur Scale of socioeconomic status and all three survey sections determined to be monotonic: Section One $r_s(213) = .315, p < .0005$, Section Two $r_s(213) = .195, p < .004$, Section Five $r_s(213) = -.149, p < .027$. There was additionally a positive correlation between the BSMSS Scale and Section One of $r_s(270) = .146, p < .015$.\footnote{Table 4.}\footnote{Laerd Statistics, Statistical tutorials and software guides, 2015.}

The primary finding is that Section One correlated to both measures of socioeconomic status, indicating that students from lower socioeconomic status do not consider themselves as competent in the basic skills to exist in the new culture. With both measures reinforcing this connection, an additional Spearman’s rank-order correlation was run on the individual survey items of Section One to find what questions had a similar significant overlapping correlation. The areas of overlapping correlation were questions that asked competency about:

1. Acquiring the things I need or want
2. Adapting to the pace of life
3. Dressing appropriately in various social settings
4. Building and maintaining relationships
5. Accurately interpreting and responding to other people’s gestures and facial expressions

These areas highlight that there is possibly a common summary to be made. According to this analysis, students from lower socioeconomic statuses have more difficulty having
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some of the material items, such as clothes, that they need to be a part of the new culture. Additionally, students from lower socioeconomic statuses have more difficulty with personal relationships and engaging in non-verbal interactions within the culture. If taken seriously by schools looking to support all of their students, this would suggest that additional efforts are needed to mitigate material and relationship issues.

Multiple linear regressions were also run to understand the effect of both the MacArthur and BSMSS measures of socioeconomic status on the survey section averages. For the MacArthur and BSMSS Scales, linearity was established against the survey sections by visual inspection of a scatterplot for each survey section. Against the MacArthur Scale and BSMSS, both Section One and Section Five indicated a linear relationship between both variables.

First, for the MacArthur Scale and Section One, there was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.057, and there was homoscedasticity, as assessed by a visual inspection of a plot of standardized residuals versus standardized predicted values. One outlier (-3.168) just beyond the standard residual used (3) was kept in the regression as there were no data entry issues. Residuals were normally distributed as assessed by visual inspection of a normal probability plot.\(^{99}\)

The prediction equation was: Section One Average = 3.598 + 0.006*MacArthur Scale. MacArthur Scale significantly predicted Section One Average, \(F(1, 216) = 24.70, p < .0005\), 10.2% of the variation in Section One adaptation score with adjusted \(R^2\) =

\(^{99}\) Laerd Statistics.
9.8%, a medium size effect according to Cohen. Predictions were made to determine mean Section One Averages for people who indicated a socioeconomic status score of either 25, 50, 75 or 95 out of a possible 100 points (with 100 being the maximum socioeconomic status attainable). For 25 points, mean Section One Average was predicted as 3.75 (95% CI, 3.62 to 3.87); for 50 points it was predicted as 3.90 (95% CI, 3.82 to 3.97); for 75 points it was predicted as 4.05 (95% CI, 4.0 to 4.1); and for 95 points it was predicted as 4.12 (95% CI, 4.09 to 4.25).

Next, for the BSMSS and Section One, there was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.078, and there was homoscedasticity, as assessed by a visual inspection of a plot of standardized residuals versus standardized
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predicted values. One outlier (-3.024) was kept in the regression as there were no data
dentry issues and it was close to the standard deviation. Residuals were normally
distributed as assessed by visual inspection of a normal probability plot.102

The prediction equation was: Section One Average = 3.78 + 0.005*BSMSS.
BSMSS significantly predicted Section One Average, $F(1, 223) = 4.28, p < .040$, 1.9% of
the variation in Section One adaptation score with adjusted $R^2 = 1.4\%$, a small size effect
according to Cohen.103 Predictions were made to determine mean Section One Averages
for people who indicated a BSMSS socioeconomic status score of either 21, 42, 57 or 66
(with 66 being the maximum socioeconomic status attainable). For a 21 score, mean
Section One Average was predicted as 3.87 (95% CI, 3.72 to 4.03); for 42 score it was
predicted as 3.97 (95% CI, 3.90 to 4.05); for 57 score it was predicted as 4.04 (95% CI,
3.99 to 4.10); and for 66 score it was predicted as 4.09 (95% CI, 4.01 to 4.16).104

102 Laerd Statistics.
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Then, for the MacArthur Scale and Section Five, there was independence of
residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.87, and there was
homoscedasticity, as assessed by a visual inspection of a plot of standardized residuals
versus standardized predicted values. Three outliers were kept in the regression as there
were no data entry issues. Residuals were normally distributed as assessed by visual
inspection of a normal probability plot.  

The prediction equation was: Section Five Average = 2.073 + -0.004*MacArthur
Scale. MacArthur Scale significantly predicted Section Five Average, $F(1, 216) = 6.70, p$
< .010, 3.0% of the variation in Section Five adaptation score with adjusted $R^2 = 2.6\%$, a
small size effect according to Cohen.  

Predictions were made to determine mean

\[ y = 3.78 + 4.62e^{-3}x \]
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Section Five Averages for people who indicated a socioeconomic status score of either 25, 50, 75 or 95 out of a possible 100 points (with 100 being the maximum socioeconomic status attainable). For 25 points, mean Section Five Average was predicted as 1.98 (95% CI, 1.83 to 2.13); for 50 points it was predicted as 1.89 (95% CI, 1.80 to 1.98); for 75 points it was predicted as 1.80 (95% CI, 1.73 to 1.86); and for 95 points it was predicted as 1.72 (95% CI, 1.63 to 1.81).\textsuperscript{107}

Finally, for the BSMSS and Section Five, there was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.74, and there was homoscedasticity, as assessed by a visual inspection of a plot of standardized residuals versus standardized predicted values. Three outliers were kept in the regression as there were no data entry

\textsuperscript{107} Laerd Statistics.
issues. Residuals were normally distributed as assessed by visual inspection of a normal probability plot.\textsuperscript{108}

The prediction equation was: \textit{Section Five Average} = 2.060 + -0.005*BSMSS. BSMSS significantly predicted \textit{Section Five Average}, $F(1, 223) = 2.978, p < .086$, 1.3\% of the variation in \textit{Section One} adaptation score with adjusted $R^2 = 0.9\%$, a small size effect according to Cohen.\textsuperscript{109} Predictions were made to determine mean \textit{Section Five} Averages for people who indicated a BSMSS socioeconomic status score of either 21, 42, 57 or 66 (with 66 being the maximum socioeconomic status attainable). For a 21 score, mean \textit{Section Five Average} was predicted as 1.96 (95\% CI, 1.77 to 2.15); for 42 score it was predicted as 1.86 (95\% CI, 1.77 to 1.96); for 57 score it was predicted as 1.79 (95\% CI, 1.72 to 1.86); and for 66 score it was predicted as 1.75 (95\% CI, 1.66 to 1.84).\textsuperscript{110}
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Another area of examination undertaken was considering if the current grade of
the student, or if the number of years at the school, was associated with higher cultural
adaptation in Section One, given the previous interaction with socioeconomic status
witnessed previously. A Spearman’s rank-order correlation was run to assess the
relationship between Section One Average and both number of years at the school and
current grade. Preliminary analysis showed the relationship to be monotonic, as assessed
by visual inspection of a scatterplot. There was a moderate positive correlation between
Section One Average and the number of years at the school, $r_s(217) = .145, p < .033$.
Furthermore, there was a moderate positive correlation between Section One Average
and current grade, $r_s(217) = .142, p < .037$. Both of these findings support the
developmental differences in adolescences discussed in Chapter three.

Additionally, I examined other socioeconomic and cultural related dichotomous
variables to look for relationships between them and cultural adaptation. The independent
surveyed variables of financial aid status, legacy status, and prior sibling status were compared against the five different section scores for cultural adaptation. Findings varied.

For financial aid status, a Kruskal-Wallis H test was conducted to determine if there were differences in the five different cultural adaptation section averages between groups that differed in their financial aid status: the “yes” (n = 82), “no” (n = 121), and “unsure” (n = 11) financial aid status groups. Distributions of section averages were similar for all groups, as assessed by visual inspection of a boxplot. The major finding was that the median average for Section Four was statistically significantly different between groups, $\chi^2(2) = 7.775, p = .021$. However, the differences were not statistically significant for Sections One ($\chi^2(2) = 4.689, p = .096$), Two ($\chi^2(2) = 2.039, p = .361$), Three ($\chi^2(2) = 2.124, p = .346$) and Five ($\chi^2(2) = 1.187, p = .552$).

Subsequently, pairwise comparisons for Section 4 were performed using Dunn’s (1964) procedure with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Adjusted p-values are presented. This post hoc analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in median section four average between financial aid “yes” (124.60) and financial aid “no” (101.13) ($p = .026$), but not between financial aid “unsure” (92.05) and any other group combination.

Section Four questions dealt with cross-cultural interactions, and this analysis reviewed those interactions against financial aid status. The positive correlation for students on financial aid may by association support the hypothesis, as students on
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financial aid tend to be from a lower socioeconomic status than those that are not. The challenges faced here suggest that students on aid have to adjust their interactions more.

Finally, one possible important finding of this research is that the two different measures of socioeconomic status received two different amplitudes of correlation. This may be because socioeconomic measures are different in one fundamental way. The Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS) calculated the socioeconomic rating independently by asking questions about parent’s education and jobs, while the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status asked for students to subjectively rate themselves on a socioeconomic scale. In my research, the MacArthur Scale proved to be more strongly associated with the level of cultural adaptation than the BSMSS.

This is a key finding of my research that suggests that how students think of themselves in socioeconomic related terms is more impactful to boarding school cultural adjustment than the actual socioeconomic status individuals hold. This finding aligns with my literature review and hypothesis and has the most practical implications for schools to consider. Boarding schools, even with the use of financial aid to make the institutions more inclusive, are not able to actually adjust for the individual socioeconomic status on every student. However, my research suggests that they can do more to affect how low income students will think of themselves and their place at these schools.
Chapter VIII.

Research Methods

To test my hypothesis, I conducted a cross-sectional design survey administered to high school boarding school students to determine if there is a relationship between socioeconomic status and cultural adaptation. First, three highly selective boarding schools agreed to participate in my survey. These schools are among the most prestigious and elite boarding schools in the country, with long histories, significant endowments, and influential alumni. With such weight and status, a historical, dominant culture likely exists at each school. Each school on average enrolled approximately 473 boarding students each year, with a total published enrollment of 1,419 boarding school students, and this collection of students was the participant group. Of the 1,419 students, 275 responses were collected for a 19.4% response rate.

The survey was undertaken by boarding school students in grades 9-12, and postgraduate, by being contacted via email by their respective Dean of Students about the survey, and given a link to complete the survey online. Survey takers anonymously answered questions for approximately 12-15 minutes about both their cultural adjustment and their socioeconomic status. All questions were voluntary.

The survey administered consisted of two separate parts: one to assess the student’s socioeconomic status and one to measure the student’s sociocultural

\[\text{\footnotesize Table 4.}\]
adjustment. I measured the student’s socioeconomic status using both The Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS) and a modified version of the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status.¹¹⁴ Both measures look at social status as a proxy for socioeconomic status. I then also measured the individual student’s sociocultural adjustment using the Revised Sociocultural Adaptation Scale by Jessie Wilson.¹¹⁵ This survey asks about competences regarding relationship building/maintaining, social interaction, adapting to lifestyle, dealing with bureaucracy, and changes to personal behavior.

With both measures implemented, I grouped and analyzed the data for each individual student. Areas of student cultural adaptation into boarding school were measured against the socioeconomic status scale created. When analyzing the data, socioeconomic status was the independent variable and different survey sections about sociocultural adaptation were the dependent variables. Additionally, other independent variables such as financial aid and legacy status, years at the school, and current grade were measured against the survey section dependent variables as well.


Chapter IX.
Research Limitations

This research required cooperation from schools involved and needed a level of openness from school officials to allow access to their student body. Preliminary discussions with school officials at over ten different schools indicated that this would be possible, however in the end, only three schools participated. Originally, the group of schools came from the Eight Schools Association, a group meeting since the 1970s and consisting of Choate Rosemary Hall, Deerfield Academy, Hotchkiss School, Lawrenceville School, Northfield Mount Hermon, Phillips Exeter Academy, Phillips Andover, and St. Paul’s School.116

The biggest obstacle I faced in working with these schools was the timing of the survey. Due to the required Institutional Research Board approval process, I was not able to implement the survey until the spring term. At that point, many schools cited an unwillingness to add another survey to their student’s demands that late in the year. Additionally, once the actual survey was reviewed by some school officials, some were only willing to proceed if their own institutional researchers could modify the survey to their liking, which was not an option.

For those schools that did participate, the research was limited by the populations present at these boarding schools and the accuracy of their self-reported data. Individual computer or phone access was necessary, but they are often required or provided at these schools.
Conclusion

This thesis has demonstrated that students in an elite boarding school environment who have a lower level of cultural adaptation in regards to learning new skills and behaviors, and in terms of handling personal difficulties, are more likely to come from a lower socioeconomic status. In particular, it was identified that students from lower socioeconomic status encounter issues acquiring things they need or want, adapting to the pace of life, dressing appropriately in various social settings, building and maintaining relationships, and interpreting and responding to gestures and expressions. Additionally, this thesis has determined that the cultural adaptation issues are mitigated by time and age; the older students are and the longer they are in the environment, regardless of socioeconomic status, the more they become adapted to the culture. Furthermore, this thesis has concluded that students on financial aid, who are most likely from lower socioeconomic statuses, have to adjust their cultural interactions more than those that are not receiving financial aid.

Finally, the comparison of two measures of socioeconomic status in my thesis revealed more sensitivity in the self-reported MacArthur Scale measure than the calculated BSMSS. This could be an area of future study. The differences may be based on the particular leveling inherent in each of the scales. It may also, though, mean something more intriguing. If the measures are both accurate, my thesis would then offer potential evidence that a student’s perception of their socioeconomic status appears to be a greater indicator of cultural adaptation than their actual socioeconomic standing.
Perception may indeed be 9/10 of reality and if so, schools should be aware of this key distinction as they look to improve their cultures.
Appendix 1.

Tables

Table 1

Percentage of Students on Financial Aid 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percent on Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choate Rosemary Hall</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Academy</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotchkiss School</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrenceville School</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Mount Hermon</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Academy</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Exeter Academy</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s School</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*New Students 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>New Students</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choate Rosemary Hall</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Academy</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotchkiss School</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrenceville School</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield Mount Hermon</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Academy</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Exeter Academy</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul’s School</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>257</strong></td>
<td><strong>795</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

School Enrollment 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Boarding Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,419</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

**Spearman's Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BSMSS</th>
<th>MacArthur</th>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Section 2</th>
<th>Section 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSMSS</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.146*</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.146*</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.604**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.604**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.149*</td>
<td>-.616**</td>
<td>-.628**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 6

Financial Aid Variable Kruskal-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The distribution of Section 1 Average is the same across categories of Financial Aid.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>Retain the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The distribution of Section 2 Average is the same across categories of Financial Aid.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>Retain the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The distribution of Section 3 Average is the same across categories of Financial Aid.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>Retain the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The distribution of Section 4 Average is the same across categories of Financial Aid.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>Reject the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The distribution of Section 5 Average is the same across categories of Financial Aid.</td>
<td>Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>Retain the null hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.
Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>Section 4 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA Yes</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA No</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Unsure</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>7.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymptotic Sig. (2-sided test)</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The test statistic is adjusted for ties.
Table 7

Financial Aid Pairwise Comparison

Pairwise Comparisons of Financial Aid

Each node shows the sample average rank of Financial Aid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 1-Sample 2</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Test Statistic</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Adj.Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA Unsure–FA No</td>
<td>9.083</td>
<td>19.801</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA Unsure–FA Yes</td>
<td>32.558</td>
<td>20.217</td>
<td>1.610</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA No–FA Yes</td>
<td>23.476</td>
<td>8.947</td>
<td>2.624</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each row tests the null hypothesis that the Sample 1 and Sample 2 distributions are the same. Asymptotic significances (2-sided tests) are displayed. The significance level is .05. Significance values have been adjusted by the Bonferroni correction for multiple tests.


