

AN EVALUATION OF A SUMMER  
MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

by

Susan Smith, Shelhamer,

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

Jimmie Fortune  
Co-chairman

Ronald McKeen  
Co-chairman

Kenneth Underwood

Wayne Worner

Theodore Cromack

Patricia Gould-Champ

August 1986

Blacksburg, Virginia

1/6 11 4. 22. 87

AN EVALUATION OF A SUMMER MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

by

Susan Smith Shelhamer

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between school-related behaviors of migrant students enrolled in a summer program and selected factors in the home and school which may interact with academic performance.

The research strategy utilized three components to address the research questions: an ethnographic study of selected students, teachers and personnel; a teacher survey with achievement data on students; and paired student-parent interviews.

The research questions to be addressed were: (a) What educational needs were reported for migrant students by school personnel and parents? (b) What was the cultural and psychological context of the school for migrant students? (c) How did the educational values of migrant parents and students relate to academic performance and school philosophy? (d) For a migrant population, did the study habits relate to academic performance? (e) What was the

relationship of English proficiency to academic performance?

(f) What were the strengths and weaknesses of the program as reported by parents and program personnel and as reported through research observations?

Crosstabulations and frequencies were used to report interview data. The quantitative component utilized a regression analysis and the Developmental Research Sequence was used for ethnographic analyses.

The findings of the study indicated that the summer migrant education programs of Virginia were facilitating the pursuit of education through their programming by providing positive academic experiences. Students exhibited academic gains. In addition, the programs provided an important social function by offering full day programs and individualized health-related services. There was a lack of parental involvement that would "personalize" the program for each family if nurtured. The components of the evaluation design provided for input from a variety of sources for program improvement.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Family, friends, professors and co-workers have supported me in numerous ways to bring this research project to fruition. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to them and to the members of my doctoral committee, namely:

and \_\_\_\_\_, for their many hours of persistent and continued guidance and expertise;

\_\_\_\_\_, for his support and direction in the administrative program;

\_\_\_\_\_, for his constructive criticism;

\_\_\_\_\_, for assistance in the development of the survey and interviews; and

\_\_\_\_\_, for Chapter 1 program expertise.

Gratitude is extended to Chapter 1 Migrant Education personnel who provide services to our migrant families, especially \_\_\_\_\_ a friend whose encouragement and assistance made this research possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	7
Limitations of the Study.....	8
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	10
Evaluation Results in Migrant Education.....	10
Strategies for Statewide Evaluation.....	16
State Evaluations.....	18
Information Deficiencies in Migrant Education	23
Factors Relevant to Migrant Education.....	24
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	34
Setting.....	34
Sampling Procedures.....	37
Sample.....	37
Data Collection.....	38
Selection of Variables.....	39

CHAPTER

3.	METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	34
	Research Design.....	43
	Data Analysis.....	45
4.	RESULTS.....	48
	Parent Interview.....	50
	Student Interview.....	56
	Teacher Survey.....	70
	Ethnographic Component.....	81
	Scaling Results.....	101
	Crosstabulation Results.....	103
	Regression Analysis of Relationships.....	117
	Summary and Interpretation of Responses.....	121
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	133
	Educational Needs.....	135
	Context of the School.....	136
	Educational Values.....	140
	Study Habits.....	142
	English Proficiency.....	142
	Program Strengths and Weaknesses.....	143
	Implications.....	145
	RESEARCHER'S COMMENTARY.....	147
	REFERENCES.....	149

APPENDIX

A	Instruments.....	155
B	State Performance Report.....	177
	VITA.....	181

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Location of Results in Chapter 4.....	49
2. Frequencies of Race for Parent Respondents.....	50
3. Frequencies of Language Spoken for Parent Respondents.....	50
4. Sample Distribution for Parent Respondents.....	51
5. Frequencies of Marital Status for Parent Respondents.....	51
6. Frequencies of Best About the Program Comments for Parent Respondents.....	53
7. Frequencies of Areas of Help Needed for Children.....	54
8. Frequencies of Child's Talk About School.....	54
9. Frequencies of Source of Homework Help.....	55
10. Student Grade Distribution.....	57
11. Frequencies of Student Ratings of Health and Ability.....	58
12. Frequencies of Bipolar Adjectives for Students.	59
13. Frequencies of Responses to Worry Questions for Students.....	60
14. Frequencies of Career Aspirations for Students.	61
15. Frequencies of Reactions to School Subjects for Students.....	62
16. Frequencies of Ways to Improve in School for Students.....	64
17. Frequencies of Student After School Activities for Students and Parents.....	66

TABLE	Page
18. Frequencies of Student Ability to Speak English for Students and Parents.....	67
19. Frequencies of Student Ability to Understand English for Students and Parents.....	67
20. Frequencies of Student Ability to Read English for Students and Parents.....	68
21. Frequencies of Student Ability to Understand What They Read for Students and Parents.....	68
22. Frequencies of Student Ability to Write English for Students and Parents.....	69
23. Frequencies of Education Levels for Teachers.....	70
24. Frequencies of Years of Teaching Experience.....	71
25. Distribution of Summer Teaching Assignments.....	71
26. Distribution of Objectives for Teacher Expectations in Reading.....	72
27. Distribution of Objectives for Teacher Expectations in Mathematics.....	73
28. Distribution of Objectives for Resource Teacher Expectations.....	73
29. Distribution of Parent Contacts.....	75
30. Means and Standard Deviations of Student Descriptors.....	76
31. Means and Standard Deviations of Educational Needs.....	77
32. Means and Standard Deviations of School Components.....	79
33. Distribution of NCE Scores for Students in the Ethnographic Sample.....	95
34. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Sex.....	104

TABLE	Page
35. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Marital Status.....	104
36. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Books.....	105
37. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Mother's Education.....	105
38. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Father's Education.....	105
39. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and School Enjoyment.....	106
40. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Feeling of Being Fortunate.....	106
41. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Ability.....	106
42. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Health.....	107
43. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Sociability.....	107
44. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Friends.....	108
45. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Mean Children.....	108
46. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Self-concept.....	108
47. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Homework.....	109
48. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Homework Help.....	109
49. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Television.....	110

TABLE	Page
50. Crosstabulation of School Progress and Attendance.....	110
51. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Grade Level.....	111
52. Means of Pre-Post Matched Scores Showing Gains in Reading.....	112
53. Means of Pre-Post Matched Scores Showing Gains in Mathematics.....	112
54. Profile of Significant Achievers.....	114
55. Regression Coefficients for Reading.....	118
56. Regression Coefficients for Mathematics.....	120
57. Parent-Student Consistencies in English Proficiency.....	129
58. Crosstabulation of Index of School Progress and Race.....	130

## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction and Problem Statement

Title I of Public Law (P.L.) 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, authorized a national educational program for disadvantaged children. This act was amended in November, 1966 by P.L. 89-750 to incorporate special provisions for children of migratory agricultural workers. This identifiable group was already living well below the poverty level and the mobility of the family was necessary to seek continuous employment in agriculture, fishing, or related industries. Federal monies were allocated to state educational agencies (SEAs) for the special academic needs of migrant children who face a lack of educational continuity complicated by health and social problems which may be the result of frequent mobility and lack of financial resources. Monies were to be targeted for supplemental instruction, supportive services, intrastate and interstate coordination of migrant projects, and the transmittal of records.

SEA expenditures of federal funds were channeled through local education agencies (LEAs) for a wide array of service delivery systems throughout the United States and its territories.

There are two basic types of programs in Virginia

which offer services to eligible students in residence during the summer or the regular school term. The regular term project provides an instructional program of basic skills activities that supplement regular classroom instruction. Support services such as medical and dental care and clothing needs are provided based on a preliminary needs assessment. The summer migrant education programs are not supplementary but provide intensive all-day instruction of basic skills, music, art, and physical education with support services available for identified needs. Parent involvement and program evaluation are a legislative mandate for both programs.

The evaluation of the success of compensatory education programs has been a concern of Congress due to the level of appropriations. The two federally funded national migrant education evaluations that were conducted in 1974 and 1978 were unable to attribute educational gains to program services due to the lack of consistent data and the mobility of the population. Desperate for uniform evaluative criteria, the Department of Education initiated the State Performance Report. This report encouraged 49 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C. to aggregate local data to produce state data. The State Performance Report required: (a) participation information of students by sex, age, category, program type, and subject area; (b) staff

information; and (c) achievement data that was reported in no specified format. This report did not distinguish among amounts, kinds, and quality of services.

Numerous migrant education evaluation reports have been completed on the state and local levels. Most state evaluation designs have been limited to demographic data and achievement gains.

Migrant education programs operate by providing funds to LEAs that identify and serve eligible students. These students are identified as currently migratory or formerly migratory. Congress has prioritized expenditures for SEA's by stating that currently mobile school-aged migrant children will be served before school-aged migratory children whose parents have chosen to settle in a community.

The special educational needs of migrant children necessitate more intensive application of educational psychology than is normally employed in the regular classroom. Migrant students, as disadvantaged learners, are considered high-risk children in an unstable situation. A literature review indicates that information is needed in areas of self-concept improvement, exposure to language, home-school communications, culturally relevant instructional experiences, an understanding of migrant values and prioritized skills instruction (Sutton, 1972; Ritzenthaler, 1971; Zavaleta, 1971; Ott, 1971; Davis, 1972; Reul, 1974).

During a time of fiscal restraint and educational accountability, there will be a need for information to facilitate program planning. Knowing some of the needs of migrant students and some of the factors that have been linked to school success should provide a basis for investigation of relationships specific to migrant education students enrolled in a summer program. Home and school factors that show a significant relationship to school success will prove useful for program planning.

Limited staff and resources have directed LEA outputs to directly benefit migrant students, often overlooking the value of a quality program evaluation.

#### Statement of the Problem

After twenty years of administering compensatory programs under Chapter 1 (formerly Title I), the Department of Education is interested in identifying exemplary programs that demonstrate success. The SEA needs to aid the local school divisions in a determination of worthwhile and cost-effective features through the development of an evaluation design that is reflective of the scope and quality of the state's programs. The evaluation design needs to focus on the identification of factors associated with academic achievement in order to address some of these persistent questions posed by migrant educators such as:

How do instructors address the educational needs of a varied and disadvantaged population? What pedagogical techniques are most beneficial for this specialized population? What are the parental concerns regarding their child's education?

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between school-related behaviors of migrant students enrolled in a summer program and selected factors in the home and school which may interact with academic performance. Knowledge of the behaviors and factors associated with high academic performance will contribute to program improvement in instruction and documentation of academic growth for students during the period of program operation.

This study was designed to describe the educational needs of migrant students and to investigate home and school factors which have been linked to school success through prior research.

Some of the selected school-related behaviors of migrant students included: study habits (Coles, 1971); perceptions of school work (Beane, 1982); student opinions on how to improve in school (Fortune, 1985); self-reports of English proficiency (Valverde, 1981; Rodrigues-Brown & Junker, 1980); information on self-esteem (Purkey, 1978); and

student-initiated talk (Carter, 1980).

Selected factors in the home which refer to home characteristics that may relate to student achievement included: parental involvement in the student's schooling (Rich, 1980); and parent attitudes toward school (Burns, 1982). Parent attitudes toward the English language (Valverde, 1981) was a third factor that warranted research.

Some of the selected factors in the school included: (a) teacher expectations (Good & Brophy, 1984); (b) teacher perceptions of the educational needs of students (Savard & Cotton, 1983); (c) home school interface (Rich, 1980); (d) language patterns and mannerisms that constitute "warmth" (MaCaffery, 1971); (e) classroom usage of cultural background (Serrano, 1980), student experiences (Scott, 1971), and English language usage (Valverde, 1981); (f) teacher talk (Berliner, 1983); and (g) time on task (Stallings, 1980).

#### Research Questions

In pursuit of the study, the following research questions were formulated.

1. What educational needs are reported for migrant students by school personnel and parents?

2. What is the psychological and cultural context of the school for migrant students?

3. How do the educational values of migrant parents and students relate to academic performance and school philosophy?

4. For a migrant population, do the study habits of migrant students relate to academic performance?

5. What is the relationship of English proficiency to academic performance?

6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program as reported by parents and program personnel and as reported through research observations?

#### Significance of the Study

This study was intended to provide a spectrum of evaluation information for planning summer migrant education programs. First, the evaluation components go beyond the standard program descriptions and demographic data to include a focus on individuals and their reactions to the teaching-learning process.

Second, the triangulation of data sources provided a perspective unprecedented in migrant education program evaluations.

Third, the investigation of factors having a positive effect on achievement will be identified for this population. Finally, ECIA Chapter 1 legislation mandated the use of program evaluation outcomes of the previous year to

be utilized for planning relevant to the next fiscal year.

### Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations imposed by the design of the study. The ethnographic techniques provided some baseline, process and values data that was not generalizable beyond the sample population. The data set was also limited by the nature of the assessment tools and by the degree of exposure the participants were willing to reveal about themselves. A further description of the setting will be described in Chapter 3.

The student achievement data analyzed in this investigation were collected from students in grades three through ten, who were pretested and posttested with the Curriculum Referenced Test of Mastery, a standardized achievement test which reports mastery of specific curriculum objectives. Data was collected during a summer program that was operable for twenty-nine days. Attendance varied from one day on roll to twenty-nine days.

### Summary of Chapter 1 and Preview of Succeeding Chapters

Chapter 1 contained background information that led to the identification of the problem under study: factors identified with academic achievement of migrant students, educational needs of a disadvantaged population, beneficial teaching strategies and parental concerns about their

child's education.

Chapter 2 will highlight a review of the literature and research relevant to evaluation concepts and variables influencing achievement.

Chapter 3 contains the descriptions of the population and sample, selection of variables, instrument design and data collection. The chapter concludes with an explanation of a unique research design and data analysis procedures.

Chapter 4 displays the results of the study as they pertain to each component of the study which includes: (a) paired parent-student interviews; (b) a teacher survey; and (c) ethnographic observations and interviews. The findings will be synthesized at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 5 will be comprised of the conclusions and recommendations with implications for further research.

## CHAPTER 2

### Review of the Literature

The literature review for this study will focus on evaluative concerns in migrant education on a variety of levels and a variety of areas. Much of the literature will focus on previous evaluations sponsored by the Department of Education, state department evaluations and reports of local education agencies concerning the migrant service delivery systems. The selection of variables affecting the achievement of migrant students worthy of investigation and evaluation will be summarized.

#### Evaluation Results in Migrant Education

The evolution of educational evaluation had been a pioneer effort on both local and federal levels. Historically, education in the United States had been the responsibility of the individual states. Traditionally, the financial support and governance of schools rested with state and local resources. Federal lawmakers began to enact legislation in the fifties and sixties that provided financial support for schools nationwide. When Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), a comprehensive and heavily funded law providing for thousands of federal grants to local education agencies,

legislators recognized the law must contain provisions for the mandatory evaluation of whether local education agencies (LEAs) had used their grants properly (Popham,1975). The federal requirements to conduct local educational evaluations for renewal of Title I monies provided an impetus for writers in various disciplines to address the conceptual nature of educational evaluation.

The First Annual Report, Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 included a recommendation that better evaluation instruments and procedures should be made available (Plunkett, 1985). One year previous to this report, Title I had been amended to incorporate special provisions for children of migratory agricultural workers. This made grants available to State Education Agencies (SEAs) for assistance in educating migrant children and interstate coordination of migrant education projects including the transfer of records.

In the 1970's, the National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children (N.C.E.M.C.) sponsored by the Ford Foundation conducted a nationwide study of the Title I migrant programs. It concluded that immediate changes to the existing amendment were necessary to ensure that migrant children received needed services (N.C.E.M.C.,1972). The amendments succeeded in mobilizing many SEA's to provide services; however, the United States Office of Education did

not mandate the establishment of nationwide goals and objectives. SEAs varied in their project appropriations, staff selection, and quality of services provided.

During the late sixties and early seventies, educators, citizens, and legislators were concerned about educational accountability. A concern for spending limited educational dollars precipitated the institution of federally mandated evaluation requirements. Throughout the seventies, Congress used clearer language in each renewal and extension of the original law. Use of three evaluation models and the establishment of regional Technical Assistance Centers made evaluation data more consistent and reliable with assistance to implement the models and interpret the results (Plunkett, 1985).

Two other national studies have been completed to date. The Exotech study was contracted by USOE in 1974 to assess the impact of migrant education programs on migrant students. Ten states, which received approximately 70% of the migrant monies, were surveyed. The Exotech study had severe time restrictions in that twelve months were allocated to conduct the study and write the report. One finding concluded that educational gains could not be attributed to migrant education funds since only migrant education students were tested (Exotech, 1974). The study did not collect achievement data from migrant children but

rather results from state evaluations that were based on grade equivalent test scores. Other findings focused on testing difficulties and descriptive information regarding enrollments, attendance, attitudes toward school, student and parent valuing of education, and student aspirations. In its discussion of services provided to migrant students, the authors of the study indicated that few states conducted adequate needs assessments of migrant children, there was no agreement as to what procedures should be used, and it was recommended that base states should be primarily responsible for conducting these assessments (Fisher, et al. 1976).

The second contract awarded by U.S.O.E. for a national evaluation was given to Research Triangle Institute (R.T.I.) in February, 1976. The objectives were to: "1) describe services and recipients of services; 2) assess the impact of the migrant education program on basic skills; 3) validate counts used in fund allocations; and 4) develop evaluation models that would permit data aggregation at the state and national levels" (R.T.I., 1981, p.1). Research and planning took place in 1976 and 1977 and data were collected in 1978. The research regarding program development stated that most SEAs and LEAs did not present a rationale for selecting types of educational methods specifically for compensatory programs of migrant children (Fisher, et al., 1976).

R.T.I. reviewers concluded that "the large majority of reports, proposals, etc., were not based on any theory" and "references to research in areas such as learning were rarely made" (Fisher, et al., 1976,p.160). It was also noted that "subgroup variations among migrants exist along racial and ethnic lines". Specifically, "the Mexican-American migrant, for example, may have more in common with and be more like the nonmigrant, lower-socioeconomic status, rural, or even urban, Mexican-American than black migrants" (Fisher, et al., 1976, p. 161).

In 1980 and 1981, data analyses and reports addressing the objectives were submitted. The major findings included the characteristics of the served population and the validity of the data used for funds allocation. One additional finding in the R.T.I. study described the impact of the program on academic skills by stating that migrant children made gains almost as large as their peers at the same pretest level; however, the magnitude of their progress could not be associated with program services or other variables (R.T.I., 1981). The evaluation design recommended by R.T.I. to USOE for migrant programs in 1978 was revised in 1981 after R.T.I. considered the results of the impact study, analyses of basic skill score changes, computer data on enrollments and enrollment information about instructional services received

by migrant children in non-project schools (Pressin, 1981). The revised strategy recommended the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) should be used to evaluate projects serving those migrant students who are enrolled in a single school district for all or the major part of the academic year or summer term. In addition, state statistical reports to gather descriptive information about program components, data collection by the Migrant Student Transfer System, a computerized system, and special studies were recommended (Pyecha, 1981).

Simultaneously, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children (N.A.C., 1978) prepared a policy paper on migrant education programs. Council members participated in seminars and discussions with federal, state and local administrators, teachers and parents to review and evaluate administration and program operations. The Council recommended that federal and state level program goals and objectives be further refined and implemented at the local level. In addition, a comprehensive service delivery system should contain a needs assessment, identification of all resources, coordination of available services and planned activities by each service to meet individual needs (N.A.C., 1978). The Council determined that "migrant student achievement cannot be improved solely through the academic instruction or supportive resources of ESEA Title I; the

social and economic conditions of the student's daily life must be considered in the planning and delivery of effective services" (N.A.C., 1978, p.1).

### Strategies for State-wide Evaluation

The evaluation theorists of the late sixties and early seventies wanted to guide educators; therefore, many of the educational evaluations have been modeled after the schemes proposed by Michael Scriven, Robert Stake, Daniel Stufflebeam and others (Popham, 1975). The goal-attainment models made popular by Ralph W. Tyler (Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam, 1983) involved the formulation of educational goals according to institutional and instructional factors, into measureable behavioral objectives. Program success was determined by the degree to which goals were achieved. This was also known as the pretest/posttest model with a focus on student achievement.

Also popular was Hammond's goal-attainment model which included: (a) isolation of program aspects to be evaluated; (b) definitions of institution and instructional variables; (c) specification of behavioral objectives; (d) assessment of the described behaviors; and (e) analyzation of results (Popham, 1975). The 1975-76 Virginia Migrant Education Variable Report prepared by EPIC Systems utilized this model.

Educational evaluation models that focused on the evaluator's judgment were common in accreditation approaches which were almost totally reliant on intrinsic rather than extrinsic criteria. Judgmental approaches by Scriven and Stake (Madaus, et al., 1983) primarily focused on extrinsic criteria. Scriven became involved with evaluative review teams which monitored the operations of federally financed research and development centers. He proposed that the preoccupation about the project's goals might cause evaluators to overlook unanticipated outcomes; therefore, he proposed goal-free evaluation (Popham, 1975). Stake proposed a Countenance Model that emphasized descriptive and judgmental acts of the evaluator according to conditions prior to instruction (antecedents), during instruction (transactions), and after instruction (outcomes).

The last of the major conceptual models were decision-facilitation models. Daniel Stufflebeam refined the context, input, process and product (CIPP) evaluation components. Four types of decisions would correspond to each kind of component, namely: " (1) planning decisions to determine objectives; (2) structuring decisions to design instructional procedures ; (3) implementing decisions to use, monitor and improve the procedures; and (4) recycling decisions to judge and react to the outcomes produced by those procedures" (Popham, 1975, p.35). The CIPP model was

popular in the U.S. Office of Education for several years. The model proposed by Alkin (1979) at the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation was known as the CSE model. Alkin emphasized that evaluators should attend to the enroute products as well as the process of the program. Decision making was encouraged at each stage of the evaluation: needs assessment; program planning; implementation evaluation; progress evaluation; and outcome evaluation. This model did not suit administrators who were unable or unwilling to examine their programs as part of evaluation. Malcolm Provus (Fopham, 1975) understood the role of educational decision making to be a systematic approach comparing performance with standards and examining the discrepancies. His model was unique in proposing a cost-benefit analysis as a basis of comparison to other competing programs, thereby facilitating evaluation by agencies other than the participating agency.

#### State Evaluations

Examination of the models have provided a framework for the examination of evaluations completed in migrant education on federal, state and local levels.

The final regulations published on November 13, 1978 (D.O.E., 1978) addressed a new part 116d, that would govern grants to state educational agencies authorized by section

122 of Title I ESEA. Among the many managerial responsibilities of the SEAs were the "design, publication and final preparation of the evaluation, performance and financial reports that the SEA submits to the Commissioner" (D.O.E., 1978, p. 52680). Evaluation reports from the Virginia Director of Migrant Education have been submitted since the program's inception in 1966. The earliest report reviewed, the FY72 evaluation, was primarily a narrative highlighting major objectives, exemplary projects, grade placement, teacher-pupil ratio, interrelationships with Title I programs, coordination and integration with other programs, in-service training, staff utilization and dissemination. Program effectiveness was documented by a statement of test gains in grade equivalents on the Wide Range Achievement Test. A statement of limitations and restraints addressed mobility, availability of records, and staff awareness of a limited time frame (Conyers, 1972).

A statewide study conducted during 1975-1976 designed by EPIC Systems, specified data collection linked to identified variables and related it to migrant student performance in reading and mathematics (EPIC, 1976). The resultant analyses were specific to the Eastern Shore, Central and Valley programs. Major findings for the Eastern Shore program tended to show relatively high performance levels in reading and mathematics except for one test level

and teacher aides may have had a positive influence on the levels of performance (EPIC,1976). Neither the study, nor parts of it were submitted to the Office of Education for FY76.

State evaluations changed in format in 1981. Priorities were listed and accomplishments related to each priority were enumerated. Tables identifying students served were now aggregated data indicating migrant status and type of program. Staff utilization and staff training were enumerated. A needs assessment was included in addition to identification of objectives. The objectives were evaluated according to preestablished criteria. Test scores were listed but they were not differentiated by grade level and program. Parent Advisory Councils were described, cooperation with other agencies was described, and interstate and intrastate activities were listed. The format for state evaluations was influenced by suggestions and recommendations proposed by the evaluation committee of the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME), which was formed after the R.T.I. national evaluation.

In 1981, Title I became Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) which was enacted as part of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L.97-35). Chapter 1 was

amended by Public Law 98-211 on December 8, 1983, and Public Law 98-312 on June 12, 1984 (ED,1984). These December 8, 1983, amendments, also known as the Technical Amendments required SEAs to collect data on the age, sex, ethnicity and grade level of program participants. The Department of Education (ED) was interested in collecting systematic and consistent data for the first time through the use of the State Performance Report. State Directors were encouraged by ED to utilize the resources of the Technical Assistance Centers (TACs) established in 1976 with Chapter 1 funds for program improvement. The Evaluation Committee of the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) produced a forum for the discussion of evaluation issues, maintained an evaluator's contact file of persons completing state evaluation reports and maintained a file of summaries of current research and evaluation projects.

Recently, a federally-funded task force has completed a review of state evaluation reports for 1982 and 1983. ED personnel, representatives of the NASDME evaluation committee and TAC personnel have prepared a document highlighting a national summary of participation and achievement information from state migrant evaluation reports 1981-1983 and an analysis of four evaluation options (Murray, 1986).

These guidelines were recommended that SEA personnel

develop an evaluation plan that gave representative coverage of its program. The four designs discussed in detail included: (a) norm-referenced testing to show program impact; (b) pre-post matched testing to assess change; (c) posttest only testing; and (d) assessment testing. The most recent Virginia Annual Performance Report for Migrant Education Programs (FY85) reported the number of student pretest and posttest scores and the number meeting the stated objectives in addition to the data enumerated in the 1981 state evaluation. The report also met all of the requirements for the ED State Performance Report.

LEA evaluation reports presented information relative to the basic components of the SEA report but in a different format. Test data was first reported in 1972 when the evaluation was prepared by EPIC Diversified Systems, for the Eastern Shore programs (Roberson & Lusk, 1972). Seven out of thirteen Eastern Shore evaluations reviewed by this researcher contained a listing of strengths and weaknesses or recommendations for program improvement.

ECIA Chapter 1 legislation authorizing programs specify in section 556.b.4 that programs and projects:

Will be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in achieving the goals set for them and that such evaluations shall include objective measurement of educational achievement in basic skills and a determination of whether improved performance is sustained over a period of more than one year and that the results of such evaluations will be

considered by such agency in the improvement of the programs and projects assisted under this chapter. (Murray, 1986, p.2)

The former Secretary of Education, Terrell Bell, initiated a process to improve Chapter 1 programs. The second year of the Secretary's initiative has produced little response in migrant education. In FY85, five migrant projects were selected for commendation.

#### Information Deficiencies in Migrant Education

The need for an evaluation design that presented representative coverage of program activities while providing enough information for program improvement has been documented. Stake (Madeus, et al., 1983) suggested that evaluation efforts should examine the purposes of a study, and a responsive evaluation approach "may sacrifice some precision in measurement to increase the usefulness of the findings to person (sic) in and around the program " (Madeus et al., 1983, p.292). Stake focused on descriptive data and judgmental data with different emphases on antecedents (intents), transactions, and outcomes.

Dewey contended that significant problems for investigation were essentially qualitatively based, and quantitative measures were instrumental or secondary to the qualitative scheme; therefore, using various methods helps to correct the inevitable biases that were present in using

only one method (Tanner & Tanner, 1980). Issac and Michael (1984, p.92) stated that "once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more independent measurement processes, the uncertainty of its interpretation is greatly reduced."

Multimodal research designs assessed processes as well as provided specific information on effects of programs (LeCompte and Goetz, 1984). Stake summarized to state, "The important matter for the evaluator is to get his information in sufficient amount from numerous independent and credible sources so that it effectively represents the perceived status of the program however complex" (Madeus, et al., 1983, p.297).

Such a multimodal design was developed and implemented for the Choctaw School Study of the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians (Fortune, 1985).

The purposes of the study were defined in four research tasks which addressed 21 key topic areas. Thirteen components were designed to address these topics. The component approach to the study provided for cross comparisons and replications not possible in a single discrete study (Fortune, 1985). This decision-based model sought to develop school system reforms.

#### Factors Relevant to Migrant Education

The specific educational needs of migrant children

have been addressed in the literature. Some of the needs are listed below.

1. Migrant children have a need for an atmosphere for learning conducive to improving the child's self-concept (MaCaffery, 1971; Sutton, 1972).

2. Migrant children have a need for exposure to a great deal of language (Ritzenthaler, 1971; Clark, 1971; Terrell, 1971; Hicks, 1971).

3. Migrant children have a need for teacher visits to the home (Zavaleta, 1971; Stockburger, 1971).

4. Migrant children need experiences relevant to the child's culture (Ott, 1971; Sutton, 1972).

5. Migrant children need teacher understanding of migrant values and migrant culture (Scott, 1971; Cole, 1971; Friedland and Nelkin, 1971; Davis, 1972).

6. Migrant children need parental valuing of education (Scott, 1971; Reul, 1974; Friedland and Nelkin, 1971).

7. Migrant children need prioritizing of skills (Sutton, 1972).

In addition to the needs stated in the literature, were recent studies on effective teaching that carried implications relevant to migrant summer school programs.

### Self-Concept

Johnson (1979) using the Piers-Harris Self-concept

Scale, concluded that migrant children had a significantly lower self-concept than non-migrant children. Similarly, Ockerman-Garza (1982) found that in using three revised standardized instruments that non-migrants were in the "high" self-esteem category while migrants were in the "medium" category. Canfield and Wells' study (cited in Crouse, 1981) found students with high self-concepts were more willing to take a risk in a learning situation especially in areas of perceived academic ability. Brookover's work (cited in Crouse, 1981) indicated that a student's self-concept of ability in a school subject may differ from his self-concept in another subject as well as from a global self-concept of ability. Similarly, Gottfried (1979) found that intrinsic motivation in specific subject areas was correlated with achievement.

Purkey (1978) demonstrated relationships between self-concept and academic achievement; however, Beane (1982) suggested that studies of global self-perception and achievement were not as significant as self-concept of ability. Active parent involvement in a structured program has shown to be related to increased academic performance and self-concept (Revicki, 1981).

### Teacher Expectations

Good and Brophy (1984) reviewed recent studies to

conclude that both positive and negative expectations can be found in the classroom dependent on teacher behavior that will communicate expectations. Behaviors that indicate differential treatment of low achievers included:

(a) failing to give feedback; (b) less friendly interaction; (c) waiting less time for answers; and (d) calling on lows less often (Good and Brophy, 1984). Using a mastery learning approach, teachers have communicated achievement expectations of specific levels with a study-test-remediation-retest cycle. This approach was felt to be conducive to the content of migrant education programs such as basic skills in language and mathematics (Savard and Cotton, 1983).

#### Teaching Strategies

Direct instruction, leading students through a process and teaching them to use that process as a skill to master other tasks, has been particularly effective in teaching some basic skills to young and disadvantaged children (Department of Education, 1986). This approach has benefitted students with learning problems resulting from language barriers or limited background experiences (Savard and Cotton, 1983).

Dunn (1980) reported a study of effective teachers of disadvantaged children. Structure, organization and careful

planning were important with clear rules and regulations and some type of structured motivational system with positive reinforcement for good behaviors (Dunn, 1980).

Student perceptions of the classroom environment of second grade students indicated that students accurately reported differential teacher behavior and the organization and management of the classroom (Clements, 1980). Furthermore, self-perceptions of secondary Mexican-American students were more positive than the Anglo-American students (Engstrom, 1981). Savard and Cotton (1983) stressed that social reinforcers such as approval from school personnel in which student effort and achievement were given public recognition were effective in lasting behavioral improvements.

Research studies on instructional time and achievement have been summarized with emphases on allocated time, engaged time, and academic learning time. Concerns applicable to migrant education listed by Savard and Cotton (1983) were substantiated with research documentation from Good and Brophy (1984): (a) be cautious as to whether the time allocated will be sufficient enough to make an educational impact (Stallings, 1980); (b) high engagement rates in interactive classroom activities had a more positive effect on achievement than high engagement in non-interactive activities alone (Berliner, 1983); and

(c) students need to be engaged in appropriate learning activities in which they will experience a high rate of success (Good and Brophy, 1984).

Good and Brophy (1984) reviewed a body of research funded by the National Institute of Education and other correlational studies to conclude that behaviors connected with gains in basic skills instruction included: (a) teachers who actively instructed their students in large and small groups using demonstration, explanation, participation, practice and review; and (b) teachers who interacted with their students, one to one, within small group settings in the early grades. Successful teachers in higher grades relied more on whole group presentations, utilizing small groups for remediation. Savard and Cotton (1983) suggested that administrators may need to justify the time and expense of small group instruction for older migrant children on some other basis than expected cognitive achievement.

Curriculum that emphasized the cultural heritage of the migrant student was proposed by Serrano (1980). He suggested that the educational system must become more responsive to Hispanics, the fastest growing minority in the United States, by providing cultural enrichment that would focus on the Spanish, Indian, Mexican and American heritage of Hispanics.

English language proficiency and bilingualism were thought to be a major problem for educating English-speaking Hispanics. Valverde (1981) reported that English proficiency alone was not sufficient to assure normative levels of achievement and proficient bilingualism was not a detriment to achievement but was likely to increase achievement. In research sponsored by the National Institute of Education, a study was designed to investigate the relationships between student and home variables, and language proficiency and reading achievement of bilingual first and third grade children. Rodrigues-Brown and Junker (1980) found that length of residence in the U.S. was one of the main variables in determining achievement in English.

#### Home-School Factors

Parent involvement in migrant education programs was mandated by law. The SEA and LEA were required to "solicit actively parental involvement in the planning, operation and evaluation of the State's migrant education program" (Department of Education, 1985). Involving migrant parents, especially, currently migratory parents can be an arduous task. Rich (1985, p.80) stated that " To ensure its acceptance parent involvement must be viewed as a legitimate activity of the school, and reaching the family must be considered as important as reaching the child". Research

findings related to disadvantaged children indicated that home efforts can greatly improve achievement (Department of Education, 1986). Parent participation both within and outside of school was related to achievement of disadvantaged students. Programs fostering at-home teaching by parents have been found to improve achievement for elementary students (NIE, 1985). The Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs was conducted October, 1978 through February, 1982 by the System Development Corporation (1982) under contract with the United States Office of Education. A representative sample of ESEA Title I programs were selected for the survey and site studies with the intent of identifying practices that districts and schools could utilize "in order to improve their own educational offerings" (Burns, 1982, p.55). Some of the positive outcomes of effective projects were (a) improved student attendance, conduct and attitudes; (b) improved classroom performance when parents tutored; (c) better understanding of student needs; (d) increased self-confidence for participating parents; and (e) active parental support of the instructional program (Burns, 1982).

#### Research Findings Specific to Title I and Summer Programs

The federally sponsored Sustaining Effects Study was conducted during 1967-1977 to determine educational

practices associated with Title I effectiveness. Noteworthy findings indicated that higher student growth in reading and math were related to experienced teachers and modest effects on achievement growth were produced by the amount of regular instruction and tutor/independent work (Carter, 1980). Carter states that "the frequency of feedback on a student's progress sometimes relates positively to reading and math achievement growth" (Carter, 1980, p.136).

Summer school instruction for pupils of low socio-economic strata in Texas, and evaluative reports on other summer schools suggest that participation in summer schools was not effective in raising achievement (Curtis, 1982). Suggestions for more effective summer schools include: (a) extending the duration of summer school; (b) broadening teacher expectations; (c) emphasizing basic skills; (d) providing greater student motivation; and (e) careful planning with increased staff and efficient evaluation (Curtis, 1982).

### Summary

Evaluation designs in migrant education have not been utilized for program improvement. Classic evaluation models are not suited to a conglomerate of programs; therefore a multimodal component approach is needed to most efficiently present representative coverage of a state or local program.

The intent of Congress was to provide a service delivery system for disadvantaged migrant students that would primarily focus on instruction. To that end, program planners will need to review and incorporate teaching strategies with demonstrated effectiveness for the targeted population.

## CHAPTER 3

### Methods and Procedures

This chapter will explain the methodology used in the study. A description of the setting and the sample will be followed by data collection procedures. A description of the research design will detail instrument utilization of collection procedures within the context of a component design which addresses each research question.

Finally, the data analysis section will list the analyses performed and describe the synthesis of data from several sets of respondents. The creation of the aggregated data set on which regression analyses were performed will be described.

#### Setting

Most compensatory education programs were designed for implementation during the regular school term. Chapter 1 summer programs were unique in providing intensive basic skills offerings if LEA's could substantiate the resource allocation by a needs assessment. The Virginia summer migrant education programs have maintained services for eligible students despite funding restrictions. Two centers were in operation to service both currently migratory and formerly migratory students. The total enrollments included

359 students for both centers with a total of 342 currently migratory students and 17 formerly migratory and intrastate migratory students aged four years to sixteen years.

The levels of implementation of the ECIA Chapter 1 migrant education funds and program services were determined almost completely by the LEA. The differences in the programs related to grade assignment, curriculum, and staff utilization. The rationale for these differing points of emphasis was due to an administrative belief in maintenance and stability of staff assignments and conventional wisdom concerning policies, procedures and use of instructional time. Little empirical evidence was used.

The greatest challenge for the researcher was to learn where the numerous migrant camps were located in order to obtain the necessary parent interviews. By the completion of the study, over thirty camps would be visited numerous times; some were houses that accommodated several families and others were barracks-type dwellings with community kitchens and bath facilities. The bus drivers and recruiters were most knowledgeable about camp locations. A recruiter helped the researcher find the camps in one county, while bus drivers assisted the researcher in locating camps in the other county. One driver, a twenty year veteran, started at 7 a.m. with her first camp stop at 7:10 a.m. Thirteen camps, twenty-four students, and one hour later, we arrived

at the school. Another driver began his route at 6:40 a.m., made ten stops for a total of 79 students and arrived at school around 8:30 a.m. Since some camps were located as much as 32 miles from the center, another bus was added to relieve the overcrowding and lengthy ride.

After breakfast, the instructional day began and lasted from 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. with instructional aides supervising the students until 4:20 p.m. The instructional day at the other center began at 9:00 a.m. after breakfast, and continued until 3:00 p.m. Lunch and recess were integral parts of both programs.

Children, who were previously enrolled, were assigned to a teacher when they arrived. Counselors and recruiters enrolled other students as they arrived each morning and recruiters would depart for the camps to obtain parent permission and specific enrollment information. Counselors proceeded to request educational and health information for each child enrolled in the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) data bank housed in Little Rock, Arkansas. Terminal operators at the MSRTS center in Mappsville, Virginia, disseminated their data and placed new students on the data base. Students were screened for health problems that might need immediate attention.

Teachers began to pretest each student (grades 1-6) with the 1984 edition of the Curriculum Referenced Test

Mastery (CRTM) published by Charles E. Merrill Company.

A personalized educational plan developed for each student was based on CRTM results. Students were most often grouped for instruction to efficiently meet their educational needs.

#### Sampling Procedures

At the beginning of the researcher's selection of matched pairs of students and parents, exact probability sampling was selected to include all possible segments of the migrant population on the Eastern Shore; however, once on site, the limited numbers of students in grades 3-6 and the mobility of those students made that type of sampling unrealistic for  $n=60$ . A representative sampling of students from the Accomack Center and the Northampton Center, most camps, ethnicity, state, migrant status, grade, and family was selected. Students selected for the ethnographic interviews ( $n=6$ ) were representative of each grade level 3-6, sex, and ethnic background. The population consisted of 102 students enrolled in grades 3-6.

#### Sample

The sample consisted of 60 cases, 28 males and 32 females, of which 37 were Hispanic, 19 were Black, 3 were Haitian, and 1 was Caucasian. Grade distributions included 25 third-graders, 18 fourth-graders, 12 fifth-graders, 3 sixth graders, and 1 each of ninth and tenth grade students.

The six students in the ethnographic sample were included in the original 60 and were chosen to be representative of sex, teacher, grade level and ethnicity. The interviewed "parents" of the 60 students included temporary guardians such as a close relative, an older brother, aunt or grandparent. Approximately one-half of the parent interviews were conducted with the assistance of a child interpreter.

All teachers, resource teachers, and librarians servicing students in grades 3-6 were selected for the teacher survey. All six teachers were interviewed in addition to a camp counselor, school counselors, home-school coordinator, two principals and two Chapter 1 coordinators.

#### Data Collection

Reading and mathematics scores on the condensed version of the CRTM constituted achievement scores for the data base. Only 65% of the students were pre and posttested due to withdrawal from the program and frequent absences. There were more students posttested than pretested; therefore, the posttest data was reflective of 47 (78%) of the students.

The teacher survey instrument was field-tested during spring, 1985. The teachers completed the form with the investigator present for clarification purposes.

The student interview was piloted in grades 3-5 with fifteen Chapter 1 students and fifteen non-Chapter 1 students to determine reliability. Coefficient alpha was calculated to be .44 and .59. Content validity was determined during a review of the instrument by two migrant education teachers.

All student interviews, including self-concept instruments, were administered by the investigator during school hours. The help of a Spanish interpreter was needed in one instance. The student interviews were delayed until the third through fifth week of the program in order to foster student familiarity with the investigator.

#### Selection of Variables

Factors which may be the cause of achievement gains were identified in the literature. Literature specific to disadvantaged and migratory populations was reviewed as well as effective schools literature.

The following variables were examined: (a) student achievement in reading and mathematics; (b) home characteristics which may relate to student achievement; (c) parental involvement in the student's schooling; (d) parental attitudes toward school and the English language; (e) student's study habits; (f) student's self-concept; and (g) student's attitude toward school and the English

language.

The student interview contained questions about study habits, attitudes toward school, attitudes towards the English language, future aspirations and self-concept items. Open-ended responses were coded and Likert-type responses were weighted.

The parent interview contained attitude scales similar to the student interview. There were 60 matched student/parent interviews to be analyzed. Additional descriptive information was obtained relative to the student's family, length of migrancy, school contacts, educational background, study habits, books and program strengths . Responses to open-ended questions were edited and categorized by similarity of response.

Two attitude scales and three indices were calculated from the data. The parent attitude toward school scale and the student attitude toward school scale were calculated similarly by totaling interview items pertinent to the topic and assigning a range of values for a negative, neutral or positive attitude.

The first index that was calculated was an index of English language proficiency. The higher the score, the more proficient the student. The student self-concept index was calculated from a 14 item list of polar adjectives and 16 items of Likert-type questions. The index had a range

from 1 to 5 with 5 being the most positive. The index of school progress was calculated from two achievement scores. Students were classified into two categories: satisfactory progress, with an NCE score of 40 or above; and unsatisfactory progress.

The study of interrelationships of the variables included in this component of the study focused on the prediction of academic achievement in reading and mathematics. Limitation in sample size and the problem of multicollinearity due to the interrelationships of the predictors indicate that a stepwise regression model would be most suitable for the analysis. A two-staged sequence of regression analysis was used. The predictors were first run stepwise then statistically significant predictors ( $p < .05$ ) were identified from these preliminary analyses and combined for the second stage analysis.

The following sets of predictors were used: (a) an index of English proficiency which indicated both parent and student responses to the ability to speak, write, read and comprehend the English language; (b) parent attitude toward school ratings included responses to the importance of school, helping a child adjust to a new school, asking their children about school and stating reasons why school was important; (c) the index of school progress indicated satisfactory and unsatisfactory progress in reading and

mathematics; (d) the index of self-concept included student responses to the teacher liking them, self-descriptive words and responses to thinking about the future, having problems in school, health estimate, getting in trouble, sharing, doing what you want at home and in school, being lonely, having school friends, showing sociable behavior, being chosen last for games, being picked on, doing their best in school, indicating their ability to learn, and blaming individuals for poor performance; (e) the student attitude toward school index included responses to wanting to do their best in school, enjoying school, desiring homework, talking about school to parents, liking their teacher and asking the teacher for help.

The teacher survey was designed to provide information regarding basic demographics, education background, teacher expectations, home-school interaction, class descriptions, educational needs of the students, and the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

The ethnographic student interviews were initially structured to address the psychological and cultural context of the school and the educational valuing of academics. The teacher and administrative ethnographic interviews focused on educational needs of migrant students, the psychological and cultural context of the school and the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

### Research Design

The major intent of this study was to investigate the needs of migrant students and some of the factors that have been linked to school success. Qualitative and quantitative methods were implemented. When used for the same purpose, qualitative and quantitative methods can offer insights that neither alone could provide (Reichardt & Cook, 1979).

The five instruments designed specifically for this study were used repeatedly. The study was designed to address each of the research tasks in the following ways.

1. What educational needs are reported for migrant students by school personnel and parents?

Parent Interview (n=60)

Teacher Ethnographic Interview (n=6)

Teacher Survey Form (n=13)

Administrative Interviews (n=8)

2. What is the psychological and cultural context of the school for migrant students?

Teacher Ethnographic Interviews (n=6)

Classroom Observations - five hours per class

Student Ethnographic Interviews (n=6)

Student Interview (n=60)

3. How do the educational values of migrant parents and students relate to academic performance and school philosophy?

Document Review

Test Data (n=60)

Student Ethnographic Interviews (n=6)

Student Interview (n=60)

Parent Interview (n=60)

Administrative Interview (n=8)

4. For a migrant population, do the study habits of migrant students relate to academic performance?

Test Data (n=60)

Student Interview (n=60)

Parent Interview (n=60)

5. What is the relationship of English proficiency to academic performance?

Test Data (n=60)

Student Ethnographic Interview (n=6)

Student Interview (n=60)

Parent Interviews (n=60)

Teacher Survey Form (n=13)

Classroom Observations

Administrative Interview (n=8)

6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program as reported by parents and program personnel and as reported through research observations?

Parent Interview (n=60)

Teacher Survey (n=13)

Administrative Interview (n=8)

Classroom Observations

### Data Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed separately. Factors identified in the teacher survey were synthesized with results from the parent interviews, student interviews and the ethnographic interviews to present a holistic picture of the cultural scene.

Responses to the teacher survey form were edited and analyzed using the following plan.

1. Frequencies and percentages were calculated on the demographic information, education background and home-school interaction.

2. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the student descriptors.

3. Multiple response analyses were used to summarize the responses to the questions relating to needs and suggestions for improvement.

4. Means and standard deviations were used to report the results of the ratings of the different school characteristics.

The matched parent-student interviews and the subsequent analyses were adapted from the Comprehensive School Study for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians

(Fortune, 1985). This component of the study was designed as a descriptive relational study involving an array of hypothetically related variables.

The study used achievement measures based on the Curriculum Referenced Test of Mastery by Charles Merrill, Publishing, 1984. Attitude scales and open-ended questions were administered to both the parents and the students. The responses were edited and analyzed using the following plan.

1. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the entire array of data including frequencies and percents for ordinal items and standard deviations for interval items.

2. Crosstabulations were used to illustrate pairwise relationships.

3. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were used to identify predictors of the achievement variables. The regression analysis was first applied to blocks of similar variables. The strongest predictors were selected from the blocks and then were entered into a combined analysis for each dependent achievement variable.

The qualitative analysis of the ethnographic interviews involved the use of the Developmental Research Sequence (Spradley, 1979). The initial domain analysis focused on semantic relationships. A few domains were selected for in-depth analysis while a surface understanding of cultural themes was developed.

### Summary

A qualitative and quantitative component approach to evaluation of migrant education programs will provide the data necessary to identify factors which contribute to achievement during a summer program. The ethnographic component will address research questions 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. The teacher survey component will focus on research questions 1, 5, and 6. The final component, paired parent-student interviews, will present data relative to research questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The triangulation of data sources should describe the program accurately and provide information for program improvement.

## CHAPTER 4

### Results

This study was conducted with a matched set of parents and students who qualified as being migrant and were provided services by the summer migrant education programs in Northampton County and Accomack County, Virginia. In addition, teachers were surveyed and parents, students, and administrative personnel were interviewed.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between school-related variables of migrant students enrolled in a summer program and selected factors in the home and school which may interact with academic performance. The surveys and interviews were constructed to investigate these variables and a number of statistical analyses were employed to structure the data and to provide a framework for conclusions. The findings were then organized around the design components, parent interview, student interview, and teacher survey. The results were analyzed by using crosstabulations, scaling procedures and regression techniques.

The ethnographic data component, which involved teachers, students and administrative personnel was then synthesized with the results of the surveys and interviews.

Table 1 will serve to organize the results in Chapter 4.

---

TABLE 1 LOCATION OF RESULTS IN CHAPTER 4 AS THEY RELATE TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

---

Research Question	Chapter 4 Findings	Page
1. What educational needs are reported for migrant students by school personnel and parents?		
Parent Interview.....		53
Teacher Survey.....		77
Teacher and Administrative Ethnographic Interviews		84
Summary of Results.....		121
2. What is the psychological and cultural context of the school for migrant students?		
Student Interview.....		58
Classroom Observations.....		113
Teacher and Student Ethnographic Interviews (Psychological Context).....		85
Teacher and Student Ethnographic Interviews (Cultural Context).....		94
Index of Self-concept.....		102
Crosstabulations.....		103
Summary of Results.....		122
3. How do the educational values of migrant parents and students relate to academic performance and school philosophy?		
Parent Interview.....		52
Student Interview.....		62
Student and Administrative Ethnographic Interviews		95
Document Review.....		97
Test Data.....		112
Regression Analysis.....		116
Summary of Results.....		126
4. For a migrant population, do the study habits of migrant students relate to academic performance?		
Parent Interview.....		55
Student Interview.....		65
Test Data.....		112
Crosstabulations.....		109
Summary of Results.....		128
5. What is the relationship of English proficiency to academic performance?		
Parent Interview.....		67
Student Interview.....		67
Teacher Survey.....		77
Student and Administrative Ethnographic Interviews		98
Classroom Observations.....		124
Index of English Proficiency.....		102
Regression Analysis.....		116
Summary of Results.....		128
6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program as reported by parents and program personnel through research observations?		
Parent Interview.....		52
Teacher Survey.....		79
Administrative Ethnographic Interviews.....		99
Classroom Observations.....		113
Summary of Results.....		130

Parent InterviewDemographics

A parent or guardian for each student was interviewed. Table 2 and Table 3 indicate the ethnicity of the respondents and the primary language spoken at home.

---

TABLE 2           ETHNICITY OF RESPONDENTS

---

ETHNICITY	#	%
Hispanic	37	61.7
Black	19	31.7
Haitian	3	5.0
Caucasian	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

---



---

TABLE 3           LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME

---

Language	#	%
Spanish	27	45.0
English	20	33.3
English/Spanish	10	16.7
Creole	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

---

Two thirds (66.7%) of the students were from homes where English was not the dominant language.

The respondents indicated that 48.3% had been migratory every year. The students came from households in which the mean number of people residing was 6.3 with a standard deviation of 2.5. The majority of the respondents were mothers, as shown in Table 4.

---

 TABLE 4                    DISTRIBUTION OF PARENT RESPONDENTS
 

---

Respondent	#	%
Mother	46	76.7
Both Parents	5	8.4
Grandparent	3	5.0
Father	2	3.3
Aunt	2	3.3
Sister/Brother	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0

---

In regard to employment, all of the households reported at least one member employed and an average of two people employed. Income levels could not be estimated due to the variety of jobs, i.e., crewleader, picker, grader worker, truck driver and the uncertainty of the length of employment due to the weather, number of pickers, crop maturity and the health of the worker.

Data in Table 5 show the marital status of the parents in the sample. There were a considerable number of broken homes and families separated due to the nature of the job.

---

 TABLE 5                    MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS
 

---

Status	#	%
Married	41	68.3
Single/Divorced	16	26.7
Married-Here Alone	3	5.0
Total	60	100.0

---

It was reported that 28 (46.7%) of the students were residing here with both parents, while 11.7% of the students

were not presently residing with either the mother or the father.

#### Parental Attitude Toward School

The parent interviews indicated the respondent's involvement with the schooling of the student. Only 11 (18.3%) of the families had directly contacted the school. The other 49 respondents had talked with the recruiter (66.6%) or knew about the program by talking to the bus driver, boss, or neighbor (15.0%).

Respondents indicated that school was important. Three primary responses for that importance included: (a) to better themselves (25.0%); (b) to learn more (21.7%); and (c) to get an education (20%).

Although the majority of the families were migratory every year, 80% had attended one school during the regular term. Adjustment to a new school was accomplished by parents telling the students to go (30%), the students liked to go (11.7%) or the students got used to it (11.7%). An additional 20% were reported not to mind school and didn't give their parents any trouble.

Parents were unfamiliar with specific details about the summer migrant education program. Sixty-six percent felt that nothing should be done differently, 20% did not know what should be done differently and the remaining 13.3%

spread their responses among trips, earlier dismissal, homework, more academics and different bus drivers. Table 6 indicates what the parents liked best about a summer program. Again, the responses were not specific; however they do indicate a valuing of academics by 51.6% of the respondents.

---

TABLE 6           WHAT PARENTS LIKE BEST ABOUT THE PROGRAM

---

Response	#	%
Learn More	15	25.0
Don't Know	8	13.3
Kids Are Not At Camp/Work	6	10.0
Kids Are Taken Care Of	5	8.3
Retain Learning	5	8.3
Practice For Next Year	3	5.0
Language Exposure	3	5.0
Do Everything	3	5.0
Don't Worry About Kids	3	5.0
For All Ability Levels	2	3.3
Nothing	2	3.3
Something For Kids To Do	1	1.7
Keeps Kids Out of Trouble	1	1.7
Like the People	1	1.7
Open House	1	1.7
Health Care	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

---

Parents did report that their children needed help in the areas shown in Table 7. A majority of the respondents indicated that mathematics and language arts instruction was needed in a summer program. Some parents mentioned other problems such as retention (5.0%), special education (5.0%), language (3.3%), and behavior (3.3%).

---

 TABLE 7            AREAS OF HELP NEEDED FOR CHILDREN
 

---

Area	#	%
Language Arts	18	30.0
Mathematics	11	18.3
Math & Lang. Arts	10	16.7
Don't Know	9	15.0
Speaking English	3	5.0
Social Studies	3	5.0
Everything	2	3.3
Nothing	2	3.3
Listening	1	1.7
Math & Science	1	1.7

---

Most responding parents reported that they talked to their children about school with the exception of 11.7% of the parents who reported that they never talked to their children about school. Parents were questioned about what information their children shared. Table 8 indicates that the majority of the students talked about specific activities while 10% did not respond.

---

 TABLE 8            CHILD TELLS PARENT ABOUT SCHOOL
 

---

Response	#	%
What Is Done	12	20.0
Played/Ate/Worked	6	10.0
Likes It	6	10.0
Played/Ate	4	6.7
Disliked School	4	6.7
People and Activities	4	6.7
Can't Remember	3	5.0
Had a Good Time	3	5.0
Math and Reading	3	5.0
Special Activities	1	1.7
Play/Sleep	1	1.7
Work/Dentist	1	1.7
What They Learned	1	1.7
Kids Fighting	1	1.7
Bus Driver	1	1.7

---

In summary, parents felt that 66.7% of the students liked school, 8.3% liked it sometimes, and 25% did not like it. This figure supported the positive student responses (65%) to the question, "Do you enjoy school?".

The majority of the parents wanted to talk to the teachers during the late afternoon (56.6%); however, some preferred the morning (6.7%), or anytime (30.0%). Some parents (6.7%) felt that there would not be an appropriate time or they did not want a time.

Considering the demands put upon migratory workers, the parents appeared to be supportive of their children. Table 9 shows the source of homework help. Almost half of the parents reported not helping their children with homework.

---

TABLE 9            HOMEWORK HELP FOR STUDENTS

---

Source of Help	#	%
Mother	23	38.3
Brother/Sister	18	30.0
Relative	9	15.0
Father	5	8.3
No One	4	6.7
Both Parents	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

---

The education level of the mothers had a grade level mean of 7.4 with a standard deviation of 3.6. The fathers had a grade level mean of 6.1 with a standard deviation of 4.1. Only 10 (17.2%) of the mothers and 6 (15%) of the fathers

completed high school. All of the parents believed that it was important for their children to finish school. Emphasis on education was not reflected in the amount of books in the home as 43 (71.7%) of the families had none.

### Summary

The majority of migrant parent respondents were either Black or Hispanic and rarely contacted the school directly but heard about the program from recruiters. Although the majority of the respondents did not complete school, they valued completion for their children. Respondents indicated that mathematics and language arts instruction were educational needs of their children. Most families supported homework and wanted to talk to the teacher. Summer school was viewed as having many purposes. Although many parents talked to their children about school, very few parents knew enough about the program or they were reluctant to suggest improvements.

### Student Interview

The student interview provided an opportunity for the researcher to meet and converse with each student on an individual basis. The students were removed from the classroom or playground setting and were assured that the source of their comments would not be divulged. Results of the student interviews were organized into main investigative

areas: demographics; self-perceptions; attitudes toward school; study habits; and attitudes of English proficiency.

### Demographics

The age of the students ranged from 8 to 16 years with 75% of the students ranging from 9.1 to 11 years of age. Twenty-eight (46.7%) of the respondents were male and 32 (53.3%) were female. Table 10 displays the grade distributions. A crosstab of age and grade indicated that 16 (27%) of the students were overaged for their grade placement.

---

TABLE 10                      STUDENT GRADE DISTRIBUTIONS

---

Grade	#	%
Three	25	41.7
Four	18	30.0
Five	12	20.0
Six	3	5.0
Nine	1	1.7
Ten	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

---

It was interesting to note the total number of members in the family. This gave the researcher an indication of the size of the family although it does not reflect the number of members presently living at the camp. Families ranged from 2 to 13 members.

### Self-Perceptions

The students were asked a series of questions about

how they felt about themselves. These questions constituted an index of self-concept to be used in other analyses.

Estimates of their ability and health were summarized in Table 11. The majority of students considered themselves to be of average ability while health estimates were mostly average and above average.

TABLE 11 STUDENT RATINGS OF HEALTH AND ABILITY

Area	Below Average		Average		Above Average	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ability	13	21.7	29	48.3	18	30.0
Health	6	10.0	28	46.7	26	43.3

Sociability for migrant students included questions about relationships with other students. Students indicated that they had a lot of friends (40.0%) and the majority (53.3%) indicated that they had some friends in school. Students felt that they got along "OK" with other students in school (60.0%) while 56.7% felt that other children were occasionally "mean" to them. Most migrant students (65%) felt that they were never chosen last for games.

Questions pertaining to relationships at home were also presented. Responses indicated that students were occasionally lonely (41.7%) and frequently lonely (33.3%). Sometimes they had the opportunity to do what they wanted to do at home (76.7%) and sometimes they got into trouble (11.7%). Many student indicated that they occasionally

wanted to share their belongings (60.0%).

Students were asked about self-perceptions within a school setting. The results were as follows: most students wanted to do their best in school (73.3%); occasionally students were able to do what they wanted in school (55.0%); and some students indicated never doing what they want in school (41.7%). Students occasionally took blame when they did poorly in school (68.3%), as compared to only 25% that took all the blame for their performance.

Seven pairs of bipolar adjectives were presented to the students for self-descriptions. The students responded individually to the 14 adjectives. The results are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12 STUDENT RESPONSE TO BIPOLAR ADJECTIVES

Adjective	#	%	Adjective	#	%
Punctual	51	85.0	Late	9	15.0
Attractive	35	58.3	Not Good Look.	28	46.7
Interesting	35	58.3	Dull	7	11.7
Busy	26	43.3	Boring	18	30.0
Happy	60	100.0	Sad	10	16.7
Helpful	56	93.3	Useless	3	5.0
Carefree	7	11.7	Worry	50	83.3

The majority of students indicated positive self-descriptions. A certain modesty was indicated in the high percentage of students described as "not good looking". Hispanic students would confuse the concept of bored with the term "boring". It was surprising to note the large

number of students described as worriers.

Students were asked to indicate things that they worried about and many responded with multiple items. The results are displayed in Table 13.

Half of the students worried about the illness of relatives at home or accidents occurring as a result of their travels. Many of the students (18%) worried about getting into trouble with their parents.

---

TABLE 13            STUDENT RESPONSES TO WORRY QUESTION

---

Response	#	%
Relative Sick/Hurt	25	50.0
Being In Trouble	9	18.0
Relative Dying	6	12.0
Student Sick/Hurt	5	10.0
Siblings	5	10.0
Family Home Late	3	6.0
Schoolwork	3	6.0
Dying	2	4.0
Others Hurt	2	4.0
Dad Drinking	2	4.0
Where Parents Are	2	4.0
Traveling	2	4.0
Friends At Home	2	4.0
Job In The Future	2	4.0
Animals	2	4.0
Relatives Fighting	1	2.0
Finding Work	1	2.0
Divorce	1	2.0
Lost Wallet	1	2.0
Kidnapped	1	2.0
Toys	1	2.0

---

Students were surveyed regarding their thoughts about the future. Most of the students (68.3%) had thought about the future while 31.7% were not concerned. Of the students

in the sample, 24 (40%) wished to go to college and 16 (26.7%) wanted to help their parents. The students were then asked about their career aspirations and the corresponding parents were surveyed about career aspirations for their children. The results are displayed in Table 14.

TABLE 14 CAREER ASPIRATIONS HELD BY STUDENT AND PARENT

Career Goal	Held by Student		Held by Parent	
	#	%	#	%
Nurse	10	16.7	4	6.7
Teacher	10	16.7	6	10.0
Police	7	11.7	2	3.3
Picker	7	11.7	1	1.7
Crew Leader	6	10.0	3	5.0
Don't Know	3	5.0	20	3.3
Truck Driver	2	3.3	3	5.0
Carpenter	2	3.3	0	0.0
Model	2	3.3	0	0.0
Clerk	1	1.7	5	8.3
Bus Driver	1	1.7	0	0.0
Teacher Aide	1	1.7	0	0.0
Engineer	1	1.7	0	0.0
Computer Programmer	1	1.7	0	0.0
Lawyer	1	1.7	2	3.3
Doctor	1	1.7	2	3.3
Football Player	1	1.7	0	0.0
Car Painter	1	1.7	1	1.7
Beautician	1	1.7	1	1.7
Body Builder	1	1.7	0	0.0
Veterinarian	0	0.0	1	1.7
Grower	0	0.0	1	1.7
Car Salesman	0	0.0	1	1.7
Military	0	0.0	2	3.3
Office Job	0	0.0	1	1.7
What They Want	0	0.0	3	5.0
What They Find	0	0.0	1	1.7

Only 25% of the student responses were reflective of careers associated with the current temporary life style of migrancy as compared to 13.4% of parent responses for the

student to remain in the current life style. It was interesting to note the lack of parent aspirations for their children (33.3%).

### Attitudes Toward School

The students were asked a series of questions pertaining to school. "Yes" responses to the question, "Do you enjoy school?" were given by 39 (65%) of the students. Table 15 shows the student responses to several questions concerning school subjects.

TABLE 15 STUDENT REACTIONS TO SCHOOL SUBJECTS

Subject	Best Liked		Least Liked		Best Grades		Worst Grades	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Math	21	35.0	16	26.7	30	50.0	18	30.0
P.E.	14	23.3	1	1.7	2	3.3	2	3.3
Art	6	10.0	2	3.3	1	1.7	1	1.7
Spelling	4	6.6	2	3.3	9	15.0	3	5.0
Reading	3	5.0	7	11.7	7	11.7	10	16.7
Library	3	5.0	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Music	3	5.0	6	10.0	1	1.7	0	0.0
Language	2	3.3	5	8.3	4	6.6	5	8.3
Science	1	1.7	1	1.7	0	0.0	1	1.7
English	1	1.7	9	15.0	5	8.3	7	11.7
Writing	1	1.7	2	3.3	0	0.0	2	3.3
All	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Soc. St.	0	0.0	2	3.3	1	1.7	4	6.6
None	0	0.0	6	10.0	0	0.0	7	11.7
Total	60	100.0	60	100.0	60	100.0	60	100.0

When language arts scores were combined, the results indicated that it was best liked by 11 (18.3%) and least liked by 25 (41.7%). Twenty-five students (41.7%) felt that they obtained the best grades and 27 (45%) felt that they

obtained the worst grades in language arts areas. It was not surprising that mathematics was favored over language arts when the majority of the students were bilingual.

The students reported that 46 (76.7%) of the parents talked with them about school. This figure was fairly consistent with 53 (88.3%) of the parents who reported talking to their children.

The students were asked about their relationships with their teachers and they were asked what would help them improve school performance. Students (70%) indicated that they liked their teacher. The reasons given were: the teacher was nice (33.3%); the teacher gave playtime (83.0%); the teacher gave work or little work (5.0%); the teacher helped or the the teacher did not yell (3.3%); the teacher was "OK" or the teacher was fun (3.3%); the teacher taught a lot or the teacher gave items to the students (1.7%); and the students liked the aide (1.7%).

Some 34 (56.7%) of the students disliked things about their teacher. The reasons given for dislike included: the teacher hits (11.7%); the teacher was mean (10.0%); the teacher gave a lot of work (5.0%); the teacher was boring or allowed no physical education (3.3%); the student must work (3.3%); everything about the teacher or the aide (1.7%); and the teacher got mad (1.7%). Thirty-seven (61.7%) of the students reported that the teacher offered to help them most

of the time while 46 (76.7%) of the students indicated that they asked for help and an additional 6(10.0%) occasionally asked for help.

Table 16 indicates the student responses to three questions they were asked regarding improvement of school work.

TABLE 16 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF WAYS TO IMPROVE IN SCHOOL

Ways	Teacher Help		Self Help		Parent Help	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Offer Help	23	38.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Teach More	9	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Explain	6	15.0	0	0.0	7	11.6
Homework	4	6.7	1	1.7	11	18.3
Show Us	3	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Talking	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
No Naps	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Give Feedback	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Tell Mom	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Make Bet	1	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Answer Questions	1	1.6	1	1.7	0	0.0
Sit By Fan	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Study	0	0.0	11	18.3	16	26.7
Complete Work	0	0.0	9	15.0	0	0.0
Listen	0	0.0	9	15.0	0	0.0
No Fooling	0	0.0	6	10.0	0	0.0
Read More	0	0.0	4	6.7	4	6.7
Pay Attention	0	0.0	2	3.4	0	0.0
Learn More	0	0.0	2	3.4	0	0.0
Think	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0
Correct Work	0	0.0	1	1.7	0	0.0
Talk English	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0
Quiet Spot	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0
Color	0	0.0	1	1.6	0	0.0
Punish	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	10.0
Practice	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	8.3
Attendance	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	6.7
Tell Do Better	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	5.0
No Response	8	13.3	10	16.6	4	6.7
Total	60	100.0	60	100.0	60	100.0

Students reported that they could help themselves by studying more, completing all their work, and listening. The students felt that parents could help them with studying and homework assignments. Homework was consistent across three help sources and studying was consistent across two help sources.

### Study Habits

Good study habits included good attendance. The students attended school an average of 70% of the time they were enrolled. Although excuses were not required, students indicated the majority of their absences were due to babysitting, translating for parents, or disliking school.

Homework was not usually assigned during summer school; therefore, the study habits of students during the summer were addressed with the present situation in mind and with the hypothetical question, "If you got homework, who would help you?". When students were asked if they would want homework, 41 (66.3%) responded that they would. If homework were assigned, the students indicated that help would come from the mother (33.3%), or a brother or sister (33.3%). This appeared to be consistent with the parent report of homework help which indicated that 38.3% of the mothers helped their children and 30% of the brothers or sisters helped.

The majority of the students 48 (80.1%) returned home

from school between 4:45 and 5:30. Some students were on the bus for as long as 1 1/2 hours; however, an additional bus reduced the longest ride to an hour. Table 17 shows the primary after school activities reported by students.

-----  
TABLE 17      AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES  
-----

Activities	Reported By Student		Reported By Parent	
	#	%	#	%
Play Outside	27	45.0	36	60.0
Play Ball	14	23.3	5	8.3
TV	11	18.3	10	16.7
Bike	10	16.7	4	6.7
Eat	7	11.7	3	5.0
Housework	7	11.7	7	11.7
Work With Parents	6	10.0	0	0.0
Nap	3	5.0	1	1.7
Bathe	2	3.3	1	1.7
Play School	1	1.7	2	3.3
Help Mom	1	1.7	0	0.0
Study/Read	1	1.7	1	1.7
Listen To Radio	1	1.7	2	3.3
Visit	1	1.7	3	5.0
Play With Animals	1	1.7	0	0.0
Marbles/Dice	1	1.7	0	0.0
Dolls	1	1.7	0	0.0
Bible Study	1	1.7	0	0.0
Shopping	1	1.7	0	0.0
Babysitting	0	0.0	1	1.7

Responses indicate that 46.7% of the students and 41.7% of the parents report two after school activities with 20% of the students reporting three activities. Playing outside, playing ball and watching TV were the most frequently reported activities. Parent responses were consistent with students, with parents perceiving outside activities as including ball playing.

Students reported watching an average of 1.2 hours of television per day. Twenty students (33.3%) did not have access to a set or preferred not to watch.

### English Proficiency

Students and their parents were asked to estimate student proficiency with the English language. Table 18 reveals that only 38 (63.4%) of the students have confidence in their ability to speak English compared to 50 (83.0%) of their parents.

-----  
TABLE 18 ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH  
-----

Ability	Reported by Student		Reported by Parent	
	#	%	#	%
Very Well	19	31.7	23	38.3
Well	19	31.7	27	45.0
Somewhat Well	19	31.7	10	16.7
Poorly	3	5.0	0	0.0

-----

Table 19 shows the responses to the question concerning student ability to understand English. Students were confident that they understood more English than they spoke. The parents remained consistent in their previous estimates of ability.

-----  
TABLE 19 STUDENT ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND ENGLISH  
-----

Ability	Reported by Student		Reported by Parent	
	#	%	#	%
Very Well	22	36.7	29	48.3
Well	21	35.0	22	36.7
Somewhat Well	16	26.7	9	15.0
Poorly	1	1.7	0	0.0

-----

Table 20 displays the responses to student ability to read English. The results were similar to ability to speak English. Confidence in ability seemed to decline when comprehension was addressed.

---

TABLE 20                    STUDENT ABILITY TO READ ENGLISH

---

Ability	Reported by Student		Reported by Parent	
	#	%	#	%
Very Well	16	26.7	10	16.7
Well	24	40.0	25	41.7
Somewhat Well	19	31.7	22	36.7
Poorly	1	1.7	3	5.0

---

Table 21 indicates that only 56.7% of the students felt that they understood what they read. Parents were consistent with a lowered estimate of 53.3%.

---

TABLE 21                    STUDENT ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THEY READ

---

Ability	Reported by Student		Reported by Parent	
	#	%	#	%
Very Well	9	15.0	6	10.0
Well	25	41.7	26	43.3
Somewhat Well	19	31.7	22	36.7
Poorly	1	1.7	3	5.0

---

Responses to the question pertaining to student ability to write in English are found in Table 22 on page 69. Confidence in their abilities returned but not to the level of speaking and understanding. Most students were much more proficient than their parents. The parents understood the difficulties associated with reading,

comprehending material, and writing in English; therefore, those skills were rated more difficult for their children to master.

-----  
 TABLE 22                    STUDENT ABILITY TO WRITE ENGLISH  
 -----

Ability	Reported by Student		Reported by Parent	
	#	%	#	%
Very Well	11	18.3	9	15.0
Well	29	48.3	25	41.7
Somewhat Well	19	31.7	19	31.7
Poorly	1	1.7	7	11.7

-----

#### Summary

Migrant students were occasionally lonely. They indicated that they sometimes got to do what they wanted to do at home and sometimes got into trouble at home. Generally, they viewed themselves as punctual, attractive, interesting, happy, helpful, busy, and worrisome. They worried the most about a relative being ill or injured. Most aspired to a career not related to migrancy.

The majority of migrant students in grades 3-10 have rated their self-concept of ability as average. They had some friends in school and were sociable at school with occasional socially unfavorable behaviors directed toward them. Students wanted to do their best in school and only took occasional blame when they did poorly. Most would not mind homework. Parents discussed school with their children

and offered homework support systems. Students enjoyed playing outside and watched a minimum amount of television. They liked their teachers and felt that the teachers offered help.

Students often rated their understanding of English as "very well". They rated speaking, writing, reading and comprehension of what they read as "well".

### Teacher Survey

The teacher survey component was designed to examine demographic, teacher expectations, teacher perceptions of students, educational needs, and program strengths and weaknesses.

#### Demographics

The 13 respondents included 100% of the teaching force serving grades 3 and up, and consisted of 12 females and 1 male teacher. The teachers reported that they were 77% black, 15% white and one nonresponse.

Table 23 displays the educational background of the respondents.

---

TABLE 23                    EDUCATION LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

---

Level	#	%
Masters	2	15.4
Bachelors	11	84.6
Total	13	100.0

---

Table 24 indicates that 69% of the teachers have taught twenty years or more, with experience in the program ranging from 5 to 19 years.

It appeared that veteran teachers were attracted to summer employment and a specialized population. Lack of federal financing had forced recent cutbacks that effected teachers without a specialty area and with less than four years of experience in the migrant program.

---

TABLE 24                      TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS

---

Years	#	%
5-9	1	7.7
10-14	2	15.4
15-19	1	7.7
20 and up	9	69.2
Total	13	100.0

---

Table 25 shows the grade level assignments. Students were placed according to the grade just completed. Multi-grade classes were used when enrollments were too low to justify a separate class.

---

TABLE 25                      SUMMER TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS

---

Grade Level	#	%
Third	1	7.7
Third and Up	2	15.4
Fourth	1	7.7
Fifth and Up	2	15.4
Art	1	7.7
Music	1	7.7
Physical Education	1	7.7
Reading Specialists	2	15.4
Library	2	15.4
Total	13	100.0

---

### Teacher Expectations

The migrant education program was a supplementary instructional program that was primarily skill-based. There were limited materials and no formal curriculum guides. Migrant education teachers had identified reading and mathematics objectives to be completed at each grade level. Teacher knowledge of these objectives was tempered by the reality of a six week summer school session. Tables 26, 27, and 28 indicate the objectives identified by an appointed teacher committee of migrant educators who identified objectives that were then correlated to the Curriculum Referenced Test of Mastery. These objectives have been correlated with teacher expectations for fast and slow students.

---

TABLE 26           TEACHER EXPECTATIONS IN READING

---

Teacher	#	Objectives		Total
		Fast	Slow	
Third	1	5-6	1-2	10
Third & up	2	3-4	1-2	10-12
Fourth	1	>6	>6	11
Fifth & up	2	>6	3-4	11-12
			5-6	
Reading	2	3-4	1-2	10-12
		>6	3-4	

---

Confusion appeared to exist with varied grade levels in the intermediate block when summer school teachers identified the number of objectives per grade level.

---



---

 TABLE 27            TEACHER EXPECTATIONS IN MATHEMATICS
 

---



---

Teacher	#	Objectives		Total
		Fast	Slow	
Third	1	3-4	3-4	12
Third & Up	2	3-4	1-2	11-12
Fourth	1	>6	>6	11
Fifth & Up	2	>6	3-4 5-6	11

---



---



---



---

 TABLE 28            RESOURCE TEACHER EXPECTATIONS
 

---



---

Teacher	#	Objectives		Total
		Fast	Slow	
Art	1	>6	3-4	2
Music	1	5-6	3-4	2
P.E.	1	5-6	3-4	5
Library	2	1-2 5-6	1-2 3-4	1

---



---

Third grade teachers correctly identified the number of math objectives and approached the correct number of reading objectives within one objective. Half of the third grade and up teachers underestimated the number of reading and math objectives.

Fourth grade teachers correctly identified the number of math objectives. Fifth grade teachers overestimated reading and math objectives. Reading teachers underestimated reading objectives for all levels but grade three. Library and physical education personnel identified the correct range of objectives while art and music personnel overestimated the number of objectives.

Teacher expectations were surveyed by requesting the teachers to identify the number of objectives that "fast" and "slow" students would be expected to master in six weeks. Respondents (50%) indicated that mastery of reading objectives by a "fast" student would be less than the objectives for each level. In mathematics a similar response was consistent for all teachers surveyed (50%). Resource teachers indicated that "fast" students could master all of the stated objectives.

Mastery of reading objectives by a "slow" student was found to be less than a "fast" student in all instances except grade four. Teacher expectations of grade four teachers for slower students in reading were high with "fast" and "slow" students mastering more than 6 objectives out of a possible 11. In mathematics, mastery of material by "fast" students was in the same range for "slow" students. Grade four objectives for "slow" students were high. Grade three, and grade three and up teachers indicated fewer objectives were mastered by the "fast" student in reading and math in comparison to the total available objectives for the grade level.

Resource teachers (60%) consistently expected "slow" students to master 3-4 objectives in art, music and physical education and 1-4 objectives in library skills. These results were incongruent with the total available number of

objectives in physical education and library.

Teachers were surveyed about parent involvement. Parent involvement in Chapter 1 migrant education programs was mandated by law. Formal parent advisory council meetings were conducted by the Chapter 1 program administrators with no teacher participation. Only two of the teachers had ever been to a migrant camp. Teachers were asked questions concerning their contact with the migrant community. Since the survey was administered during the fourth week of the program, the contact estimates were based on the previous year's program. Table 29 indicates that the limited number of respondents have had varied parent contacts with visits and phone calls as the most prominent contacts.

-----  
TABLE 29            PARENT CONTACTS  
-----

Contact	# of Contacts	Teachers
Letter	1	2 (15.4)
	10	1 ( 7.7)
Visits	1	1 ( 7.7)
	20	2 (15.4)
Phone	1	1 ( 7.7)
	25	1 ( 7.7)

-----

One respondent indicated that 5 parent visits were conducted during an open house that was usually held during the last week of the program.

#### Teacher Perceptions of Students

Selected student descriptors characteristic of migrant

are displayed in Table 30.

TABLE 30 STUDENT DESCRIPTORS IN CLASSROOM PERCENTS

Descriptor	# Teachers	Mean	S.D.
Has language problems	11	14.5	11.2
Does assignments	12	72.5	34.0
Is a discipline problem	8	15.5	11.5
Tries to please	13	62.4	37.6
Is lazy	11	13.3	10.2
Has good personality	13	73.4	27.0
Needs remedial work	13	35.1	33.6
Is unhealthy	7	5.0	5.5
Lacks personal hygiene	10	10.5	7.2
Can excel in school	13	48.5	28.0
Below average in ability	13	32.9	25.8
Will never finish school	10	27.2	26.4
Should go to college	13	38.9	28.5
Is an attendance problem	13	25.8	19.5

Teachers were asked to respond to the descriptors in terms of the number of students in their classes possessing those characteristics.

The low percentage of students that experienced language problems credited the ability of the majority population, Hispanic, with their diligence in utilizing the dominant language in grades three and up.

The majority of the students did their assignments, exhibited a good personality and tried to please others. Migrant students were seen as healthy and clean. Students requiring remedial work (35.1%) were consistent with those of below average ability (32.9%). The estimate of those students not expected to finish school seemed low. Migrant

teachers expressed a positive attitude toward the abilities of students who could excel (48.5%). This was also reflected in the students projected to go to college. Discipline and attendance problems may be indicative of a noncompulsory summer program. Many parents left for work before children left for school, therefore children may not have attended school regularly when they were left unsupervised. Other parents allowed the students to work in the fields.

Teachers were presented with a menu of curriculum areas shown in Table 31. They were asked to indicate the need for inclusion in a summer school program by placing the number of students in need of that subject area or service, then these numbers were converted to classroom percents. Teachers were given an opportunity to mention other areas.

TABLE 31 EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF STUDENTS  
IN CLASSROOM PERCENTS

Subject/Service	Mean	S.D.	#
Mathematics	88.4	29.3	13
Reading/Lang. Arts	87.9	30.0	13
Art	86.9	32.5	13
Physical Education	85.6	35.2	13
Music	80.9	37.3	13
Guidance	75.2	40.2	12
Social Studies	73.1	43.8	13
Cultural Heritage	66.6	44.8	12
Science	65.9	47.8	11
Communication Skills	63.9	43.7	13
English as a Second Lang.	48.3	33.6	12
Vocational Training	47.7	45.1	11
Career Education	46.6	43.4	11
Health Education	7.7	27.7	13

The areas currently receiving the most emphasis such as reading, mathematics, art, music and physical education were seen as priorities. Social studies and science were part of the curriculum in one migrant program; however, the need was addressed in this survey as desirable in both programs. It was surprising that in today's high tech society the teachers rated communication skills low in comparison to other needs. Guidance and cultural heritage were two areas rated as important; however, they were not emphasized in the present curriculum.

The teachers were asked to rate the program on several key components using a three point scale. The results are reported in Table 32 on page 79. The results of the ratings were significant in that 16 out of 20 areas were rated above average. Teachers appeared to be content with the present program.

Recruitment and staff cooperation were rated the highest. Recruitment services were important for the enrollment of students. The staff cooperation on a building level involved teachers that have worked together in varying capacities for many years.

Also rated above average were facilities, library access, equipment, and transportation services. Both summer programs utilized elementary school facilities including cafeterias and gymnasiums. School buses traveled to camps

from one end of the county to the other.

TABLE 32 RATINGS OF SCHOOL COMPONENTS  
1=Inferior 2=Average 3=Superior

Charac./Component	Mean	S. D.	#
Staff Cooperation	2.9	.28	13
Recruitment	2.9	.28	13
Classroom Instruction	2.8	.44	13
Library	2.7	.48	13
In-service Training	2.7	.48	13
School Facilities	2.5	.52	13
School Equipment	2.5	.52	13
Curriculum	2.5	.52	13
Home-School Coordinator	2.5	.88	13
Transportation	2.5	.52	13
Food Service	2.4	.65	13
Counseling	2.4	.51	13
Student Motivation	2.3	.48	13
Support Services	2.2	.80	13
Migrant Student Record			
Transfer System	2.2	.83	13
Instructional Aids	2.2	.69	13
Textbooks	2.0	.82	13
Student Discipline	2.0	.58	13
Student Attendance	2.0	.00	13
Parent Support	1.8	.60	13

With in-service training rated as above average, there was an indication that annual training experiences were meaningful. Attendance and discipline were rated average which was commendable for a noncompulsory program.

Teachers viewed parent support as below average. This was reflected in the limited number of parent contacts with the school and no teacher visits to the camps. The recruiter, as a school representative, frequently visited the camps.

Teachers were presented with an open-ended question to elicit responses related to program improvements. Only 31% of teachers responded. Improvements to the program included: (a) more teachers in the lower grades; (b) art in the classroom; (c) lower pupil/teacher ratio; and (d) experienced teacher aide supervision in the afternoon. Greater enrollments were seen in the lower grades (K-2) as parental concern for child care was emphasized. One program utilized high school students for extended day care services and the same program did not offer instruction by specialists due to funding restrictions.

#### Summary

Migrant teachers were experienced professionals, many of whom work under less than optimum conditions. Teacher expectations based on a knowledge of objectives in reading, mathematics and resource instruction was varied and inconsistent. Home-school contacts by teachers were minimal with the most prevalent being parent visits to the school during an annual open house usually held the last week of the program.

Teachers perceived students as willing to please, responsible for assignments, and having a good personality. Primary educational needs of students include mathematics, language arts, physical education, music, and guidance

services. Parental support was the only program component rated below average.

### Ethnographic Component

The ethnographic component will be discussed by presenting a data summary relative to each research question. The Developmental Research Sequence recommended by Spradley (1979) was used to structure the interviews and analyze the data to domain and taxonomic levels.

#### Introduction

The ethnographic component consisted of six student interviews, six teacher interviews, eight administrative interviews, and thirty hours of classroom observations.

Students were chosen to be representative of grade, teacher, sex, and ethnicity. Two of the three males were Hispanic, nine years of age, had traveled from Texas and Florida, and were in the third grade. The other male was Black, thirteen years of age, assigned to grade five and had traveled from Florida. They were assigned to three different teachers. The female sample consisted of one Haitian (12 years old), one Hispanic (10 years old), and one Black (12 years old), assigned respectively to grades 4, 5, and 6. They had traveled from Florida and were assigned to the remaining three teachers.

The students were interviewed privately by the researcher during the fifth week of the program to allow time for the development of a rapport between the student and the researcher. General questions relating to favorite teachers, school likes and dislikes, and school behaviors were presented. Students were to elaborate on differences.

Teacher interviews were conducted on noninstructional time during week four. Teachers were asked general questions relating to classroom descriptions, room organization, descriptions of migrant students, descriptions of the classroom atmosphere, program needs and philosophy, cultural enrichment and migrant valuing of education. The teachers were asked to elaborate on differences in specific areas.

The administrative interviews were conducted during weeks four and five. The format of the interview was similar to the teacher interview with an additional emphasis on an explanation of duties and responsibilities assigned to each position. The administrative interviews included two principals, two Chapter 1 directors, two counselors, a recruiter, and a camp counselor.

Classroom observations were conducted between the fourth and the twenty-second day of program operation. The researcher was usually seated at a student desk or folding chair at the rear of the room. Thirty hours of classroom

observations were conducted during sixty one-half hour sessions. The number of observations per teacher depended on the availability of the class and teacher schedules. Observations were completed in the following areas.

1. There were 27 reading/language arts lessons observed.

2. There were 18 mathematics lessons observed.

3. There were 2 social studies/cultural enrichment lessons observed.

4. There was 1 observation of a reading laboratory lesson.

5. There were 2 observations of resource art lessons and 1 observation of a classroom art lesson.

6. There were 2 observations of resource music lessons and 1 observation of a classroom music lesson.

7. There were 4 resource library lessons observed.

8. There were 2 resource physical education lessons observed.

There were ten observations per class and 12 out of a possible 13 teachers were observed. Class attendance ranged from three students to fourteen students with an average pupil-teacher ratio of 9.3 to 1. Teacher aides, available in every class but one, reduced that ratio to 4.6 to 1.

### Research Question 1

What educational needs are reported for migrant students by school personnel and parents?

Domain analysis revealed relationships from the data relative to key terminology in the research question.

Domain 1 - Kinds of educational needs. Classroom observations have documented the perceived educational needs of migrant students to be instruction in reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies, library, art, music, and physical education. Teacher and administrative interviews focused on a need for basic skills instruction, individualization of needs both academic and health-related, the inclusion of a writing program, creative activities in all areas, resource instruction and field trips. The program would need to be expanded to include a preschool program, Saturday programs and an evening program. The current program did provide services to a number of preschool children for which no reimbursement was obtained. The rationale for this extended service had been to provide some preschool services for younger siblings of school-age children to facilitate attendance of the older siblings. Field trips, Saturday programs and evening instructional programs have been eliminated due to funding restrictions. A perceived need for continued home-school contact was the

intent of the camp counselor's job. He traveled to large camps as a school representative to provide movies and crafts for the families.

### Research Question 2

What is the psychological and cultural context of the school for migrant students?

Domain analysis revealed that the psychological context of the school, especially the classroom, consisted of the following descriptors: (a) grouping; (b) comments and questions to groups; (c) comments and questions to individuals; (d) student talk; (e) attitudes of migrant teachers; and (f) attitudes of migrant students. The cultural context of the school focused on the migratory life style.

Domain 1 - Grouping. The domain, Grouping, as revealed through taxonomic analysis of teacher statements and classroom observations, was characterized by instruction in small groups, a group circle, and total class grouping for direct instruction.

Small groups. Two teachers preferred to routinely operate using small groups, primarily based on ability. Groups of two to six students received language arts and mathematics instruction.

Group circle. A class group circle of desks was observed once; however teachers using small group instruction used circles for language arts lessons.

Total group. Most migrant teachers preferred direct instruction of the total class. The students were seated in rows and were racially mixed. On one occasion two classroom groups merged for instruction. Students ate lunch with the same classroom groupings. Classroom groupings would often schedule recess at a similar time, thereby allowing student interaction between groups.

Domain 2 - Comments and questions to groups.

The psychological context of the classroom included comments and questions to groups during direct instruction. All teachers provided directions and explanations. The verbage was classified into statements and questions that were general, evaluative, reprimands and competition-oriented.

General. General comments and questions included some of the examples listed below.

1. "Have you guessed what we're making yet?"
2. "Don't worry if you didn't finish."
3. "You worked hard this morning."

Evaluative. Evaluative statements and questions were used repeatedly by three teachers.

Representative samples are listed below.

1. "How many agree?"
2. "You're doing a better job than yesterday."
3. "Is that right, Class?"

Reprimands. Group reprimands were used sparingly by a variety of teachers.

Competitive statements. Competitive comments to groups were used exclusively by one teacher. Examples included some of the comments listed below.

1. "The first one finished gets the point."
2. "Remember, speed counts."

Domain 3 - Comments and questions to individuals.

This domain comprised the bulk of the psychological context of the classroom. Listed in order of prevalence, the taxonomies are presented below.

Neutral feedback. Neutral feedback was characterized by the use of "OK" and "Alright".

Positive feedback. Teachers used "Good", "Very Good", "Correct", "Right" or other positive comments.

Corrective feedback. Teachers would work with students individually by moving around the room to check their work or their performance. Several teachers preferred

that the student report to the desk or a table to have their work checked. Two teacher aides were utilized for checking work.

Reprimands. Students were frequently reprimanded in front of others. Some offenses worthy of reprimand included noncompletion of work, lack of attending and disrespect.

Comments directed to students during direct instruction. The majority of these comments were directed to the students to help them derive an answer.

Questions and comments to students during independent work. The majority of the comments and questions were designed to help the students understand their work. There were a variety of instructional levels in each room; therefore, worksheets required additional explanation for some students.

Other comments. This taxonomy included teacher talk which addressed a variety of areas such as clarifying answers, providing encouragement, telling students to move their seats, belittling students, asking students to explain their favorite items and giving posters to students.

Summary. This presents a picture of classrooms

in which much feedback was given to student responses. Discipline was stressed. Students were deprived of resource classes, i.e., art, music, physical education and library, or recess due to incomplete work or misbehavior. Three teachers provided individualized attention and assistance while two teachers had students working independently with little instructional assistance.

Domain 4 - Student talk. The most prevalent kind of student talk involved comments to peers. For bilingual students, comments were usually spoken in their native language between instructional activities, at lunch or during recess. Three other types of student talk included a complaint, an argument, and sharing a book with another student.

Domain 5 - Attitudes of migrant teachers. The psychological environment of the classroom can be summarized from teacher attitudes. Interviews and observations revealed two taxonomies: (a) attitudes toward students; and (b) attitudes toward teaching.

Attitudes toward students. Comments were scattered; however, the comments and observations most frequently documented indicated that migrant students need attention; that they were touched for both positive and negative

reasons; that they smiled a lot; and that they were eager to learn. Other observations and comments revealed that migrant students were defensive, picked on each other, needed strict discipline, and lost resource time as a punishment. Students were chronologically older for their grade assignment. They were perceived to perform better in mathematics than language arts and they needed the teacher to work with them and to keep them busy. The students were thought to be lovable and willing to please, appreciative, and free to believe what they want. Students wanted someone to listen to them, care for them and call them by name.

Attitudes toward teaching. Teacher attitudes toward migrant students were similar to teacher attitudes toward regular school teaching; therefore, this research indicated that teaching style does not necessarily change with the population being instructed. These strategies included strict discipline, and help for the students. Other attitudes toward teaching emphasized by only two of thirteen teachers included strategies of writing objectives on the board and active involvement in the classroom. Active involvement was noted as physical participation in the lesson. Students were observed sitting in rows with two classrooms having an over abundance of desks.

Students appeared to enjoy receiving stickers from one

teacher, who happened to be the same teacher that deemphasized grades. Bulletin boards were noted in each room. Most contained an "Our Work" board as well as some type of announcement or schedule board. One teacher commented that she learned from her students. Inappropriate audiovisual materials were viewed by two classes.

Summary. The attitude of migrant teachers toward migrant students revealed that teachers perceived the needs of migrant students to be similar to other students. Increased supervision and staff development should deter incidences of inappropriate audiovisual materials, encourage more appropriate discipline plans, stress the sharing of objectives between instructor and students, and develop active involvement in learning tasks.

#### Domain 6 - Attitudes of migrant students.

Students and teachers were interviewed about their attitudes toward teachers, curriculum likes and dislikes, family and peers, and the physical facility.

Attitudes toward teachers. Taxonomic analysis revealed that students enjoyed favorite teachers that gave them time and attention. Teachers that were nice, helpful, and caring, who gave treats for good behavior, and provided educational games in the classroom were favored. These

comments were combined with statements relating to summer school teachers. Students reported missing recess to finish work, the teacher need for quiet and that the teacher yelled a lot. Teachers observed that students wanted good grades, liked rewards and were eager to learn. In summary, the results indicated that the six students made many comments relating to classroom management, specifically missing recess to complete work; and perceiving the teacher as mean, boring, yells a lot and wanting quiet. The teacher was also seen as being nice, giving a lot of work and teaching a lot of things.

Attitudes toward curriculum. The analysis of the taxonomy which included curriculum enjoyed revealed that the majority of the students enjoyed the subjects listed below. The subjects listed were in order of frequency mentioned by students: (a) mathematics; (b) art; (c) physical education and science; and (d) language, social studies, spelling, and music.

Very few subjects and parts of the school day were disliked by the students. Two students disliked social studies while others mentioned math and rest time.

Attitudes toward family and peers. Analysis of peer/family relationships indicated that students were exposed to inappropriate language, discrimination and

crowded living conditions at the camps. Problems with peer relationships at the camp were often brought to school including name-calling and intended isolation of designated peers. Like most students, migrant students enjoyed talking with their peers. Peer tutoring was used by one teacher. While most teachers encouraged students to sit racially mixed, one teacher did not encourage this and students sat in ethnic groupings.

Attitudes toward the physical facility. Some students and teachers commented on classroom conditions. A cool classroom was preferred by everyone and a colorful classroom that emphasized educational games was preferred by students.

### Summary

The psychological context of the migrant classroom was generally characterized by teacher-directed instruction with the total group. Neutral feedback which included the use of "ok" and "alright" was more prevalent than positive feedback. Students were individually reprimanded in front of the total group. They were assisted by the classroom teacher with little assistance from the aides. Students enjoyed interacting with their peers. Teachers viewed students as eager to learn, willing to please, and requiring discipline. Students remained in their seats, and were generally passive

learners. They usually did not have objectives stated for them. Students enjoyed mathematics and disliked social studies. They carried camp concerns with them to school. They enjoyed coming to a classroom that was cool, colorful and stimulating with educational games.

### Cultural Context of the Classroom

#### Domain 1 - Kinds of factors relevant to teaching.

The cultural context of the classroom was addressed through an awareness of the migratory lifestyle. Students valued cleanliness and good behavior. Most missed friends and family that were left behind in the home base state. Teachers permitted some students to nap in the classroom or at the clinic. Close living conditions at the camps, unsupervised children and waking early with their parents were all factors that may have contributed to exhaustion.

The migratory life style influenced student attendance. Some students were motivated to get out of the fields and others were anxious to help their parents. Some students missed school because they needed to babysit for younger siblings or they were needed to interpret for their parents. Occasionally students enrolled at the summer school after their parents decided that they had worked in the fields long enough. It was observed that children preferred staying in groups by camps. Occasionally students conversed

in Spanish or Creole with other students. There were few multi-ethnic teaching materials in use. Emphasis on the migratory lifestyle was infused into the lessons by two teachers.

In summary, the inclusion of materials and activities that related specifically to the cultural context had not been achieved by the majority of the teachers.

### Research Question 3

How do the educational values of migrant parents and students relate to academic performance and school philosophy?

Domain 1 - Kind of Values and Achievement. Table 33 displays the educational performance of the students in the ethnographic sample. All students achieved at a satisfactory level. A satisfactory rating was determined when the posttest score on either the reading or mathematics test was above an NCE of 40%.

-----  
TABLE 33 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF INTERVIEWED STUDENTS  
-----

Student#	Age	Math Pre (NCE)	Math Post (NCE)	Read. Pre (NCE)	Read. Post (NCE)
1 (gr.5)	13	44	53	1	19
2 (gr.3)	9	37	53	26	64
3 (gr.4)	12	25	50	1	71
4 (gr.6)	12	15	64	28	60
5 (gr.5)	10	34	83	37	75
6 (gr.3)	9	37	63	26	45

-----

Student reasons for valuing an education are listed below in order of frequency.

1. School was important to learn.
2. School was important to learn mathematics, reading, career skills, English, science and social studies.
3. School was important to help parents, to go to college, or to go on trips.

Parents interviewed for this same group indicated that school was important for the following reasons.

1. School was important to get an education.
2. School was important to get an education so the children did not have to work in the fields.
3. School was important to graduate.
4. School was important to learn everything the children can to help their parents.

School was valued by parents and students as reflected in the high average attendance rate of 90.5%.

The relationship between educational performance and valuing education can be seen as a positive one since all of the students achieved satisfactorily.

Domain 2 - Valuing and philosophy. Administrative interviews and teacher interviews were conducted to address the relationship between parent and student valuing of education and school philosophy. The school philosophy

listed below is in order of frequency of interview responses. The summer program will provide: (a) educational enrichment; (b) a means to meet the needs of children that have their education interrupted; (c) a means to help the child see the importance of an education; and (d) provide instruction for students below grade level.

A philosophy of meeting the needs of children that have had their education interrupted appeared to be most consonant with the valuing of education to change or improve their child's future life style. It is interesting to note that parents and students never mention having their education interrupted as a problem. They valued more education as a means of bettering themselves; therefore, the philosophy of educational enrichment would be most relevant to parents, students and staff.

Examination of summer program applications revealed no stated philosophies but broad statements of needs as well as stated objectives. They produced a commonality of statements focusing on reading and mathematics skills for migrant students with supportive services offered to meet their individual needs. Educational enrichment beyond the basics was implied. Statements regarding the inclusion of fine arts were stated but were not apparent in program activities. The philosophy of providing summer educational experiences for migrant students was in agreement with

student valuing of an education to learn mathematics, reading, career skills, English, science and social studies.

#### Research Question 5

What is the relationship of English proficiency to academic performance?

The relationship between English proficiency and academic performance can best be described by examining student, teacher, and administrative interviews as well as classroom observations. Domain analysis revealed the following categories: (a) perceptions of academic performance of students by teachers, administrators and the researcher; and (b) perceptions of academic performance by the student.

Domain 1 - Teacher perceptions. Respondents in administrative interviews perceived that there was no need for specific language instruction in the daily schedule. This was contrary to numerous observations in which students displayed difficulty understanding questions and directions. Language differences were noted as putting a strain on the staff. Teachers instructed a wide range of reading abilities within a grade level. The Hispanic student was seen as shy and academically behind his peers. Haitian students, unable to communicate freely in English, were also viewed as withdrawn. Parents were perceived by

administrative personnel as being supportive of English instruction.

Domain 2 - Student perceptions. Student perceptions of the relationships between English proficiency and academics were much more specific. Students understood that language instruction would help them to read and speak English. Short term consequences of proficiency were seen relating to academics as well as relating to helping interpret for their parents. Long term benefits were perceived as a valuable tool in a career.

#### Research Question 6

What are the reported strengths and weaknesses of the program as reported by parents and program personnel and as reported through research observations?

Domain 1 - Program strengths. The domain of Program Strengths was further delineated into strengths of program services, strengths of program personnel and strengths of students. Program services included educational enrichment experiences that addressed auxiliary services including health needs and child care through an extended day program. Children were provided with transportation services in the morning and in the late afternoon. Program personnel provided a welcome, caring atmosphere at the centers with

low pupil-teacher ratios. Teachers experienced few discipline problems.

Parental contact was accomplished through camp visits by home-school coordinators, also known as recruiters, and a camp counselor.

Domain 2 - Program weaknesses. The domain of Program Weaknesses can be categorized into program services and program personnel. Reduced funding, which forced a cut in essential program services, was mentioned during two administrative interviews. Some personnel indicated a need for an evening instructional program for young adults, a Saturday program for students and field trips. Administrative interviews suggested a longer teaching day and additional nutrition and health care.

Personnel weaknesses were noted as a need for experienced instructional aides and additional resource teachers. This would certainly enhance the academic day. Administrators indicated that knowing the grade assignment in advance would help teachers in preparing for the summer session.

#### Scaling Results

Two attitude scales were administered and three indices were calculated from the data.

### Parent Attitude Toward School Scale

The results of the parent attitude toward school scale produced a distribution with a mean of 5.57 and a standard deviation of .70. This indicated a positive attitude toward school in that the maximum score was a 7 and a negative attitude would be a 2 or less. The small standard deviation suggested that no parents were negative and there was little variability in responses. The parent attitude toward their child speaking English produced a distribution with a mean of 9.4 and a standard deviation of 2.83. These results suggested that the parents were in favor of their children speaking English in that the scale permitted a range of scores from 0 to 15. The small standard deviation indicated little variability of response and no negative attitudes.

### Student Attitude Toward School Scale

The Student Attitude Toward School Scale produced a distribution with a mean of 9.8 and a standard deviation of 2.22. These results indicated that students, like their parents, had a positive attitude toward school. The scale permitted a range of scores from 0 to 13. The standard deviation indicated that there was more variation in the student distribution than in the parent distribution.

### Index of English Proficiency

The first index that was calculated was the Index of English Language Proficiency which permitted scores from 0 to 15, with the higher score indicating more proficiency. This index combined the ratings of the parent attitude toward their child's English proficiency with the student attitude toward their English proficiency. These scores were then rated 2, 3 or 4 with a rating of 2 indicating a range of low proficiency and a 4 indicating high proficiency in English. This index produced a distribution with a mean of 3.3 and a standard deviation of .54 thereby indicating that both parent and child felt that the child was fairly proficient in English.

### Self-concept Index

The student self-concept index permitted a range from 0 to 5. This index produced a distribution with a mean of 3.1 and a standard deviation of .85. These results suggested that the students possessed a relatively positive self-concept in a homogeneous school setting.

### Index of School Progress

An index of school progress (ISP) was calculated from the two achievement scores. This index classified students into two categories -- satisfactory progress and unsatisfactory progress. Satisfactory progress was based on

scoring greater than 40 NCEs on the pre and posttests or scoring 40 or less on the posttest only or the pretest only. Unsatisfactory progress was based on scoring below 40 on the pretest and the posttest. This index classified 27 (45%) of the students as making satisfactory progress and 28 (46.7%) of the students as making unsatisfactory progress. Five students (8.3%) were not tested. ISP produced a distribution of 1.5 with a standard deviation of .79. In the context of rating 40 to 60 NCEs as average, half of the migrant students could be considered as low average learners.

#### Crosstabulation Results

The relationship of school progress to other nominal variables was investigated through the use of crosstabulation. The use of the nominal scale index was appropriate in crosstabulation analysis in pointing out the abnormal and identifying the robust relationships.

Variables were grouped by themes such as home-related variables, school-related variables and self-concept.

#### Achievement and Home-related Variables

Sex was crossed with the index of school progress (ISP). Table 34 indicates that fewer males than females were high achievers.

---

 TABLE 34            ISP AND SEX
 

---

Sex	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Male	12 (21.8%)	14 (25.4%)	26
Female	15 (27.3%)	14 (25.5%)	29
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

---

A recoding was completed on the marital status of the students' parents. The married respondents were classified into one category and the remaining respondents were placed in the "other" category. Table 35 displays the cross of this variable with ISP. There were no meaningful relationships.

---

 TABLE 35            ISP AND MARITAL STATUS
 

---

Status	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Married	19 (34.5%)	21 (38.2%)	40
Other	8 (14.6%)	7 (12.7%)	15
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

---

Amenities in the home which may be considered as learning aids have been associated with school progress. The possession of books was crossed with ISP and the results were reported in Table 36 on page 105. There was no relationship to academic achievement.

Educational attainment of the parents was another potential correlate of achievement. There were no significant differences among educational levels of the mother or father and the student's academic achievement as

shown in Tables 37 and 38. The migratory life style has forced many individuals to earn an income at an early age.

TABLE 36           ISP AND BOOKS

Books	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Yes	5 (9.1%)	9 (16.4%)	14
No	22 (40.0%)	19 (34.5%)	41
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

TABLE 37           ISP AND MOTHER'S EDUCATION

Education	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Grade 5 and less	5 (9.4%)	6 (11.3%)	11
Grades 6-12	21 (39.6%)	19 (35.9%)	40
Grade 13 and up	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.9%)	2
Subtotal	27 (50.9%)	26 (49.1%)	53

TABLE 38           ISP AND FATHER'S EDUCATION

Education	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Grade 5 and less	9 (25.0%)	7 (19.4%)	16
Grades 6-12	10 (27.8%)	9 (25.0%)	19
Grade 13 and up	1 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1
Subtotal	20 (55.6%)	16 (44.4%)	36

#### Achievement and Self-Concept Variables

The students were asked questions about their perceptions regarding school and the school environment. Table 39 reports the crossing of school enjoyment with ISP. Responses indicate that most students enjoyed school.

There were no meaningful differences between the enjoyment of school and successful or unsuccessful school performance.

TABLE 39           ISP AND SCHOOL ENJOYMENT

Enjoyment	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Yes	18 (32.8%)	19 (34.6%)	37
Sometimes	5 (9.0%)	5 (9.0%)	10
No	4 (7.3%)	4 (7.3%)	8
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

The association of being lucky and ISP was investigated. There were no meaningful relationships nor were there any when estimate of ability and ISP were crosstabbed as shown in Tables 40 and 41.

TABLE 40           ISP AND FEELING OF BEING FORTUNATE

Lucky	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Yes	15 (27.3%)	14 (25.4%)	19
No	12 (21.8%)	14 (25.5%)	26
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

TABLE 41           ISP AND ABILITY

Ability	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Easily	9 (16.4%)	8 (14.5%)	17
OK	13 (23.7%)	13 (23.7%)	26
Slow	5 (9.0%)	7 (12.7%)	12
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

Students' estimates of their health status did show

some differences. These results are displayed in Table 42.

TABLE 42           ISP AND HEALTH

Health	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Very Good	13 (23.7%)	10 (18.1%)	23
Good	13 (23.6%)	14 (25.5%)	27
Not Good	1 (1.8%)	4 (7.3%)	5
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

Students who felt that they were in very good health did better academically. Conversely, students who felt that they were in poor health achieved unsatisfactorily more often.

Migrant students were strangers to various new school settings during the school term. Tables 43, 44, and 45 show the analyses of getting along with others, having friends, and being picked on crosstabbed with ISP. Students that did well academically felt that they had a lot of friends. Most of the students got along "OK" with their peers and were occasionally taunted.

TABLE 43           ISP AND SOCIABILITY

Relationships With Others	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Very Good	8 (14.5%)	9 (16.3%)	17
OK	16 (29.1%)	16 (29.1%)	32
Poor	3 (5.5%)	3 (5.5%)	6
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

---

 TABLE 44            ISP AND FRIENDS
 

---

Friends	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Lot	9 (16.4%)	14 (25.4%)	23
Some	17 (30.9%)	11 (20.0%)	28
None	1 (1.8%)	3 (5.5%)	4
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

---

Results also indicate that those students who were unsuccessful academically felt that they had a lot of friends.

---

 TABLE 45            ISP AND MEAN CHILDREN
 

---

Picked On	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Hardly Ever	9 (16.4%)	10 (18.1%)	19
Sometimes	17 (30.9%)	15 (27.3%)	32
Often	1 (1.8%)	3 (5.5%)	4
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

---

The index calculated to estimate the student's self-concept was crossed with academic progress. Table 46 indicates that most of the students have a good self-concept; however, students with a poor self-concept were low achievers more often than high achievers.

---

 TABLE 46            ISP AND SELF-CONCEPT
 

---

Self-concept	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Good	22 (40.0%)	18 (32.7%)	40
Poor	5 (9.1%)	10 (18.2%)	15
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

---

Achievement and School-related Variables

Study habits for migrant students for the purpose of this study were defined as a desire for homework, homework help, television time, and attendance patterns. Crosstabulations of homework and academic progress indicated that there were no meaningful relationships. Most students requested homework to have "something to do at the camp". Table 47 displays this relationship.

-----  
TABLE 47           ISP AND HOMEWORK  
-----

Homework	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Yes	2 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2
Sometimes	18 (32.7%)	19 (34.5%)	37
No	7 (12.7%)	9 (16.4%)	16
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

-----

Students who received help with homework benefitted by achieving satisfactorily. Table 48 reveals these relationships.

-----  
TABLE 48           ISP AND HOMEWORK HELP  
-----

Helpers	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Mother	12 (21.8%)	5 (9.1%)	17
Father	4 (7.3%)	2 (3.6%)	6
Parents	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.5%)	3
Brother/ Sister	8 (14.6%)	10 (18.1%)	18
Relative	2 (3.6%)	3 (5.5%)	5
No One	1 (1.8%)	5 (9.1%)	6
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

-----

Although homework was not required in a summer program, students achieving satisfactorily knew that a support system was available to them.

The majority of migrant students (78.3%) watched two hours or less of television per day. Students who watched two hours of TV per day achieved significantly better than those who watched more or less per day. Table 49 describes this relationship.

-----  
TABLE 49           ISP AND TELEVISION  
-----

Hours/Day	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
4	1 ( 1.8%)	2 ( 3.6%)	3
3	3 ( 5.5%)	2 ( 3.6%)	5
2	9 (16.4%)	3 ( 5.5%)	12
1	9 (16.3%)	11 (20.0%)	20
0	5 ( 9.1%)	10 (18.2%)	15
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

-----

Good study habits include faithful attendance. There was a direct relationship between average attendance percentages for the duration of the program and academic progress as shown in Table 50.

-----  
TABLE 50           ISP AND ATTENDANCE  
-----

Academic Progress	Program Attendance		#	%
	Mean %	S.D.		
Very Satisfactory	85.5	16.9	6	10.0
Satisfactory	79.2	20.1	21	35.0
Unsatisfactory	67.2	26.3	28	46.7
Not Tested	29.4	11.6	5	8.3

-----

The average attendance rate for students not tested indicated that teachers made an effort to test most students in attendance.

The index of school progress was deemed satisfactory when a student attained an NCE score greater than 40 on the reading or mathematics tests of the Curriculum Referenced Test of Mastery. The results indicated that 49.1% of the students were achieving satisfactorily. A crosstab of grade and index of school progress indicated that students in the upper grades were not achieving. The results are displayed in Table 51.

TABLE 51                    ISP ACROSS GRADES

Grade	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Three	11 (20.0%)	11 (20.0%)	22
Four	9 (16.4%)	8 (14.6%)	17
Five	7 (12.7%)	5 (9.0%)	12
Six	0 (0.0%)	3 (5.5%)	3
Ten	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.8%)	1
Subtotal	17 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

Additionally, achievement was viewed through pre-post matched test scores. The results indicated that 36 (92%) of the students demonstrated an NCE gain between the reading pre and posttest and 26 (96%) of the students produced a gain in the percentage of objectives mastered. The discrepancy between scores and objective percentages were due to lack of data. Similarly, 37 (100%) of the students

demonstrated an NCE gain between the mathematics pre and posttest with 26 (93%) showing an increase in the percentage of objectives mastered. The strong preference for mathematics as the subject best liked was substantiated by test scores; however, reading scores were high despite the student responses indicating that it was least liked by 25 (41.7%).

The pre-post design did assess change as indicated in Tables 52 and 53. It was significant that over 60% of a mobile population was pre and posttested. The largest gains were in the percent of reading objectives mastered.

-----  
TABLE 52 PRE-POST MATCHED SCORES SHOWING GAINS IN READING  
-----

Score	# Students	Pre Mean	Post Mean	# Students	Mean Gain
NCE	39	23.7	46.9	36	23.4
% Obj.	27	32.5	70.3	26	38.5

-----  
TABLE 53 PRE-POST MATCHED SCORES SHOWING GAINS IN MATH  
-----

Score	# Students	Pre Mean	Post Mean	# Students	Mean Gain
NCE	37	29.7	51.3	37	21.6
% Obj.	28	43.6	70.5	26	26.8

Furthermore, significant achievement gains may be defined as a gain of 20 NCEs or greater between the pretest and posttest in either reading or mathematics. This would

indicate a growth of two months achievement or greater during a six week program. The profile, shown in Table 54 on page 114, leads to a generalization that the majority of significant achievers were Hispanic, female, third graders, nine years of age and achieved more satisfactorily in reading than mathematics.

Implications for instruction can be inferred through an examination of the teaching style and classroom environment of the teacher providing services to the largest number of achievers.

#### Classroom Environment of Achievers

A description of the teaching style and environment conducive to achievement fell into three categories: classroom management, instructional implementation, and classroom behaviors.

Classroom mangement. The teacher managed routine tasks effectively and efficiently. All materials were readily available. Pencils, notebooks, and textbooks were disseminated as needed. Students were involved in collecting and caring for materials. There was a daily teaching schedule that allocated blocks of time to major subject areas. The teacher was flexible when schedule adjustments were necessary to accommodate health-related activities. The instructional aide was used to prepare

---

 TABLE 54                    PROFILE OF SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVERS (N=23)
 

---

Descriptors	#	# In Total Sample
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Hispanic	16	37
Black	5	19
Haitian	2	3
Caucasian	0	1
Subtotal	23	60
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	10	28
Female	13	32
Subtotal	23	60
<b>Grade</b>		
Three	11	25
Four	7	18
Five	4	12
Six	1	3
Nine	0	1
Ten	0	1
Subtotal	23	60
<b>Age</b>		
Eight	2	5
Nine	7	15
Ten	5	16
Eleven	5	14
Twelve	2	5
Thirteen	2	3
Fourteen	0	1
Sixteen	0	1
Subtotal	23	60
<b>Subject Area</b>		
Reading	21	54
Mathematics	17	54
<b>Achievement Level</b>		
Above Grade Level	3	4
On Grade Level	16	46
Below Grade Level	4	5
Subtotal	23	55

---

materials, correct tests and worksheets and provide individualized instruction as directed by the teacher. The physical layout of the classroom invited learning. There was one desk for each student and the students sat in rows, racially mixed. Bulletin boards featured student work.

Instructional implementation. The objectives for each lesson were written on the blackboard and the same objectives were stated when the lesson began. Closure to the lesson included a summary of the day's lesson with a preview of the following day's objectives.

Students received an abundance of positive, negative, and neutral feedback. They received teacher assistance as the instructor moved about the room. The teacher was patient, provided "wait" time for responses, and clarified concepts with additional information or further questioning.

The classroom was task-oriented with active learner involvement characterized by students writing on the blackboard or moving about the room as part of their participation in a learning game. There were varied learning activities and varied methods, i.e., demonstration, drill, explanation and questioning that were used to emphasize language arts and mathematics instruction. Homework was assigned as practice and students were not reprimanded for noncompletion.

Classroom behaviors. The students worked quietly. When activities changed, they were given an opportunity to talk. The teacher encouraged participation by reprimanding certain individuals for nonparticipation, not attending and increasing the noise level. Threats were made to send one child to the principal. The teacher fostered a respect for everyone's opinion.

#### Regression Analysis of Relationships

Included in this evaluation were a number of predictor variables of interest. A stepwise model was utilized due to the limitations in sample size and the interrelationships of the predictors. The sets of predictors were first run stepwise. Statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) predictors were identified from the preliminary analyses and combined for the second stage analysis.

The following sets of predictors were used: (1) an index of English proficiency which indicated both parent and student responses to the ability to speak, write, read, and comprehend the English language; (2) parent attitude toward school ratings included responses to the importance of school, helping a child adjust to a new school, asking their children about school and stating reasons why school was important; (3) the index of school progress indicated satisfactory and unsatisfactory progress in reading and

mathematics; (4) the index of self-concept included student responses to the teacher liking them, and responses to self-descriptive words, i.e., late, attractive, interesting, busy, not good looking, happy, dull, carefree, boring, helpful, sad, punctual, useless, worrier. They also responded to questions regarding thinking about the future, having problems in school, health estimate, getting in trouble, sharing, doing what they want at home and in school, being lonely, having school friends, being sociable being chosen last for games, being picked on, doing their best in school, indicating ability to learn, and blaming; (5) the student attitude toward school index included responses to wanting to do their best in school, enjoying school, desiring homework, talking about school to parents, liking their teacher and asking the teacher for help.

#### Regression Analysis of Reading Achievement

Various predictors were combined in order to identify significant relationships. The criterion variable was identified as posttest reading scores utilizing a condensed version of the Criterion Referenced Test of Mastery. The most effective prediction was one that produced the smallest error of estimate and optimum weighting resulted in the largest possible correlation (R). Multiple R was the correlation between the posttest reading scores and the

linear combinations of the predictors which in the first stage of analysis include self-concept, parent attitude toward school and student attitude toward school. There were no significant relationships when a measure of student self-concept was combined with both parent and student attitudes toward school to measure posttest reading achievement.

When both parent and student attitudes toward school were combined with the index of English proficiency, the variables generated  $F(1,45) = 5.14$ ,  $p < .01$  and  $r^2 = .10$ . The index of English proficiency indicated a regression coefficient of .32, therefore contributing to 32% of the relationship to reading achievement.

Parent attitude toward school scale score and the index of English proficiency were then combined with an overall indicator of school success, the index of school progress. Together these variables explained 49.5% of the variance. They generated  $F(2,44) = 21.6$ ,  $p < .01$ . Table 55 shows the regression coefficients of the two variables which contributed to the relationship.

-----  
TABLE 55 REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR READING ( n=47 )  
-----

Variable	Beta	T	Significance
Index of English Proficiency	.2291	4.48	.05
Index of School Progress	.6334	34.26	.05

-----

These two variables were combined with an index of self-concept. Self-concept, like parent attitude toward school, was not significant.

Parent attitude toward speaking English and parent attitude toward school were combined with index of school progress. This relationship explained 44.4% of the variance and generated  $F(1,45)=35.9$ ,  $p<.01$  with index of school progress as significant. The same percentage of variance explained remained when index of school progress, self-concept and student attitude toward school were combined and also when the index school progress, self-concept and parent attitude toward school were combined.

In summary, the index of school progress, or success in reading and mathematics was the best predictor of reading achievement. The index of English proficiency, self-reports and parent-reports of confidence in using English, was the next best predictor. When the index of school progress was combined with the index of English proficiency and the index of self-concept or the index of English proficiency and parent attitude toward school, the relationships yielded the smallest error of multiple estimate (15.27).

#### Regression of Mathematics Achievement

The criterion variable was defined as posttest mathematics scores utilizing a condensed version of the

Curriculum Referenced Tests of Mastery. Linear combinations of the predictors were examined. Combinations of parent attitude toward school, student attitude toward school and index of self-concept produced no significant relationships.

Student attitude toward school and self-concept were then combined with the index of English proficiency. This relationship explained 9.25% of the variance with  $F(1, 45) = 4.59, p < .05$ . Once the index of school progress was entered into any combination, the standard error was significantly reduced and  $r^2$  increased. Index of school progress and index of English proficiency yielded the coefficients in Table 56 when combined with self-concept, parent attitude toward school or student attitude toward school.

-----  
 TABLE 56 REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR MATHEMATICS (n=47)  
 -----

Variable	Beta	T	Significance
Index of School Progress	.6219	32.44	.05
Index of English Proficiency	.2637	5.83	.05

-----

These combinations explained 47.8% of the variance with a standard error of 14.74 and  $F(2, 44) = 20.1, p < .01$ . Achievement in mathematics was predicted by achievement in other areas rather than a strong self-concept, positive

parent or student attitude toward school or a positive parent and student attitude toward speaking English. Parental and student confidence in English proficiency minimally contributed to mathematics achievement.

### Summary and Interpretation of Responses

#### Educational Needs

Educational needs of migrant students were documented through classroom observations, parent, teacher and administrative interviews, and teacher survey forms. Planned curriculum needs were preestablished by administrators prior to the summer program. The planned curriculum included reading/language arts, mathematics, art, music, physical education, social studies and library services. The teacher survey agreed with a need to stress these areas and identified guidance services, cultural heritage activities, science and communication skills as high priority areas not documented through observations. Teachers felt that vocational training, English As A Second Language instruction and career education were needed by slightly less than half the class. The migrant population was perceived as having high educational and career aspirations and a desire to learn English as a key to those aspirations.

Teachers indicated that health needs were necessary for only 7.7% of their class; however, administrative and

teacher interviews stressed that there must be a continued focus on health-related needs in order to stress a maintenance program rather than a crisis intervention program.

Respondents from the administrative interviews mentioned a need for creative activities, a writing program and field trips. A creative activities and writing program could be instituted with minimal additional resources through the direction and encouragement of a building level instructional supervisor or head teacher. Financial sponsors will need to be obtained in order to reinstitute educationally-oriented field trips.

Parents appeared to be content with the present level of services. Their main concern was for an appropriate day care facility; however, 51.6% of responding parents indicated a need for a program that would stress academics. Administrative interviews indicated that a needed expansion of services would include preschool services, Saturday programs, and instructional evening programs.

#### Psychological Context of the Classroom

The psychological context of the school was examined through student and teacher ethnographic interviews, classroom observations and student interviews. The attitudes of migrant students toward teachers and education

revealed that they enjoyed school. This was substantiated by a 65% positive response on the student interviews, observations of classroom participation, and minimal discipline encounters. Mathematics and physical education were the best liked subjects and mathematics and spelling were the least liked subjects. Student ethnographic interviews revealed that mathematics was "tops" on the list of curriculum enjoyed with spelling on the bottom along with reading. With 66.7% of the respondents from a bilingual background, it is not surprising that language arts activities were not favored activities.

Students wanted to do their best in school (73.3%) and enjoyed receiving either verbal or material positive reinforcements for satisfactory work. Ethnographic student interviews indicated that teachers were described as nice. Student interviews indicated that 70% of the students liked their teacher with 33.3% describing them as nice. Teachers were described as task-oriented by both interviews and documented observations. Both student interviews and ethnographic interviews indicated that students occasionally missed physical education or recess in order to complete work or as a punishment. The teacher was also described as being boring and mean. Observations document numerous reprimands and a lack of consistent positive or constructive feedback. Student interviews indicate that 61.7% of the

students received help and 76.7% asked for help; therefore, 15% of the students were not receiving help. Classroom observations documented teacher help; however, further analysis of individualization of instruction suggested that time for independent practice with teacher supervision could be increased. Student assistance could be managed by by permitting those students who understood the assignment to proceed with it while inviting those who did not to join the teacher at a table for further explanation and supervision. Better utilization of the teacher aide was suggested based on classroom observations.

Student talk was the most prevalent type of peer communication. Classroom observations suggested that talking with other students in their native language may have contributed to the high percentage of student interview responses about getting along "okay" with others (60%) and "having friends in school" (53.3%).

Ethnographic teacher interviews and classroom observations indicated that students were eager to learn. This was documented by teacher reports that 72.5% of the students did their assignments, 62.5% tried to please their teachers and 48.5% could excel in school. Teacher interviews reported that students smiled a lot and teacher surveys indicated that 73.4% of the students had a pleasing personality.

### Cultural Context of the Classroom

The cultural context of the classroom was documented through teacher and student ethnographic interviews, student interviews and classroom observations. The majority of migrant students experienced a cultural background of poverty, crowded living conditions, bilingualism and frequent moves. Child care was not ideal and children were expected to care for each other as well as to contribute to the needs of the family, whether it be housework, field work, or interpretive services. Student interviews indicated that after school activities involved 13.4% of the students in housework and helping mother, while 10% worked with their parents. Fifty percent of the students in the ethnographic sample helped their parents after school.

Classroom absences were frequent for a variety of reasons related to familial needs. Classroom observations indicated that aides were not utilized for students who missed instruction. Student interviews indicated that 6.7% of the parents should encourage attendance to help their child improve in school. Ethnographic interviews revealed that most of the students attended regularly (85% to 100% ) with the exception of missing school for interpretive services and lack of parental encouragement to attend a daily summer program.

Teachers in ethnographic interviews indicated an

understanding of the close living conditions at the camp and the need for sleep or rest during the day. Student interviews indicated that 5% would nap after school.

Seventy-five percent of the students indicated that they were lonely either occasionally or frequently. Only one student in the ethnographic sample admitted to missing family and friends. Generally, the students formed close relationships with other children at the camp. Hispanic families often traveled as extended families with aunts, uncles, cousins and grandparents.

Twelve out of thirteen teachers agreed that an average of 66.6% of the students needed cultural heritage curriculum experiences. Classroom observations indicated that only two teachers actually used ethnic stories or discussed student experiences. Observations indicated that teachers were accepting of student conversations in Spanish or Creole.

### Educational Values

Educational values of migrant parents and students were documented through student and administrative ethnographic interviews, student interviews, and parent interviews. A review of test data and program applications provided an opportunity to relate parent and student values with academic performance and school philosophy. Responses in the parent interview were reflective of migrant mothers

(76.7%) who were also more highly educated than their spouses. Respondents believed that it was important to finish school, 51.6% liked an academically oriented summer program and 88.3% talked to their children about school. This was slightly inflated from a reported student figure indicating that 76.7% of their parents talked about school. Help with homework was an indicator of parent valuing of education. Students reported that 33.3% of the mothers helped with homework.

Student ethnographic interviews revealed that an education was valued as an opportunity to learn. Corresponding parents agreed that getting an education was the most important outcome of schooling. This positive valuing was reflected in summer test scores. Two students in the ethnographic sample were overage for their grade level and one student experienced off level testing; however, all scored satisfactorily on either the reading or mathematics subtests.

A philosophy of educational enrichment was supported by administrative and teacher ethnographic interviews. Parent interviews indicated that 25% wanted students to learn more while an additional 10% felt that language exposure and additional practice were important reasons for summer school. Parents did not have a clear philosophy of the intent of the program due to the lack of information

regarding program services.

### Study Habits

Migrant students that did well academically did not display any strong tendencies toward desiring homework or opting not to watch television. Successful students had a homework support system and fairly high attendance rates.

### English Proficiency

The relationship of English proficiency to academic performance was documented through administrative and student ethnographic interviews, parent and student interviews, teacher surveys, classroom observations and test data.

Language instruction was not a part of the daily schedule during the summer program; however, 84.6% of the teachers felt that an average of 14.5% of the class experienced language problems. Additionally, 92.3% of the teachers felt that English As A Second Language instruction was necessary for an average 48.3% of the class. Classroom observations substantiate student language difficulties in comprehending directions and questions. Observations showed a wide range of reading abilities per class with no team teaching attempted.

Administrative and teacher ethnographic interviews described Hispanic students as shy and Haitian students as

withdrawn. Students of this ethnicity were interviewed and they expressed an understanding of language instruction as a means to helping them read and speak English, thereby improving schoolwork and career choices. A knowledge of English made students feel useful as an interpreter for their parents. Despite the previous documentation, administrative interviews stated that there was no need for language instruction in the daily schedule.

Table 57 displays the percentage of students and parents that were confident enough with English to rate their abilities as Well and Somewhat Well.

---

TABLE 57                      CONFIDENCE IN ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

---

	Parent	Student
Ratings of Well and Somewhat Well	%	%
Speak English	83.0	63.4
Understand English	85.0	71.7
Read English	58.4	66.7
Reading Comprehension in English	53.3	56.7
Write English	56.7	66.6

---

The most confident parents and students indicate a need for additional language instruction in all areas. Parent interviews (5%) indicated that their children needed help in speaking English and an additional 5% liked the

summer program due to the language exposure.

Bilingual students enrolled in the summer program were of Hispanic and Haitian backgrounds. These students have not demonstrated difficulties with academic progress different from other enrolled students. Table 58 demonstrates no meaningful relationships.

-----  
TABLE 58           ISP AND RACE  
-----

Race	Academic Progress		Subtotal
	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Hispanic/Haitian	19 (34.5%)	18 (32.7%)	37
Black/Caucasian	8 (14.5%)	10 (18.2%)	18
Subtotal	27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	55

-----

#### Program Strengths and Weaknesses

The reported strengths and weaknesses of the program were documented through parent interviews, teacher surveys, administrative interviews and general research observations.

The program strengths were many and varied. Parents (51.6%) liked the summer program and cited academically oriented reasons, i.e., learn more. In addition, 26.7% of the parents liked the fact that child care was available, and 5.1% enjoyed program personnel, Open House and related health services.

Before the children arrived, teachers received in-service training. This was viewed as a program strength

in addition to classroom instruction, staff cooperation and library services. Administrative interviews indicated that the summer program offered educational enrichment with a welcome, caring atmosphere, a structured day, and related health services. Teachers cited recruitment as a program strength. Camp visits by recruiters and a camp counselor were an essential part of maintaining a program designed to provide services to all eligible migrant students. Lack of student discipline problems added to the overall atmosphere. Research observations noted that the facilities, food services and transportation services were essential components that added to the quality educational services for migrant students. Research observations could substantiate these strengths with a caution against complacency.

Many of the stated program weaknesses were related to reduced funding based on federal cutbacks and reduced enrollments. Administrative interviews indicated a desire for an instructional evening program, a Saturday program and field trips. Parent interviews indicated that field trips were desired. A longer teaching day and improved nutrition and health care were suggested weaknesses noted in administrative interviews that cannot be substantiated by research observations, teacher surveys or parent interviews.

Additional resource teachers and experienced aides

were requested by administrative personnel as well as by teachers. Some parents indicated that an earlier dismissal, homework and more academics would improve the program. Generally, parent support and involvement was viewed as a weakness as indicated in teacher surveys and research observations.

## CHAPTER 5

### Conclusions and Implications

The researcher has conducted this study of the summer migrant education program in the context of investigating the relationships between home and school-related factors and resulting academic achievement. These factors included an acknowledgment of the special educational needs of migrant children. Some of the needs documented in the literature included an atmosphere conducive to improving self-concept, exposure to large amounts of language, home-school communication, teacher understanding of migrant values and experiences relevant to their culture and a prioritizing of skills. The collection of meaningful data has enhanced an evaluation design that was reflective of the state's summer migrant education programs. In addition, the researcher focused on a homogeneous population of summer migrant education students enrolled in grades 3-10, that visited the Commonwealth for varying time periods dependent on crop availability and parental employment. These students were offered a weekly full day program of educational experiences for a period of twenty-nine days. Many students (63% - 66%) were pre and posttested during that time.

The Department of Education recommended uniform evaluation requirements for migrant education programs.

Recently, a federally-funded task force dedicated to providing evaluative guidelines has recommended that an evaluation plan be unique to each state and such a plan should focus on representative coverage of the state's program. A component evaluation design was utilized in this study to provide information relative to factors in the home and school which contributed to academic achievement. The problem of providing information to migrant educators for program improvement has been addressed through a quantitative and qualitative approach to evaluation to identify and validate concerns. Instruments and interviews have been developed to focus on the study habits of students, attitudes toward school, self-reports of English proficiency, information on self-esteem, student-initiated talk, parental attitude toward school and the English language, teacher expectations, teacher perceptions of need, teacher talk, classroom observations of time on task and utilization of student experiences.

These data were analyzed using scale development, indexes, crosstabulations, descriptive statistics and a stepwise multiple regression model in which the school, home or student variables were entered. Although the potential for impact of school variables on achievement may be minimal, educational practices associated with achievement can be identified. Some of these practices may be easily

instituted, e.g., stating objectives, and others are much more difficult to change, e.g., increased resource allocations. The program administrators will need to continue to look for creative ways to maximize the use of existing personnel and public service agencies.

In this chapter the above factors will be discussed in detail in order to clarify the interpretation of results. Findings will be discussed relative to each research question. The chapter will conclude with an explanation of the study's implications and suggestions for the direction of further research.

### Conclusions

Major questions this study sought to answer are listed below with a summary of the major findings.

#### Educational Needs

1. What educational needs are reported for migrant students by school personnel and parents?

Educational needs were documented in both academic and nonacademic areas. The results of the study indicate that it was important to all respondents to maintain an academic program which would focus on reading/language arts, mathematics, art, music, physical education, social studies and library services. A common daily schedule was not existent for both programs. Additional requested services

included: the institution of guidance services; the infusion of science, cultural heritage activities, and communication skills that included writing; and other creative activities. Summer school enrollments indicate that young adults, 14 to 18 years old, did not take advantage of program services. Institution of an evening instructional program would not be possible with the present resource allocation. In addition, a six week academic extended day program meets only a portion of the day services needed for students whose parents continue to work on Saturdays and during the entire summer.

Nonacademic health needs included dental screenings and health fair education programs. The continued emphasis on maintenance of health care based on mass screenings and prioritizing of individual health needs should be continued.

### Context of the School

2. What is the psychological and cultural context of the school for migrant students?

Results of the study indicate that approximately two thirds of the students enrolled enjoyed school, especially mathematics and physical education. Observations indicated that most student talk was in response to questions posed by instructors. Other than lunch time and recess, the students have very few opportunities to talk during the

school day.

Students received teacher-directed instruction in all subjects. The amount of direct instruction varied from 5 minutes per half hour lesson to thirty minutes per lesson. Students were most often instructed seated in rows. Teacher talk primarily consisted of general statements to groups, explanations, directions, occasional evaluative statements and reprimands. The students received a lot of feedback, mostly neutral and discipline was important. Generally, teacher aides assisted very little with individualized instruction.

Objectives were not always clearly stated and they were rarely written. Students stated that they enjoyed educational games; however, active involvement in the lesson by the student was lacking. Students appeared to be eager to learn and willing to please.

There was an overall caring atmosphere provided by all personnel under occasional adverse conditions, namely extreme heat and humidity. Teachers were knowledgeable about crowded camp conditions and a lack of rest for a minority of students; therefore, occasional naps were permitted. There was a lack of any formal supervision and informal classroom visits by administrators were minimal. Use of multi-ethnic materials and activities relevant to migrant culture and experiences were not prevalent.

Some teachers received little planning time ( 30 min. per week) while others received two hours per day. Likewise, some students received a daily recess and weekly library time while others received daily resource instruction totaling 1 1/2 hours per day. Team teaching was rarely used to facilitate instruction or provide planning time.

The classroom environment and teaching style of the teacher associated with the greatest number of significant achievers was examined. For the purpose of this study, significant achievers were defined as students showing a gain of 20 NCEs between the pre and posttest. The results of the study indicate the following classroom and teacher characteristics.

1. Routine tasks were managed effectively and efficiently.

2. The instructional aide was effectively utilized.

3. Lesson objectives were stated and written.

Students were kept on task and they were exposed to a variety of academic subjects. There was closure to the lesson and occasional homework was assigned.

4. Students received an abundance of teacher feedback. They received assistance and were actively involved in most lessons. Students were encouraged to share their experiences either verbally or written.

5. Teacher expectations for conduct and participation

were high; yet, they were tempered with an opportunity for students to converse quietly between activities. There was a general atmosphere that demanded respect for each other.

Most students had a positive self-concept. They indicated that they were of average ability, wanted to do their best, had some friends, were sociable in school and were occasionally lonely. Most migrant students felt that they were punctual, attractive, interesting, busy, happy, helpful, and worrisome. Although the majority of the students had a good self-concept, those students with a poor self-concept were low achievers more often than high achievers.

Most students attended school an average of seventy percent of the time. They desired to have homework and would seek help from a family member if they needed it to do an assignment. They talked to their parents about school and felt that the teacher could help them improve by offering help. After school they enjoyed outside activities.

Most migrant teachers were Black, had a bachelor's degree and taught 20 years or more. Teacher expectations for student in reading and mathematics were low for fast and slow students with the exception of two teachers. Three resource teachers were on target with their estimated objectives while two overestimated for both fast and slow learners.

Parent involvement was an important part of home-school interface in contributing to the psychological context of the classroom. During the fourth week of the program minimal parent contacts had been made. Teachers requested that their estimate of parent contact be based on last year's experiences. A total of 58 contacts were reported, 11 by letter, 1 visit and 46 by telephone.

Recruiters made most parental contacts at the camps for enrollment purposes. Program information was not left with parents due to the high number of parent responses indicating that they did not know specifics about program services. Parents who talked to their children about school were able to receive that perspective of program services.

### Educational Values

How do the educational values of migrant parents and students relate to academic performance and school philosophy?

Parent and student valuing of education was reflective in the conglomerate of items which constituted the development of the attitude scales. Both scales indicated a positive attitude toward school. While the majority of parents did not have a clear philosophy of the intent of the program, approximately one-fourth of the parents verbalized that the intent of the program was to learn more. A program

philosophy of educational enrichment was supported by documentation of program objectives and an examination of daily teaching schedules. Student valuing of education was reflective in stated future aspirations. Three-fourths of the students chose careers not related to migrant, many requiring additional schooling.

The valuing of education was shown in three ways by an examination of academic performance. Satisfactory achievement was defined as:

(a) an NCE score greater than 40 on the Curriculum Referenced Test of Mastery reading or mathematics pretest or posttest;

(b) pre-post matched scores indicating a significant gain of 20 NCE's or greater; or

(c) pre-post matched scores indicating any gain.

Results indicated that 49.1% of the students were achieving satisfactorily (NCE greater than 40) on either the pretest, posttest, or both. The difficulty of attaining matched scores was due to student mobility, therefore only 39 (71%) of the students were matched in reading and 37 (67%) of the students in mathematics. Of those students, pre and posttested only 21 (54%) were significant achievers in reading and 17 (46%) were significant achievers in mathematics. These students demonstrated a gain of 20 NCE's or greater between the pre and posttest which may also be

described as a growth of two months achievement during a six week program.

### Study Habits

For a migrant population, do the study habits of migrant students relate to academic performance?

The results of the study indicated that students who received help with homework achieved satisfactorily. Although homework during the summer program was not a required or prevalent practice, students knowing they have a support system at home achieved satisfactorily more often than students who did not have a support system.

In addition, the amount of television watched per day was examined in relationship to achievement. A portion of the migrant population (27.3%) did not watch television at all due to a lack of interest or a lack of availability. Students who watched television for two hours achieved satisfactorily more often.

Finally, students who did well academically demonstrated higher average attendance rates for the program than those who did not do well. Teachers were conscientious about testing the majority of students in attendance.

### English Proficiency

5. What is the relationship of English proficiency to academic performance?

Although the entire sample was surveyed regarding self-reports of English proficiency, the main focus was on the relationship between self-reports of bilingual students and academic achievement. There were no significant relationships demonstrated. The multiple regression analysis indicated that the index of English proficiency did contribute to satisfactory posttest reading and mathematics scores when combined with the index of school progress. It may be inferred that students who report confidence in English proficiency and were relatively academically successful in other areas will also be successful in reading and mathematics.

Students will need continued language experiences in areas where they feel they are least capable, especially, speaking and reading comprehension. Teachers agreed that English As A Second Language instruction was needed for almost half the class although oral language instruction was not part of the daily schedule.

#### Program Strengths and Weaknesses

6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program as reported by parents and program personnel and as reported through research observations?

Program strengths were many and varied. Exceptional time and effort was expended by administrative personnel in

planning a comprehensive program. A full day academically oriented summer program which provided transportation, meals, and health-related instruction and screenings was seen by most parents as an excellent opportunity for their children. Recruiting efforts made parents cognizant of a summer program. The camp counselor encouraged family-oriented activities at the larger camps. School counselors made every effort to properly assign students to teachers. Teachers were cooperative, task-oriented, and specially trained through annual in-service sessions. Teacher aides were available for each classroom.

Program weaknesses included lack of parental support. Teachers reported very few parent contacts beyond the scheduled day. Parent information about the program may have facilitated communication. Teachers also indicated a need for language instruction, and creative activities. Culturally relevant activities would need to be incorporated into the curriculum. The structure of the instructional day varied greatly between programs and emphasis in specific instructional areas varied greatly among teachers. This provided inequitable situations for teachers and students. Closer teacher supervision will be needed to ensure that teachers review objectives for the entire grade level as well as for each lesson. Some parents indicated that homework could be included as part of the program. Homework

assignments would provide an opportunity for a parent review of their child's current educational tasks.

#### Implications

Implications fell into three broad areas: (a) evaluation; (b) instruction; and (c) program operations.

Study implications for evaluation include the development of an evaluation design which provided useful information for parents, teachers, and administrators for program improvement. A quantitative design, as reflected in the State Performance Report, lacked explanations for data findings. In addition, an evaluation design that provides individualized student information needs personnel to ensure that the information will be shared with the home base school.

Instructional implications were obvious. With only half of the students achieving satisfactorily, there will need to be a continued emphasis on teacher review of the objectives for each grade level, stating the objectives to students, and selecting areas of greatest need. An in-service model should be built emphasizing the successful techniques of the classroom of significant achievers in this study.

Eligible students are entitled to services throughout the Commonwealth with reasonable allowances for each

program's uniqueness. The management of a comprehensive program must be carefully delineated to ensure checks and balances for smooth and efficient operation. Resource services for students will need to be more closely monitored. Instructional implementation will need to be monitored to ensure utilization of teaching strategies shown to be effective through this research and prior research. Information about the program should be disseminated to parents.

Implications for further research include replication of this study or a portion of this study to be completed every two years with an updating of the data collection forms to reflect the current concerns of migrant educators.

## RESEARCHER'S COMMENTARY

The researcher's commentary presents the subjective view of the countless hours of data collection which goes beyond the project preparation and classroom observations. Immersing oneself in another culture by moving a place of residence and spending eight hours a day at school and two hours every evening visiting migrant parents was a unique experience.

Daily lessons went beyond sample selection to a beginning awareness of a life style so complex that it was often physically and emotionally draining to those individuals choosing to survive in that manner. Can one really understand the feelings of a nine year old when he discusses the plight of his younger brother who was given to a crew leader to raise because the mother feared paternal abuse? Is it possible to be empathetic with a pre-adolescent who was rejected and taunted by other children at the camp because she was Haitian? Can one comprehend the pride of a Hispanic boy reading aloud and feeling joy because no one laughed at him? Migrant children experience life in a manner as unique as themselves.

Camp visits were memorable for the hospitality of most families. Respect and curiosity went beyond tiredness as no one refused to talk. Many interviews were conducted while dinner was being prepared or infants were bathed.

Interviews were conducted surrounded by a "sea" of potato bugs, over the pungent fumes of a perm and while tokens were being counted for the day's pickings. The child interpreters were invaluable communicators. They could not believe that their "maestra" came to visit their parents.

The cooperation of teachers and a recruiter were heartwarming. The insights of personnel that have worked with migrant children for more than ten years provided the context for an appreciation of the status quo. The dedication and devotion of selected personnel went beyond a monetary compensation.

Once the data analysis began I thought the memories would fade -- they have not. They have provided the impetus for continued reading, writing and research pertinent to this specialized population and others.

## REFERENCES

- Alkin, M. (1979). Using evaluation: Does evaluation make a difference? Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Beane, J.A. (1982). Self-concept and self-esteem as curriculum issues. Educational Leadership, 39 (7), 504-506.
- Berliner, D. (1983, September). The executive functions of teaching. The Instructor, 93, pp. 28-40.
- Burns, G. (1982, November). Executive summary: The study of parental involvement in four federal education programs. In O.I. Crespo & P. Louque (Eds.), Parent involvement in the education of minority language children: A resource handbook (pp. 55-61). Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Carter, L.F. (1980). The sustaining effects study: An interim report. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation. (ERIC Reproduction Document Service No. ED 213 813)
- Clark, L. (1971). Teaching the children of agricultural migrants. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.), Migrant children: Their education (pp. 7-15). Washington D.C.: Childhood Education International.
- Clements, R.O., et al. (1980, April). The accuracy of students' perceptions of themselves and their classrooms (DHEW Report No. 5082). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 453)
- Coles, R. (1971). Migrants, sharecroppers, mountaineers. Boston Little, Brown & Co.
- Conyers, C.L. (1972). Virginia's annual evaluation report for migrant children. Richmond, VA: Compensatory Education. Unpublished document.
- Cook, T.D. & Reichardt, C.S. (Eds.) (1979). Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Crouse, K. et al. (1981). Reflections: Self-concept for development teachers and students. Ontario: Secondary School Teacher Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 546)
- Curtis, J. et al. (1982). Improving achievement for pupils of low socio-economic strata: The gamble we must take. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 371)
- Davis, B. (1972). Chapter 1: A former migrant. In A.B. Cheyney (Ed.), The ripe harvest: Educating migrant children (pp. 1-21). Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami.
- Department of Education. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 122, 43 CFR 116d (1978).
- Department of Education. (1984, November). Draft nonregulatory guidance. Washington, D.C. Unpublished document.
- Department of Education. ECIA Chapter 1, 1981, 34 CFR 201.35 (1985).
- Department of Education. (1986). What works: Research about teaching and learning. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Dunn, M. et al. (1980, December). Successful teaching of disadvantaged children: From the perspective of 94 Title I elementary school teachers who were identified as being the most effective in their schools. Dade County, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 488)
- Engstrom, G.A. (1981). Mexican-American and Anglo-American student perceptions of the learning environment of the classroom. (Report No. 22) Los Angeles: California University, Graduate School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 890)
- Exotech Systems, Inc. (1974, January). Summary of findings: Impact of migrant education programs on migrant students. Unpublished manuscript.

- Fisher, M.D. et al. (1976, September). Migrant culture, education and programs: A review of the literature related to the study of ESEA Title I migrant programs. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 194 249)
- Fortune, J. (1985). The Choctaw school study. Philadelphia, MS: Choctaw Heritage Press.
- Fortune, J. (1985). The comprehensive school study for the Mississippi band of Choctaw Indians. Unpublished manuscript.
- Friedland, W.H. & Nelkin, D. (1971). Migrant agricultural workers in America's northeast. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
- Good, T.L. & Brophy, J.E. (1984). Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gottfried, A.E. (1979, September). Role of intrinsic motivation in children's school achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, N.Y. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 182 637)
- Hicks, A. (1971). Inservice training for Oregon Teachers of Preschool children. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.), Migrant children: Their education (pp.26-34), Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.
- Issac, S. & Michael, W.B. (1984). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego: Edits Publishers.
- Johnson, A. (1979). Reading achievement of florida migrant children with differing levels of self-concept. Reading Improvement, pp. 198-202.
- LeCompte, M.D. & Goetz, J.P. (1984). Ethnographic data collection in evaluation research. In D.M. Fetterman, (Ed.), Ethnography in educational evaluation (pp. 37-59). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Madaus, G.F., Scriven, M. & Stufflebeam, D. (Eds.) (1983). Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

- McCaffery, B. (1971). Let each become all he is capable of being. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.). Migrant children: Their education (pp. 19-22). Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.
- Murray, S.L. (1986, May). State education options for evaluating agency options for evaluating ECIA chapter 1 migrant education programs. Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children. (1978). Special report on migrant education. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 178 230)
- National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children. (1971). Wednesday's children. New York: Ford Foundation.
- National Institute of Education. (1985, June). Parent participation and the achievement of disadvantaged students. (Contract No. 400-82-0012). New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 040)
- Ockerman-Garza, J. et al. (1982, March). Migratory status and school achievement: Analysis of critical mediating variables. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 721)
- Ott, E. (1971). Bridging the cultural gap. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.), Migrant children: Their education (pp. 46-57). Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.
- Plunkett, V.R. (1985, April). From title I to chapter 1: The evolution of compensatory education. Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 533-537.
- Popham, J.W. (1975). Educational evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Pressin, B. (1981). Interim review of the R.T.I. study of the ESEA title I migrant education program. Unpublished manuscript.

- Purkey, W. (1978). Inviting school success: A self-concept approach to teaching and learning. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Pyecha, J.N. (1981, January). Revised strategy for evaluating the ESEA title I migrant education program at the national and state levels. Available from Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC.
- Research Triangle Institute. (1981). Executive summary: Migrant education program. Unpublished manuscript.
- Reul, M.R. (1974). Territorial boundaries of rural poverty. East Lansing, MI: Center for Rural Manpower & Public Affairs & Cooperative Extension Service, Michigan State University.
- Revicki, D.A. (1981, March). The relationship among socioeconomic status, home environment, parent involvement, child self concept and achievement. Parent Education Follow Through Program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 645)
- Rich, D. (1985). Helping parents help their children learn. Educational Leadership, 42 (7), p. 80.
- Ritzenthaler, J. (1971). Talking about not talking. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.). Migrant children: Their education (pp. 16-18). Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.
- Roberson, E.W. & Lusk, D.L. (1972, August). Monitoring report ESEA title I migrant summer program. Richmond: EPIC Diversified Systems Corporation.
- Rodrigues-Brown, F.V. & Junker, L.K. (1980). The relationship of student and home variables to language proficiency and reading achievement of bilingual children. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 193 942)
- Savard, W.G. & Cotton, K. (1983, May). What effective schooling research says to migrant education program planners. Paper presented at the Annual National Migrant Education Conference, Portland, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 354)

- Scott, C. (1971). A fish out of water: The migrant child in a middle-class classroom. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.), Migrant children: Their education (pp. 35-38). Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.
- Serrano, V.Z. (1980). A legacy of four cultures: Education and the mexican americans. Denver: Education Commission of the States. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 196 620)
- Spradley, J.P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- Stallings, J. (1980). Allocated academic learning time revisited or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher, 9, 11-16.
- Stockburger, C. (1971). Children on the move. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.), Migrant children: Their education (p.6) Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.
- Sutton, E. (1972). Working more effectively with migrants in our schools. In A.B. Cheyney (Ed.), The ripe harvest: Educating migrant children (pp. 109-120). Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami.
- Tanner, D. & Tanner, L.N. (1980). Curriculum development. New York: Macmillan.
- Terrell, G. (1971). Teachers of migrant children. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.), Migrant children: Their education (pp. 23-25). Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.
- Valverde, L.A. (Ed.) (1981). Educating english-speaking hispanics. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Bilingual Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 908)
- Zavaleta, H. & Zavaleta, G. The home-school communication gap - as it affects migrant families. In S. Sunderlin (Ed.), Migrant children: Their education (pp. 58-59). Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International.

APPENDIX A

Instruments

## PARENT INTERVIEW

Number \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnic Code \_\_\_\_\_  
 Relationship to student \_\_\_\_\_ Number of student \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of children \_\_\_\_\_ Ages of children \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of family members working \_\_\_\_\_  
 Current expenses \_\_\_\_\_  
 Radio, TV, Books \_\_\_\_\_  
 Marital status \_\_\_\_\_ Problems at home \_\_\_\_\_  
 Language spoken at home \_\_\_\_\_

School

1. Have you made contact with the school?
2. Who did you talk to?
3. What did you talk about?
4. How many schools did your child attend this year?
5. How well does your child like school? Does he or she seem to have any problems? In what ways do you help your child adjust to a new school?
6. Do you talk to your child about school?
7. What does your child tell you about school?

8. Do you believe that completing school is important?
9. What kind of a job do you think your child will have someday?
10. Were you able to go to school when you were younger?
11. What kinds of books were you able to bring along with you?
12. What do you like best about the school program?
13. What parts of the school program need to be done differently?
14. In what areas does your child still need help?
15. Would you like to talk to your child's teacher?
16. If the teacher needed to talk to you when would be the best time?
17. What are the most important things about school?

Study Habits

18. Do you help your child with homework?
19. How many hours of homework does your child get each week?

20. Does your child watch television? How many hours per week?

21. What does your child do after school?

Attitude Toward Student Using English

22. How well do you think your child speaks English?

Very well                  Well                  Somewhat                  Poorly

23. How well do you think your child understands English?

Very well                  Well                  Somewhat                  Poorly

24. How well do you think your child reads English?

Very well                  Well                  Somewhat                  Poorly

25. How well do you think your child understands what he/she reads?

Very well                  Well                  Somewhat                  Poorly

26. How well do you think your child writes stories and messages in English?

Very well                  Well                  Somewhat                  Poorly



8. Do you talk to your parents about school?
  
9. How many natural parents do you have?
  
10. What do you think your parents can do to improve your school work?
  
11. What do you like about your teacher?
  
12. What do you dislike about your teacher?
  
13. Does the teacher offer to help you?
  
14. Do you ask the teacher for help?
  
15. What do you think the teacher can do to improve your school work?
  
16. What do you think you can do to improve your school work?

17. How well do you think you speak English?

Very well      Well      Somewhat      Poorly

18. How well do you think you understand English?

Very well      Well      Somewhat      Poorly

19. How well do you think you read English?

Very well      Well      Somewhat      Poorly

20. How well do you understand what you read in English?

Very well      Well      Somewhat      Poorly

21. How well do you think you write stories and messages in English?

Very well      Well      Somewhat      Poorly

22. How many different schools have you attended this year?

23. Here is a listing of some school subjects:

Music	Art	Reading
Mathematics	Science	Physical Education
Social Studies	English	Spelling
Home Economics	Health	Industrial Arts

a. In what subject are you given the most homework?

b. What subject do you like the best?

c. What subject do you like the least?

d. In what subject do you think you get the best grades?

e. In what subject do you get the worst grades?

24. What do you want to do when you get out of school?

- Get a job  
 Help parents  
 Go to school  
 Go to college  
 Military  
 Vocational School  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_

25. What do you want to be?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grower         | <input type="checkbox"/> Engineer            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Police         | <input type="checkbox"/> Computer programmer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nurse          | <input type="checkbox"/> Artist              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housewife      | <input type="checkbox"/> Coach               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Singer         | <input type="checkbox"/> Accountant          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher        | <input type="checkbox"/> Veterinarian        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Music          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cook                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Secretary      | <input type="checkbox"/> Lawyer              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clerk          | <input type="checkbox"/> Carpenter           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social work    | <input type="checkbox"/> Picker              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manager        | <input type="checkbox"/> Janitor             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bus driver     | <input type="checkbox"/> Doctor              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Truck driver   | <input type="checkbox"/> Fireman             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pro athlete    | <input type="checkbox"/> Crew leader         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architect      | <input type="checkbox"/> Nurse's aide        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's Aide | <input type="checkbox"/> Railroad engineer   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanic       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pilot          | _____  |



11. Are you the last one chosen for games?  
 Most of the time    Once in a while    Almost never
12. Do you think other children are mean to you?  
 Very often    Sometimes    Hardly ever
13. Do you want to do your best in school?  
 Most of the time    Once in a while    Almost never
14. Do you get to do what you want to do in school?  
 Most of the time    Once in a while    Almost never
15. How well do you think you are able to learn?  
 Easily    Okay    Slow
16. Do you think it is your fault when you do poorly in school?  
 Most of the time    Once in a while    Hardly ever
17. Do you think your teacher likes you?  
 Yes    No
18. Are you:
- |                   |     |    |
|-------------------|-----|----|
| late?             | Yes | No |
| attractive?       | Yes | No |
| interesting?      | Yes | No |
| busy?             | Yes | No |
| not good-looking? | Yes | No |
| happy?            | Yes | No |
| dull?             | Yes | No |
| carefree?         | Yes | No |
| boring?           | Yes | No |
| helpful?          | Yes | No |
| sad?              | Yes | No |
| punctual          |     |    |
| (on time)?        | Yes | No |
| useless?          | Yes | No |
| worry?            | Yes | No |

19. What kinds of things do you worry about?

## TEACHER SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to investigate teacher expectations, home-school interaction, educational needs of students and the strengths and weaknesses of the school program.

Directions: For purposes of this survey, students will mean migrant education students enrolled in the summer program. All information will be kept anonymous.

1. Indicate number of years of teaching experience.

- 1 - 4
- 5 - 9
- 10 - 14
- 15 - 19
- 20 and over

2. Indicate number of years experience in the migrant program.

- 1 - 4
- 5 - 9
- 10 - 14
- 15 - 19
- 20 and over

3. Indicate your race.

- Black
- White
- Hispanic
- Not specified

4. Indicate your educational level.

- Masters + 30
- Masters
- Bachelors

5. Indicate your certification status.

- Certified in Teaching Area
- Not Certified in Teaching Area

6. Indicate your teaching assignment.

Third	Art
Fourth	Music
Fifth	Physical Education
Sixth	Reading Specialist

7. Indicate the number of objectives listed for your grade level.

<u>Math</u>	<u>Language Arts</u>
1-5	1-5
6-10	6-10
11-15	11-15
More than 15	More than 15

8. Indicate the number of objectives that will be mastered by the slow student.

<u>Math</u>	<u>Language Arts</u>
1-2	1-2
3-4	3-4
5-6	5-6
More than 6	More than 6

9. Indicate the number of objectives that will be mastered by the fast student.

<u>Math</u>	<u>Language Arts</u>
1-2	1-2
3-4	3-4
5-6	5-6
More than 6	More than 6

10. Do you have parental visits to your classroom?

Yes	No
-----	----

11. Approximately how many parents contact the school?

No. of  
Parents

\_\_\_\_\_ Telephone

\_\_\_\_\_ Visit

\_\_\_\_\_ Letter

\_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. Student Descriptors. Please indicate the number of students that apply to each category. Duplication is permissible.

For example, if you have 15 students and 3 have language problems, then place a 3 next to the descriptor language problems.

<u>No. of</u> <u>Students</u>	<u>Descriptor</u>
___	Has language problems
___	Does assignments
___	Is a discipline problem
___	Tries to please
___	Is lazy
___	Has good personality
___	Needs remedial work
___	Is unhealthy
___	Lacks personal hygiene
___	Can excel in school
___	Below average ability
___	Will never finish school
___	Should go to college
___	Is an attendance problem

13. Educational Needs. Please indicate the number of students that apply to each category.

<u>No. of</u> <u>Students</u>	<u>Need</u>
___	Art
___	Cultural Heritage
___	Reading/Language Arts
___	Mathematics
___	Physical Education
___	Vocational Training
___	Music
___	Career Education
___	Communication Skills
___	English as a Second Language
___	Guidance
___	Science
___	Social Studies
___	Other _____

14. Ratings of School Components. Please rate each component in the appropriate column. The ratings are: 1 = inferior; 2 = average; and 3 = superior. Please check only one response per component.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>Component</u>
_____	_____	_____	Classroom instruction
_____	_____	_____	School facilities
_____	_____	_____	School equipment
_____	_____	_____	Instructional aids
_____	_____	_____	Textbooks
_____	_____	_____	Library
_____	_____	_____	Curriculum
_____	_____	_____	Recruitment
_____	_____	_____	Counseling
_____	_____	_____	Staff cooperation
_____	_____	_____	Home-School Coordinator
_____	_____	_____	Inservice Training
_____	_____	_____	Food Service
_____	_____	_____	Student attendance
_____	_____	_____	Student motivation
_____	_____	_____	Parent support
_____	_____	_____	Student discipline
_____	_____	_____	Transportation
_____	_____	_____	Support services (health, dental, clothing)
_____	_____	_____	Migrant Student Record Transfer System

15. Do you have any suggestions for school improvement?

16. If you received a reduction in pay due to reduced funding would you return to your current position?

## STUDENT ETHNOGRAPHIC INTERVIEW

1. Who would you like to be your teacher?
  
2. Why do you like \_\_\_\_\_? How does \_\_\_\_\_ make you feel special?
  
3. I don't know \_\_\_\_\_, can you tell me about him/her?
  
4. If you could have a teacher like \_\_\_\_\_, would you stay in school until you finish?
  
5. In what ways does school help you?
  
6. Tell me about the things you like best in school.
  
7. Tell me about your classes in school. Which ones do you like or dislike? Tell me about them.

8. Draw me a picture of your classroom and tell me what it is like.
  
9. Do you have any people that live in your house in your classroom?  
Are they in another classroom?
  
10. Do your brothers/sisters treat you different in school? How are  
they different at home? Describe if you are different or the same  
at home.
  
11. Is there anything else I should know?

## TEACHER ETHNOGRAPHIC INTERVIEW

Teacher No. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Introductory Statement

"I'm interested in understanding your job as a migrant teacher. I'm interested in finding out what it's like to be a migrant teacher. I want to know if I applied for a job as a summer migrant teacher, how would I see things? What problems and experiences would I have?

1. Describe your migrant classroom to me. Could you kind of take me through and tell me what it's like and what I would see if I walked in and around? Could you tell me what it's like?
2. Describe the migrant student to me. I need to know about all kinds of students and their life at school. Are you meeting all of their needs or are some needs unmet? Could you tell me what a migrant student is like? In what ways do they perform and behave in school?



## CLASSROOM OBSERVATION GUIDELINES

Students and teachers will be observed informally during the six weeks. The researcher will travel daily to the centers. The formal observations will include 10 visits per teacher for a total of five hours. The teachers will be chosen by assignment to student. The students will be selected as being representative of sex, grade, and center. Six students having completed grades 3, 4, 5 or 6 will constitute the sample.

The researcher as a participant observer will take detailed notes during class. Journal entries will include the daily seating arrangements; who spoke to whom before, during and after class; the amount and content of student comments and participation; and general content and tone of the lectures, discussions and questions.

Classroom Observation Guidelines for Teachers

1. Evidence of teacher expectations. (Degrading comments, reassuring comments, teacher evaluation of work, student evaluation of work.)  
Research Questions 2, 3.
2. Language patterns and mannerisms that constitute "warmth".  
(Touching, calling on a variety of students, calling students by name.)  
Research Questions 2, 5.
3. Attempts to incorporate cultural backgrounds of the students.  
Research Question 2.

4. Attempts to use experiential base of students.  
Research Questions 1, 2.
5. Time on Task  
Research Questions 2, 3.
6. Teacher Talk
  - a. Teacher talk directed to groups in the form of praise, acceptance, remediation and criticism.
  - b. Teacher talk directed to individuals in the form of praise, acceptance, remediation and criticism.Research Questions 2, 6.

#### Classroom Observation Guidelines for Students

1. Evidence of promoting English language usage. (Tally student response to commands in English, student-initiated English, and student conversing in English.)  
Research Question 5.
2. Time on Task  
Research Questions 2, 3.
3. Student initiated behaviors in the form of conformity, aggressiveness and cooperation with other students.  
Research Questions 2, 3.
4. Student initiated talk in the form of questions and comments.  
Research Questions 2, 3.





APPENDIX B  
State Performance Report

GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (SEAs)	
<b>PART I. STATE AGENCY PROGRAM FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN - PARTICIPATION INFORMATION</b>	NAME OF STATE  <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 20px; width: 100%;"></div>

**A. GIVE THE UNDUPLICATED NUMBER OF MIGRANT PARTICIPANTS DURING THE REGULAR AND SUMMER TERMS COMBINED**

1. BY GENDER

MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
------	--------	-------

2. BY YEAR OF BIRTH

1964	
1965	
1966	
1967	
1968	
1969	
1970	
1971	

1972	
1973	
1974	
1975	
1976	
1977	
1978	
1979	

1980	
1981	
1982	
1983	
1984	
198	
198	
TOTAL	

3. BY MIGRANT CATEGORY

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
TOTAL	

4. BY RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP

AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	
BLACK, NOT HISPANIC	
HISPANIC	
WHITE, NOT HISPANIC	
TOTAL	

**B. GIVE THE NUMBER OF MIGRANT PARTICIPANTS BY REGULAR TERM AND SUMMER TERM SEPARATELY**

1. BY GRADE

GRADE	REGULAR TERM (UNDUPLICATED COUNT)	SUMMER TERM (UNDUPLICATED COUNT)
PRE-K		
K		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
UNGRADED		
TOTAL		

GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (CONTINUED)	
<b>PART I. STATE AGENCY PROGRAM FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN - PARTICIPATION INFORMATION (CONTINUED)</b>	NAME OF STATE

**B. GIVE THE NUMBER OF MIGRANT PARTICIPANTS BY REGULAR TERM AND SUMMER TERM SEPARATELY (CONTINUED)**

**2. BY SERVICE AREA**

SERVICE AREA	REGULAR TERM	SUMMER TERM
INSTRUCTIONAL ENGLISH TO LIMITED ENGLISH BACKGROUND		
READING		
OTHER LANGUAGE ARTS NOT ABOVE (e.g., Oral Language)		
MATHEMATICS		
VOCATIONAL/CAREER		
OTHER (Specify)		
SUPPORTING ATTENDANCE, SOCIAL WORK, GUIDANCE, ETC.		
HEALTH		
DENTAL		
NUTRITION		
PUPII TRANSPORTATION		
OTHER (Specify)		

**PART II. STATE AGENCY PROGRAM FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN - STAFF INFORMATION**

GIVE THE NUMBER OF STAFF EMPLOYED IN MIGRANT PROJECTS BY JOB CLASSIFICATION AND BY REGULAR SCHOOL AND SUMMER SCHOOL TERMS. REPORT IN FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS BY JOB CLASSIFICATION.

JOB CLASSIFICATION	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT	
	REGULAR TERM	SUMMER TERM
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF		
TEACHERS		
TEACHER AIDES		
CURRICULUM SPECIALISTS		
STAFF PROVIDING SUPPORTING SERVICES		
RECRUITERS		
MSRTS DATA ENTRY SPECIALISTS		
OTHER (Specify)		

GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (CONTINUED)	
PART III. STATE AGENCY PROGRAM FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN - ACHIEVEMENT INFORMATION	NAME OF STATE
SUBJECT MATTER	
READING <input type="checkbox"/> MATHEMATICS <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify) <input type="checkbox"/>	
STATEWIDE DATA SUMMARIES (No specific format is prescribed for this part. (See instructions))	
THE DATA SUMMARIES REPORTED ARE REPRESENTATIVE OF THIS STATE'S PROGRAM FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
IF NO, PROVIDE A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF DATA LIMITATIONS.	

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**