

**ASSISTORS TO CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT FOR WOMEN IN TEXAS
EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS**

A Dissertation

by

YVETTE TERESA DUNN PERRY

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2003

Major Subject: Educational Human Resource Development

© 2003

YVETTE TERESA DUNN PERRY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

**ASSISTORS TO CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT FOR WOMEN IN TEXAS
EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS**

A Dissertation

by

YVETTE TERESA DUNN PERRY

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

Don F. Seaman
(Co-Chair of Committee)

Christine A. Stanley
(Co-Chair of Committee)

Homer Tolson
(Member)

Barbara Finlay
(Member)

Bryan R. Cole
(Head of Department)

August 2003

Major Subject: Educational Human Resource Development

ABSTRACT

Assistors to Continuous Enrollment for Women in Texas

Even Start Family Literacy Programs. (August 2003)

Yvette Teresa Dunn Perry, B.A., Northwestern State University;

M.Ed., Northwestern State University

Co-Chairs of Advisory Committee: Dr. Don F. Seaman

Dr. Christine A. Stanley

A quantitative and qualitative research study was conducted to discover what assistors promoted continuous enrollment of women in Texas Even Start Family Literacy programs. Two hundred seventy women who were enrolled for a second program year or longer anonymously completed a questionnaire that was available in both Spanish and English. Statements regarding which assistors promoted their continuous participation along with demographic statements were included in the questionnaire; free response comments were requested as well. Statistical measurements of factor analysis, frequency response, Chi-Square, and Analysis of Variance were used. Compared to previous research (Quigley, 1997) that identified three categories of barriers, this research identified *five* categories of *assistors*: situational, institutional, dispositional, parental, and program specific. Parental assistors, as a group, were statistically significant more than any of the other assistors when measured according to the independent variables of participants' age, children's age, and enrollment level. Institutional and dispositional assistors were found statistically significant when measured according to the variable of participants' age. Post-hoc measures did not

reveal statistical significance for any of the levels of the variables. However, free responses from the participants did provide insight as to why parental, institutional, and dispositional assistors were significant in both their lives and the lives of their children.

DEDICATION

To
the Holy Trinity - Father, Son, Holy Spirit - who has brought me thus far with such
abundant love and blessings;

To
my parents - Neal and Artelia - and all my relatives, friends, and teachers who have
guided and loved me since my birth;

To
the program directors and participants who willingly shared their thoughts and beliefs;

To
all of the mothers in this world - past, present, and future;

To
the most beautiful blessing that God gave me while on this journey - O'Neal, this is for
you; and

To
my wonderful husband Otis. Without your love and support from day one, this journey
would have been extremely colorless. I am so glad to have shared yet another dream
with you and, one-breath.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Where do I begin in thanking all those who have been with me on this particular journey.

I wish to thank all my former students at Aldine I.S.D Douglas MacArthur Senior High for continuously reminding me to pursue my own dreams as I encouraged you all to do the same.

I would not have been introduced to the amazing world of adult and family literacy if it were not for my co-chair, Dr. Don Seaman. Thank you so much for guiding me and forcing me to expand my wings; your support is immeasurable.

To my second co-chair, Dr. Christine Stanley, thank you for continuously stroking my passion for effective teaching and for being a role model for all women, particularly women of color.

I give H. P. Dr. Homer Tolson my undying gratitude for making the world of statistics less frightening and more meaningful. Your words of wisdom (WOW) will never be forgotten.

For all of your work in sharing and contributing to the knowledge regarding women and their beauty, thank you Dr. Barbara Finlay. I promise to assist in keeping the flame of Women's Studies an eternal one.

I give a special thanks to Dr. Billy Edge for serving as my Graduate Council Representative. I appreciate that you were always asking how I was doing, and if there were any way you might help.

To my AGGIE friends in EHRD, especially Clarice Fulton, thank you for your expertise, advice, smiles, and laughter.

To my AGGIE Family at St. Mary's Catholic Church, our bond will never be forgotten or broken. Father Mike, may God bless you for your love and kindness. My sisters of CRHP, you are truly amazing; I love you dearly.

To my wonderful family at the Texas Center for Adult Literacy and Learning, thank you for seeing me through the great days and the not-so-great ones. You are forever in my heart!

To Janie L. Rivas, thank you for your tenacity and strength. I could not have done this without your translating my information sheet and questionnaire. Muchas gracias, mi hermana en Cristo!

To the kind people in Curriculum and Instruction at North Harris Montgomery Community College District - District Services and Training Center, thank you for encouraging me and reminding me that the light was at the end of the tunnel.

To Ms. Marilyn and Ms. Carolyn at the Westfield – Houston, TX U. S. Post Office, thank you for your patience and encouraging words.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Need for the Study.....	4
Problem Statement	4
Research Questions	5
Question 1	5
Question 2	5
Question 3	5
Question 4	5
Question 5	5
Question 6	6
Question 7	6
Limitations of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	6
Even Start Family Literacy Program.....	6
Even Start participants	7
Family literacy.....	7
Metropolitan	8
Rural	8
Urban.....	8
II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
Barriers to Adult Education Programs	9
Barriers to Adult Literacy Programs	13
Barriers to Family Literacy Programs.....	18

	Page
CHAPTER	
Sources of Motivation, Support, and Persistence.....	21
Adult education programs	22
Adult literacy programs.....	25
Family literacy programs	29
III METHODOLOGY	33
Participants	33
Design	34
Procedure.....	35
Data Analysis and Synthesis	35
IV FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	37
Response Rate	37
Demographic Data.....	39
Program location	39
Participants' ages.....	39
Years of enrollment.....	40
Enrollment level	40
Research Questions	40
Question 1	42
Question 2	44
Question 3	47
Question 4	49
Question 5	53
Question 6	56
Question 7	58
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	60
Summary	60
Conclusions	65
Recommendations	69
Recommendations for research.....	69
Recommendations for practice.....	70
REFERENCES	74

	Page
APPENDIX A IRB INFORMATION SHEET AND QUESTIONNAIRE ..	82
APPENDIX B COVER LETTER TO PROGRAM DIRECTORS.....	89
APPENDIX C FREE RESPONSES	91
APPENDIX D DATA ANALYSIS, FREQUENCY RESPONSE	103
APPENDIX E DATA ANALYSIS, FACTOR ANALYSIS	113
APPENDIX F DATA ANALYSIS, CHI-SQUARE.....	118
APPENDIX G DATA ANALYSIS, ANOVA.....	122
VITA	134

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Questionnaire Response Rate, Spanish and English Versions....	39
2	Even Start Program Assistors, by Category	42
3	Frequency of Situational Assistors, Ranked	44
4	Frequency of Institutional Assistors, Ranked	46
5	Frequency of Dispositional Assistors, Ranked	49
6	Mean (<i>M</i>) for Assistors	51
7	ANOVA, Age of Students.....	52
8	ANOVA, Enrollment Status.....	55
9	ANOVA, Child(ren)'s Age(s).....	57
10	ANOVA, Location	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The data of the 1993 National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS), a study that the United States Department of Education (USDE) funded and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) conducted, has been quoted many times as professionals have searched for the answer to how many illiterate Americans exist and who they are (Quigley, 1997). Based upon a randomly selected sample of “almost 13,600 American adults living in households and approximately 1,100 prisoners” (Jenkins & Kirsch, 1994, p. 9), the NALS included participants from 11 of the 50 U. S. States, including Texas. The participants were assessed according to three scales: prose, document, and quantitative literacy. The prose literacy scale assessed an individual’s ability to read and comprehend various forms of prose literature, for example, newspaper stories and editorials, and product instructions. The document literacy scale evaluated a person’s skill in locating and then using information from sources such as charts, maps, and employment applications. The scale of quantitative literacy measured an adult’s aptitude of applying arithmetic operations in response to text-embedded numbers, which included checkbook balancing and loan interest calculating. “The scores on each scale represent[ed] degrees of proficiency along that particular dimension of literacy” (Jenkins

This dissertation follows the style and format of the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*.

& Kirsch, 1994, p. 11) with the tasks being ordered sets of skills and strategies to test information-processing abilities. The tasks for each scale were placed in five levels. Values for Level 1 represented the completion of tasks such as locating a piece of information in a sports article or totaling a bank deposit entry whereas Level 2 tasks involved underlining the meaning of a given term or locating eligibility from a table of employee benefits. Level 3 values represented the tasks of using a bus schedule to determine which bus to take for a given trip or writing a letter to a credit card company with regard to an error on a credit card bill. Determining correct change, using information in a menu, and comparing two metaphors used in a poem were tasks at Level 4. For performance at Level 5, participants were interpreting a phrase from a news article or determining the cost of carpet for a single room with the aid of a calculator.

The results of the NALS study, based upon all three scales, indicated that almost 50% of the American population functioned at the lowest two of the five levels of literacy. At Level 1, the tasks were described as (a) reading short texts to locate information that was identical to or synonymous with information stated in the question or directive, (b) entering requested information onto a given document from one's prior knowledge, and (c) calculating simple arithmetic operations that provided the numbers as well as the operation to be used. Descriptors for Level 2 tasks stated that these tasks involved the participants in (a) locating specific information from text that included distracters, integrating two or more informative texts, or comparing and contrasting; (b) sifting through a document's text in order to locate the requested information or

integrating information from different sections of the document; and (c) performing single operations with numbers stated in the task or located within the text. Officials from 11 states that participated in the NALS study elected to receive results specific to them. In Texas, a sample of 2,209 individuals representing approximately 12.7 million persons living in households was drawn. Compared to the national sample, approximately 53% of Texans were functioning at the lowest two literacy levels.

Of the 2,209 Texas participants, 1,251 (51%) were women. On the prose literacy scale of the Texas sample, the scores for women and men were identical but a 4-point gap separated them on the document literacy scale with the women's average proficiency being lower than that of the men. This gap was determined to not be statistically significant. However, the 9-point gap on the literacy scale was determined to be statistically significant; once again, women scored at a lower level than did the men. The gender-specific results for the national population indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between gender performances on both the document and the quantitative literacy level with the women participants having a 4-point lower score at the document literacy level and an 11-point lower score at the quantitative literacy level. With such shocking data from the NALS and the Texas Adult Literacy Survey (TALS) providing answers to the question of who are the illiterate in the U.S.A. and in the State of Texas, Quigley reminded the adult education field that there was yet a missing "picture of the trials, successes, or aspirations of the people ... studied" (1997, p. 47). Additional formal research is needed to provide the paint to create the portrait of that missing picture.

Need for the Study

Research conducted within the field of adult learning (Cross, 1981) and adult women learning (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986) has shed additional light on a portion of the American population that has been marginalized until recent times: women. According to Quigley (1997), there is little recorded history of women and literacy in the U.S. Based upon this information, a literature search for recorded data concerning women in adult literacy programs, particularly the Even Start Family Literacy Program, in Texas was initiated. The Even Start Family Literacy Program is a federally-funded program that has four integrated components: adult education, early childhood education, parent education, and parent and child together time. After a brief review of the literature and personal communication (D. F. Seaman, personal communication, April 27, 2001), sparse data about Texas Even Start Programs were located. Therefore, a formal research study regarding the enrollment and retention of women in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs was needed.

Problem Statement

These alarming data have provided additional proof for the need of literacy programs and to reduce the negative forces that hinder women's persistence in those programs. Due to the hardship of finding those participants who have dropped enrollment in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs, this study will focus upon acquiring the responses of those persons who are enrolled for a second or higher year in Even Start. These responses will provide information as to what has allowed them to continue their enrollment as well as what problems they may have encountered.

Therefore, the problem statement that guided this formal research is: What are the perceptions of Texas women concerning the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that have allowed them to continue attending Even Start Family Literacy programs?

Research Questions

Given the identified need and the stated problem, seven questions guided the research. These questions were based upon research that Quigley (1997) published regarding adults' persistence in adult literacy programs.

Question 1. According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what situational assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start?

Question 2. According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what institutional assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start?

Question 3. According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what dispositional assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start?

Question 4. Compared to students who are 22 years old and older, what are the perspectives of 18 to 21 year olds with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start?

Question 5. Compared to students enrolled in English as Second Language (ESL) classes, what are the perspectives of those students enrolled in Adult Basic

Education/General Educational Development (ABE/GED) classes with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start?

Question 6. Compared to parents with children enrolled in Pre-Kindergarten and higher grades, what are the perspectives of parents with children who are 4 years old and younger with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start?

Question 7. Do participants in rural, urban, and metropolitan locations differ in their perceptions of the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start Programs?

Limitations of the Study

As with any study, whether quantitative or qualitative in nature, there were limitations. This study was no exception. One of the limitations was that the respondents' interpretations of what the statement asked may have been different from the statement's intended meaning. A second limitation was that there was no gauge for measuring both the honesty and the accuracy levels of the participants. Restricting the sample and population to Texas Even Start enrollees was a third limitation. Participants from Even Start Family Literacy Programs throughout the United States may encounter different situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors to continuous enrollment.

Definition of Terms

Even Start Family Literacy Program. A national educational program, the Even Start Family Literacy Program is authorized under the William F. Goodling Even Start

Family Literacy Program Section of the national legislation, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. According to this legislation, the purpose of the Even Start Program is to provide academic instruction to both parents and young children via scientifically-based educational programs and to provide parenting education to the parents in such an integrated manner that Even Start will assist in breaking the cycles of poverty and illiteracy. (United States Department of Education. *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved September 8, 2002, from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation>).

Even Start participants. The participants of Even Start are those individuals who meet the criteria as spelled out in Section 1236 of the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Program Act, Subpart 3 of Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. According to this legislation, eligible participants are those parents or caregivers who have not completed high school and who have children 8 years or younger. These participants include those individuals who are within Texas' compulsory school age range. (United States Department of Education. *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved September 8, 2002, from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation>).

Family literacy. According to the National Center for Family Literacy's web site (<http://www.famlit.org>), 'family literacy' is defined as programs that promote the literacy of the entire family based upon a four component framework: adult literacy education, parenting education, parent and child together time, and early childhood education. "Through intensive education of more than one generation, family literacy programs build on families' strengths and provide the tools and support they need to

become stronger and more self-sufficient.” (National Center for Family Literacy. *What is family literacy?*. Retrieved September 8, 2002, from <http://www.familit.org>).

Metropolitan. A metropolitan area is a geographical area consisting of a core area with a large population nucleus plus adjacent communities. The number of persons living in a metropolitan area is 50,000 or more. (United States Census Bureau. *Glossary*. Retrieved September 23, 2002, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>).

Rural. Rural refers to those geographical areas not classified as urban where the population is less than 2500. (United States Census Bureau. *Glossary*. Retrieved September 23, 2002, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>).

Urban. Urban identifies those geographical locations that include an urbanized area plus surrounding communities with a population range of 2,500 to 50,000. (United States Census Bureau. *Glossary*. Retrieved September 23, 2002, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Barriers to Adult Education Programs

Quigley reported in 1997 that he had applied Cross' (1981) framework of barriers (situational, institutional, dispositional) that face mainstream adult learners to adult literacy learners. Cross proposed the three frameworks of barriers after she categorized the 24 response items that were contained in a national survey, which Carp, Peterson, and Roelfs conducted for the Commission of Non-traditional Study in 1974 (as cited in Cross, 1981). Participants in this study were asked to identify any of the 24 items that they felt prevented them from obtaining their learning goals. Some of the 24 items were: "not enough time, job responsibilities, strict attendance requirement, too much red tape in getting enrolled, not enough energy and stamina, and hesitate to seem too ambitious" (p. 99). From this research, Cross concluded that the framework from which most of the adult learner participants selected responses was the situational framework, and the institutional framework being the second highest selected framework.

Cross (1981) stated that "[s]ituational barriers are those arising from one's situation in life at a given time." (p. 98). Obstacles categorized as situational barriers included: cost; home and work obligations; lack of time, child care, transportation, and study or practice space; and family or friends not liking the idea. This definition and categorization is similar to the one that Johnstone and Rivera suggested (as cited in Comings, Parrella, & Soricone, 1999). Their suggestion was that "situational barriers

are outside the individual and include such things as availability of classes and knowledge of that availability” (p. 20). Exclusionary activities that were described as being “*institutional barriers* consist[ed] of all those practices and procedures that exclude or discourage working adults from participating in educational activities...” (Cross, 1981, p. 98). Such practices and procedures were noted as: program completion time, inconvenient course scheduling, lack of information regarding course offerings, strict attendance policies, course offerings, enrollment procedures, not meeting program admission requirements, and lack of credit courses and/or degree plan. Experiencing the obstacles and practices of both situational and institutional barriers surely affected the participants’ attitudes toward engaging in organized instruction thereby promoting them to display select attitudes and behaviors, which Cross labeled as dispositional barriers. The dispositional framework contained attitudes and behaviors that included: fear of being an older adult and just beginning a formal study; lack of confidence due to a history of earning poor grades; low energy and stamina; viewing studying as not enjoyable; not wanting to be in school, in classrooms; lack of educational interests; the inability to see the benefits of taking courses/earning a degree; and hesitation in appearing too ambitious. Not wanting to seem too ambitious was one example that Donaldson and Graham (1999) gave in their explanation of how an adult learner’s self-perception affects her or his participation in formal learning.

In presenting a model of college outcomes, Donaldson and Graham (1999) included students’ prior experience and personal biographies as well as their psychosocial and value orientations as two of the model’s six components. They stated

that “these prior experiences and personal biographies...influence learners’ motivations, self-esteem, self-confidence, responsibility, and intent, as well as the value systems or the psychosocial and value orientations component with which learners approach their education” (p. 29). With prior experiences leading adults to evaluate themselves in social and psychological dimensions, the resulting self-images that adult learners possess affected their participation attitude and behavior. If those experiences had been positive, then adult learners were confident in their role as adult learners. On the other hand, if those experiences were not positive, then adult learners saw themselves as not belonging in the classroom. One group who was reported as not having felt a part of their classroom was a group of women enrolled in nursing completion programs (Aiken, Cervero, & Johnson-Bailey, 2001).

Aiken et al. (2001) discovered that African-American women in nursing education completion programs identified the experience of being the Other and the culture of racism as the two main factors affecting their participation. In seeing themselves as the Other, the African-American nurses felt as though they were on the margins, rather than in the center, of the classroom. The women expressed that the instructors’ expectations for them were quite different from those for their white counterparts, e.g. their fellow white students were allowed to present projects longer than the specified period thereby reducing the amount of remaining class time for the African-American students’ presentations. Had one of the African-American students not vocally expressed her concern for having ample and equal time to present her project, then perhaps this behavior would have been allowed. Through this and other

covert actions such as the exclusion of ethnic minorities in the curriculum, the women expressed the presence of racism within the programs. The fact that ethnic minorities were not included in the program's curriculum even though they would surely be the nurses' patients was an illogical and a racist oversight in the nurses' eyes. Perhaps it was factors similar to these two which have influenced ethnic minorities to respond to such conditions by creating adult education programs for their respective ethnic group (Isaac, Guy, & Valentine, 2001; Young & Padilla, 1990).

According to Isaac et al. (2001), African American Churches have a long history of providing adult education courses as well as religious education classes to their congregations as a response to the social ostracism and personal problems that the members faced. Given that 66% of the congregational members who participated in the programs at the churches were women was yet another finding that addressed the barriers that women, in particular, have encountered as they have participated in adult education courses. Further findings of women encountering barriers based upon their gender identity have included: regimented programs that treat women as children (Flannery, as cited in Hayes, Flannery, Brooks, Tisdell, & Hugo, 2000); physical, emotional, and sexual abuse in the home (Hayes, as cited in Hayes et al., 2000); the need to work, other financial reasons, and change in family status (U. S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics, 2002); and misogynistic practices in their homes, communities, and schools (Stalker, 2001) . These findings regarding how the experiences in the homes of adult learners as well as those in their adult education programs have created barriers to their continuous participation have not been unique to

adult education programs. In fact, Quigley's 1997 application of Cross' 1981 framework of barriers to adult literacy marked the beginning of research examining barriers that affect adult literacy learners' participation in formal educational programs.

Barriers to Adult Literacy Programs

Quigley's 1997 research stemmed from his conduction of more than forty structured and informal presentations to literacy teachers, tutors, counselors, and administrators in California, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Texas, Tennessee, and Washington. These literacy practitioners indicated that 38% of those adults who quit literacy programs do so due to situational barriers, 10% leave as a result of institutional barriers, and 52% exit literacy programs prior to their achieving their goals due to dispositional barriers. Quigley (1997) described all 3 barriers as being influences of certain factors. Situational barriers were seen as influences of circumstances whereas institutional barriers were seen as influences of systems. The influences of experiences comprised the dispositional barriers. These findings differed from those of Cross (1981); in that research, dispositional barriers received the third fewest responses, and situational barriers received the most. Perhaps the difference was the result of Quigley (1997) selecting practitioners rather than actual students as did Cross (1981).

In Quigley's (1997) research, the dispositional framework of barriers received the most responses from the practitioner participants and the situational barriers were ranked second highest. A student's prior formal educational experience which involved learned fear of academic failure and dislike of school, attitude toward the literacy program, self-esteem, and personal goals were identified as those experiences

constituting dispositional barriers. Situational barriers were defined as a lack of childcare, transportation, living funds, personal health, family support, and personal time. Aesthetic appeal of the program's location, the structure and content of the program, the program's academic scheduling, the accessibility of the program's physical location, program registration procedures, and the teacher's teaching styles were categorized as institutional barriers. For Quigley to have used practitioners rather than literacy students to identify these barriers was a surprising discovery since in earlier publications, he posited that in order for adult basic education and adult literacy programs to accurately understand why students resist attending classes, then those programs must allow the students' voices to supply the response – not the voice of program coordinators (Quigley, 1987, 1990, 1992).

Using resistance theory as a framework for understanding nonparticipation in adult basic education, Quigley (1987, 1990) earlier analyzed nonparticipation “through a close analysis of resister figures as found in literary fiction” (1987, p. 65). One of the outcomes of Quigley's examination of 9 novels and 1 short story was that “...the protagonists never resisted actual learning or objective knowledge” (p.68). Their resistance was of “...schooling and all that it symbolized” (p. 68). In continuing to use resistance theory as a framework, Quigley in 1992 studied 20 adults who resided in urban housing projects located throughout the city of Pittsburgh, Ohio. What Quigley discovered was that each of the 12 female and 8 male participants “...had consciously chosen not to attend literacy programs” (Quigley, 1992, p. 107). Quigley shared that,

Every subject stated education was important. Many said that they “should” go to ABE or literacy centers. However, none said they were actually prepared to

take such a step. They willingly, articulately, gave suggestions for improving adult literacy programs, but the interviews continually gravitated back to early schooling as the primary de-motivating factor. Subjects were influenced - in some cases haunted - by the memories of their prior school experiences. These associations clearly impeded their stated interest in returning to a formal educational program (p. 107).

Five years later, Quigley (1997) classified such early school experiences as dispositional barriers in research where literacy practitioners identified dispositional barriers as being the most prevalent type of barriers that prevent students from continuing in adult literacy classes. Explaining why the three weeks immediately following a student's enrollment in an adult basic education (ABE) class determines whether that student remains until her or his goal is reached, Quigley referred to a program's need to recognize and address dispositional barriers (Quigley, 1998). In 2001, Quigley proposed that dispositional barriers accounted for the reason why 76% of the participants in the International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS) Study who had a lower than secondary school level of formal education responded "Never" to the question of how often did they use a library, but only 35% stated that they never read a book. According to Quigley, these students engaged in self-directed learning in accessing information. Despite the fact that Quigley's 1992 and 1997 and Cross' 1981 research involved different methodologies and population samples, their research offered similar results: dispositional, situational, and institutional factors affect adult learners enrolled in adult education and in adult literacy programs. Analogous results can also be seen in other published research (Belzer, 1998; Reder & Strawn, 2001; Drake, 1999).

In 1998, Belzer "used qualitative research methods to gain multiple perspectives on the process of participation in an adult literacy program from the point of view of

learners, staff, and tutors over time” (p. 15). Her findings indicated that the reasons which the learners, staff, and tutors offered when asked why a person left the program could be classified in the framework that Cross offered in 1981. However, a difference that Belzer did find was that students often saw their leaving a program as a temporary decision, which contrasted with the staff’s and tutors’ views. Belzer stated:

We were surprised to find that the students who left the program did not seem to consider themselves ‘drop outs.’ No one would go so far as to say that she had quit the program. Each of those who left planned to return in the future. While they had stopped coming, their intentions to participate had not ended. Although they did not necessarily know when they would be able to return, they all believed it would be possible and desirable to do (p. 16).

Whether the students returned may have been attributed to one, two, or all three of the frameworks of barriers: situational, institutional, or dispositional. Reder and Strawn presented evidence of such an attribution in 2001.

Reder and Strawn (2001) reported that the initial findings of the Longitudinal Study of Adult Learning (LSAL) have provided six reasons why high school drop outs leave school. The respondents who left school prior to receiving their high school diplomas indicated that they did so because: (a) they were bored, didn’t like school, and felt as though they didn’t belong there; (b) they experienced problems with academic performance; (c) there had job-related issues; (d) they experienced problems in their personal relationships; (e) family issues were present; and (f) they had health problems or became pregnant. These six reasons can be classified in one or more of the frameworks of barriers. Their reason of being bored, not liking school and not feeling a sense of belonging, for example, could be categorized as either dispositional barriers or institutional barriers. The job-related issues which they faced may be identified as a

situational or an institutional barrier. This institutional barrier, as well as others, was referenced in proceedings that Drake (1999) published.

In 1999, Drake asserted that institutional barriers such as local television stations' programming schedule and lack of collaboration prohibited the effective use of and access to an instructional video series as well as the variability in quality of English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. This assertion was made as Drake addressed the topic of how adults learn and what factors interfere with that learning. Drake pointed out that other variables have been identified as barriers to attendance. These variables involved an insufficient number of appropriate ESL services, learners' job schedules, lack of childcare and/or transportation, and inconvenient program locations. For a different group of women distance learners, the inability to correct technical problems created a barrier to their successful learning (Care & Udod, 2000). Foster and Rado (as cited in Milton, 1999) suggested that both personal (dispositional) barriers and structural barriers affect women's enrollment and persistence in workplace literacy programs. Marital status, stage of family life cycle, age, and ethnicity were classified as personal barriers whereas poor information dissemination, inappropriate course delivery method, required supervisor approval, and intrusion into the women's personal time were classified as structural barriers. Other researchers have referred to these, as well as other, barriers facing adult learners, especially female adult learners, in family literacy programs (Tice, 2000; Rodriguez-Brown, Li, & Albom, 1999).

Barriers to Family Literacy Programs

In the literature regarding participant retention in family literacy programs, once again, situational, dispositional, and institutional barriers affect adult learners as they attempt to further their formal education. Tice reported that "...85% of clients states that transportation was a barrier to service, and 65% indicated that child-care needs were unmet" (2000, p. 140). Additionally, 92% of the participants described their education experiences as unsatisfactory. The participants

...spoke of difficulties with particular teachers or school administrators. They recalled participating in few extracurricular activities such as clubs or sports. According to several clients, the traditional school setting "never seemed right" in terms of their interests and life experiences. (p. 140)

Rodriguez-Brown et al. (1999) also addressed the difficulties that family literacy participants have faced while attempting to navigate and negotiate with the public educational systems. A particular difficulty for Hispanic participants has been "their lack of English proficiency [which] can lead to feelings of inefficacy when helping with homework or dealing with the school" (p. 43). A similar vein of identifying barriers to family literacy programs was also found in electronic discussions.

In archived messages located at the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL) Family Literacy Discussion List, family literacy professionals throughout the United States have discussed at-length the issue of barriers to retention in family literacy programs (Rubin, 2001a; Smith, 2001; Cline, 2001; Dini, 2001; Carpenter, 2001; Rainwater, 2001; Bombach, 2001). Rubin (2001a) responded to a message requesting information regarding barriers that prevent learners from participating in family literacy programs (Smith, 2001). In the response, Rubin offered these 14 obstacles: medical problems,

mobility, transportation, domestic violence, gang activity, “giving up” [sic], schedule conflicts related to work, simple exhaustion, trouble managing time or self-care, substance abuse, lack of awareness of program, shame, mental/behavioral health issues, and prevention by public aid caseworker or “system” [sic]. Cline (2001) later added the barriers of childcare, language, and low self-esteem. The stigma attached to libraries and their family literacy programs was Dini’s (2001) offering to the discussion. Carpenter’s (2001) contribution reiterated that library family literacy programs’ stigma poses a barrier and suggested that extended family, husbands, the way adult education is taught, and physical disabilities, i.e. functional blindness, were barriers that students have encountered as well. Learning disabilities was one obstacle that Rainwater (2001) identified whereas Bombach (2001) identified two obstacles: the need for employment and money. At NIFL’s archived messages of the Women and Literacy Discussion List, Greenberg proposed that an obstacle could “be a lack of comfort in the program. I would think that one’s [sexual] orientation and people’s acceptance of that orientation is potentially a big issue in a family literacy program” (2002, para 1, 2). Justification for these discussions and other discussions concerning barriers to family literacy programs has been provided in some literature for Tao, Gamse & Tarr (as cited in U. S. Department of Education, 1998) reported that only “...about 40% [of families] participated for longer than a year” in one type of family literacy program, the Even Start Family Literacy Program.

In August, 2001, at a meeting in Washington, D. C., a staff member of the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy [whose mission is to improve family

literacy via research and the application of that research to practice and professional development (Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy, 2000)] reported that "...[a] representative from Bush's White House office actually said they were going to give Even Start one more chance, and if no research emerged to show that family literacy was a 'value added' approach, they were [not] going to [fund] it..." (D. F. Seaman, personal communication, August 31, 2001). A year and a half later, the budget concerns surrounding the Even Start Program were still a topic of national discussion and advocacy efforts. According to Peyton (2002), the Bush Administration has proposed a \$50 million reduction in Even Start funding for Fiscal Year 2003. However, due to the intensive lobbying efforts from Even Start professionals and participants, Congress did not support this reduction, and voted to maintain Even Start's 2003 funding at the 2002 Fiscal Year level (Peyton, 2003).

Given these facts, the more empirical research that can be provided to Even Start Family Literacy Program practitioners not only in Texas, but also in the United States, then the more ammunition these practitioners will have to document that the Even Start Family Literacy Program is a valuable component of our nation's and state's public educational system. However, empirical data regarding the barriers to persistence in Even Start is scarce.

In 1998, Yaffe and Williams explored reasons why women chose to participate in an Even Start Family Literacy Program located in a Midwest metropolitan area. A finding of their exploration via open-ended interviews was that the female participants cited lack of transportation, and demands of work, school, and parenting as obstacles to

attendance and continuation. Violence, in the form of “a jealous boyfriend who lingered at the door with a gun when the tutor...” (Morrish, 2002, p. 17) visited one Even Start participant’s home, was an identified barrier to learning in one Maine Even Start Program. Other barriers for participants in that particular program included child sexual abuse and the death of a family member. Lack of transportation and spousal support affected the continuous participation of women in one Texas Even Start Program (Perry, 2002). However, none of the authors referred to the barriers facing the Even Start participants within the framework of situational, institutional, and dispositional barriers.

The concept of the frameworks of barriers – situational, institutional, and dispositional – has remained within the literature of adult literacy and adult education for twenty years now. Therefore, some may say that the frameworks are somewhat classical in that the findings are relatively consistent with each published research and literature that this review has referenced. However, the application of the framework of barriers to continuation in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs has not yet been published or has not yet been researched. Texas Even Start Program Coordinators have expressed concerns regarding their programs’ high attrition rate (R. M. Chahin, personal communication, October 31, 2001; A. P. Hitchcock, personal communication, November 27, 2001). Application of the framework of barriers to Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs would provide invaluable data to all Texas Even Start Coordinators.

Sources of Motivation, Support, and Persistence

Given the vast amount of information regarding those factors that serve as obstacles to adults enrolling and maintaining enrollment in adult education, adult

literacy, and family literacy programs, supporters and motivators for these learners have been researched and identified as well.

Adult education programs. Those adult learners who have been enrolled in college have found that having supportive friends has contributed to their not having psychological distress (Chartrand, 1992 and Dill & Henley, 1998; as cited in Donaldson, & Graham, 1999). Carney-Crompton and Tan (2002) reported the sources from which traditional and nontraditional female students draw emotional and instrumental support. Emotional support (acceptance, encouragement, and praise), which was drawn from boyfriends, grandparents and parents, was statistically more significant for traditional students than for nontraditional students. For the nontraditional student, spouse/partner and child were cited as statistically significant sources of emotional support. Carney-Crompton and Tan categorized financial, childcare, and household support as instrumental support. Instrumental support sources that were reported statistically significant for traditional students were the same as their sources of emotional support; however, for the nontraditional female student, other sources such as paid help aided their spouse/partners and child(ren) in offering them instrumental support. African-American women participating in nursing completion programs found support from two factors: intrapersonal and cultural (Aiken et al., 2001). A belief in God and/or spirituality and determination were the two items the women identified as intrapersonal factors that aided them in persisting in their programs. The nurses reported that social mobility and their previous nursing experience were the cultural factors that promoted their remaining in the program. Cultural factors were also key components that

promoted the participation of African Americans in church-based adult education classes.

Issaac, Guy, and Valentine (2001) stated that the familiar cultural setting of the church appealed to the learners because they were surrounded with other Christians, in particular, African American Christians whose values and lifestyles were similar to theirs. The familiar cultural setting, along with facing personal challenges through guided counseling, and experiencing family togetherness via shared participation were three motivational factors that were introduced to the literature regarding motivation to participate in church-based adult education. The researchers went on to point out that previous adult and religious education findings of spiritual and religious development, love of learning, social interaction, and service to others being identified as motivational factors were present in this study as well. Building upon that idea of adult learners wanting to persist in programs for personal development, social networks, and service to others, the researchers Comings, Parrella, and Soricone (2000) suggested support mechanisms that adult education program may employ to aid their students in continuous enrollment.

Comings, Parrella, and Soricone (2000) offered four supports that allow students to consistently attend ABE and/or GED classes and to quickly return to the program if they must leave prior to achieving their goals. The first support of “awareness and management of the positive and negative forces that help and hinder persistence” (p. 4) called for program personnel to assist students in identifying the positive and negative forces that affect their continuation in the program. Once these forces have been

identified, then the “students can plan to build their supports and reduce their barriers” (Comings, Parrella, & Soricone, 2000, p. 5). In the explanation of the second support, adult education programs were encouraged to offer mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, and social persuasion as avenues to aid students in building their sense of self-efficacy. Programs were also expected to address their students’ physiological and emotional states to assist their (students’) overcoming dispositional, institutional, and perhaps situational barriers. Student establishment of a goal was the third support offered. Even though this process begins prior to the adult learner enrolling in a program, “the staff of the educational program must help the potential adult student define his or her goals and understand the many instructional objectives that must be met on the road to meeting that goal” (p. 6). Given that instructional objectives are often many and that the time required to meet those may be a period of six months, a year, or longer than a year, Comings, Parrella, and Soricone (2000) recommended that the fourth support of creating a continuous process through which the students are able to measure their progress in reaching their established goals be included as well. An awareness of these four supports coupled with knowing why high school dropouts leave school prior to graduating have undoubtedly provided program administrators and teachers with effective tools in their efforts to address the barriers facing students in ABE, ESL, or GED classes.

In an account of how one group of adult education students and their teachers successfully lobbied both city and county supervisors to build an adult education center, Hart expressed that “it is the prospect of achieving power and not the concept of literacy

that truly motivates...students..." (1998, p. 3). Many adult education and adult literacy students desire to increase their literacy skills as they explore new paths in life. Adult literacy students' acquisition of the power to accomplish their goals and change their lives has been shared in the literature as well (Willard, 1998).

Adult literacy programs. A graduate of a literacy program shared that it was not until he was 54 years of age and forced to take an early retirement that he realized his inability to read well was due not only to institutional and dispositional barriers but also to a learning disability - dyslexia (Willard, 1998). Willard recounted:

I stayed in my reading program for two and a half years. Many things kept me going. Initially, perhaps the most important motivation to me was that I wanted to prove to myself and the rest of the world that I was not a dummy...Another thing that helped me was to stand up and say "I'm an adult learner."...My wonderful tutor, my understanding of dyslexia, my involvement in literacy issues, the discovery of who I am, were some of the things that motivated me. The chemistry in my home helped to keep me going. I got all the encouragement and support I could want from my wife and daughter who was a senior in high school at the time...(p. 14).

Twelve years after completing the adult literacy program, Willard found himself delivering public speeches regarding adult literacy and dyslexia as well as serving as a literacy coordinator at a Midwestern community college. Gaining a sense of empowerment to overcome lifelong obstacles and to assist others in their struggle was a vital outcome of Willard successfully increasing his literacy skills. A key factor in Willard's success was his learning to trust his tutor, having a strong support system, as well as developing relationships with others in the class. Potts (2001) elaborated on the crucial role that trust plays in learners persisting in adult literacy programs: "Once the adult learners begin to form trusting, learning, and inquiry relationships with members of

the group, they often break down the barriers themselves...” (para 3). Willard’s having many different sources of support and motivation did not make him unique; other published literature has shared the importance of multiple sources of support for adult literacy learners.

According to Purcell-Gates, Degener, Jacobson, and Soler (2000), adult literacy participants received support “from different places, people, and sources but it all was important and key to the motivation driving these students to attend class and work on their literacy skills” (p. 14). The participants identified teachers, family members, neighbors, store clerks, caseworkers, acquaintances, and their belief in God as sources of support. Additionally, they spoke of “their intrinsic motivations which ranged from personal feelings of empowerment to the desire to be better workers or better parents” (p. 17). “Obviously, meeting the needs of the students is the most effective strategy...” (Wat, 2002, para 1) in reducing the attrition rates of adult learners in literacy programs. But, how does a program go about meeting the students’ needs?

In an effort to support other adult literacy program participants and their motivations to be better workers and parents, five libraries that were selected to participate in a national study will have their actions to improve learner persistence documented and published (Comings & Cuban, 2000). Leading public library-based literacy programs located in New York, North Carolina, and California have embarked on increasing learner persistence through a variety of strategies. Seven of the planned program strategies addressed issues and policies concerning childcare, transportation, new curriculum, expanded hours of operation, teacher and tutor training, new

instructional approaches, and new intake process and student orientation. Providing program participants with childcare and transportation addressed some of the situational barriers that the participants faced. Not offering program services at a variety of times was recognized as a potential institutional barrier; therefore, several libraries revised their hours of operation. Revising curriculum so that it was more relevant to the learners' lives as well as including instructional methods based upon adult learning theories addressed some of the institutional as well as dispositional barriers that the adult learners encountered. Through the use of teacher and tutor training, program coordinators believed that the quality of instruction and teacher-support would increase; thereby, having a positive influence upon student progress and persistence. To address other factors classified as institutional, situational, and/or dispositional barriers, the library literacy programs planned a more comprehensive and structured intake and orientation process. How well these efforts promoted student persistence will be made public in 2003, which has been identified as the publication year of this research project's final report (Comings, Cuban, Bos, & Taylor, 2001). However, if a program needs an immediate response as to what strategies can be implemented in order to increase learner retention, then perhaps that program should ask its students. One North Carolina adult literacy program did just that.

Sumerford (as cited in Sledd, 2001) reported that a dozen adult literacy students were asked to offer recommendations to one North Carolina community in its efforts to assist the adult learners in persisting in the community's formal educational programs.

Spanning a period of several weeks, the adult literacy students vocalized their recommendations. Included in those recommendations were:

1. Invite adult literacy students to develop policy for local education programs, both school and adult literacy programs.
2. Provide childcare and transportation for adults who want to improve their literacy skills or get involved in the education of their children.
3. Recognize that as a result of low-paying jobs, many adults have to work two jobs to earn a living wage and thus they cannot easily find the time to help their children with homework or pursue their own educational advancement.
4. Create lifelong learning centers for families in neighborhoods, and provide literacy opportunities in a variety of settings including the workplace, recreation centers and libraries.
5. Never make an adult or child feel ashamed of what they do not know.

Constantly affirm them for what they do know. (Sledd, 2001, para 11)

Responding to these adult learners' need for child care, Young and Padilla (1990) discovered a positive outcome for a group other than the adult parents. They shared that although their childcare program

...can be a difficult experience for [the children], we have found that as time passes, especially because their mothers are close by, the experience becomes a positive one. After a while, children willingly let go of their mothers' hands to walk into their own childcare room. It has also been positive because any time there is a childcare activity, attendance is great. (p. 5)

In a similar vein, one family literacy professional (Rubin, 2001b) shared 10 approaches, as well as a brief explanation of each, that a family literacy program coordinator can

execute while she or he addresses the obstacles that family literacy program participants face.

Family literacy programs. Rubin (2001b) posted the 10 approaches that the staff of a family literacy program may employ in order to create and sustain program enrollment.

1. GET THE WORD OUT [sic].
2. Provide counseling services or connect with an agency that provides these services.
3. With permission from the participant, work together with other agencies (or individual case workers) that are already serving the individual or family.
4. Help participants come up with their OWN [sic] ways of dealing with obstacles.
5. Help participants find a way to resolve transportation problems.
6. If possible, provide family literacy services at different times and places to make it available to people with changing schedules and locations.
7. Meet one on one with prospective participants; help them set realistic expectations for themselves.
8. Let participants know they are NOT ALONE [sic] in what they are feeling or doing.
9. Offer home visits to participants who are exhausted or having scheduling problems.
10. Above all, get to know the population you serve, the services they need, and

the services they want. (Rubin, 2001b, para 2-11)

Hendrick (2002) gave an additional suggestion for increasing a program's retention rate: frequent review of the student's goals and the progress s/he is making toward those goals. Handel (as cited in Padak, Sapin, & Baycich, 2002) identified that a participatory teaching approach as well as an enthusiastic teacher were two factors that contribute to high retention in family literacy programs. A learning setting that is meaningful to students and the use of authentic materials were two program components that Paratore (as cited in Padak et al., 2002) contributed to the literature. More reasons why family literacy participants remain in the program and program features that were most important to them were found in Neuman, Caperelli, and Kee (1998).

Through the examination of self-reported data from 52 family literacy programs, including Even Start Family Literacy Programs, Neuman et al. (1998) discovered that participants remained in programs that addressed their needs. Learning new ways to accomplish what they were currently doing, adding new skills to their existing repertoires, accomplishing dreams, and developing social networks were the responses that the participants gave when they were asked to describe their local program's benefits. When asked which of the program's features were most critical to them, 6 features were identified: involving participants in planning, offering family-based activities, including on-going assessment, creating social networks, integrating support services, and providing next steps for academic and career development. Even Start Programs not included in Neuman et al. have also reported support mechanisms. Including a support group for participants and hiring a social worker to train and to assist

staff were two procedures that characterized one Even Start program (Morrish, 2002). “Once students were able to address issues in this group, and staff could do the same in their monthly meetings, literacy work could be the focus during tutoring sessions” (p. 18). A supportive environment that the women provide for one another was cited as one of the numerous program components that contributed to the women’s satisfaction of another Even Start Program (Yaffe & Williams, 1998). The other components mentioned included the lack of competition, individualized instruction and focus, removal of barriers to attendance, relevant curriculum, and the provision of early childhood education. Teachers helping students resolve their problems and offering activities year-round were program components that Even Start participants in one Texas program shared (Perry, 2002).

All of these recommendations and shared strategies may or may not be immediately and/or efficiently implemented in an education program that is designed for adult learners. Yet, they do offer a framework that allows programs to support their students and promote their persistence. From the adult enrolled in a university to the one enrolled in an Even Start Family Literacy Program, sources of motivation, support, and persistence are vital as each student strives to attain her/his educational goals. Flexible scheduling, familial and/or spousal support, provided transportation, as well as valuing each student, are effective program components that the literature has offered in response to the frameworks of barriers facing adults. For the adults (mostly women) who are enrolled in Even Start, the program’s four components of: (1) adult education, (2) early childhood education, (3) parenting education, and (4) parent and child together

activities address many of the barriers that have been identified. Lack of child care, transportation, and integration of social services, for example, are barriers that Even Start programs throughout the Nation have addressed and for which, they have provided solutions (Neuman et al. 1998; Morrish, 2002; Perry, 2002). How Texas Even Start Programs provide avenues of motivation, support, and persistence, according to the female participants, was the focus of this dissertation. The following chapter shares the methods used to ascertain the female participants' views.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Due to the nature of the stated problem and the identified population, both quantitative and qualitative research methods were used to acquire data. The basic procedures employed are presented in this chapter.

Participants

According to E. Franklin, State Coordinator, Even Start, Division of Adult and Community Education of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) (E. Franklin, personal communication, January 31, 2002), the average number of families enrolled in a Texas Even Start Program was 45 with the average family having 1 adult participate in the program. According to the Texas Center for Adult Learning and Literacy's web site (2002), for the 2001-2002 School Year, there were 86 Even Start programs within the State. Therefore, the approximate total number of Even Start adult participants was 3870 for the 2001-2002 Program Year. Within that population, the number of persons who have been enrolled for one program year and beyond varies with the estimated average number being 10 (D. F. Seaman, personal communication, September 19, 2002). Hence, the total number of Even Start participants (for the 2002-2003 program year) who have been enrolled for at least one program year was approximately 860. The calculations that Krejcie and Morgan (1970) provided in a table for determining the sample size from a given population indicate that a sample size of 269 is sufficient when a population numbers 900. Therefore, a random selection of 33 Even Start Programs

found within the State of Texas during the 2002-2003 Program Year was the initial step in selecting participants.

The first 28 randomly-selected programs were contacted and all female participants who had been enrolled for one program year or longer were asked to complete a questionnaire. Due to programs not having as many participants complete the questionnaires as initially expected or later declining to participate, the 5 remaining Even Start Programs were contacted in order to obtain a sample size of 269.

Design

Quantitative and qualitative data were acquired through a questionnaire. In creating the questionnaire, the researcher based the contents upon Cross'(1981) and Quigley's (1997) surveys as well as the responses posted on the NIFL Family Literacy Discussion List (Carpenter, 2001; Cline, 2001; Potts, 2001; Rubin, 2001b) and those provided in an unpublished manuscript (Perry, 2002). The questionnaire was designed with both limited and free response answers and was available in both Spanish and English. Questions regarding the participant's age, number of months/years participating in the program and in which adult literacy class [English as a Second Language (ESL) or Adult Basic Education (ABE)/General Education Development (GED)] she was enrolled were included as well. A logistical field-test was conducted in order to ensure participants' understanding of the wording and format of the questionnaire. No changes were made to the questionnaire as a result of the field-test. The questionnaire along with the Institutional Review Board (IRB) information sheet is located in Appendix A of this dissertation.

Procedure

The initial contact with the directors of the 33 randomly-selected Even Start Programs was via telephone. Based upon that conversation, the questionnaires along with the IRB information sheets were sent to each director who volunteered to participate via mail with a postage-paid return envelope included. Questionnaires written in both Spanish and English were available. A sample cover letter to the program directors is in Appendix B.

The administering of the questionnaire to the female participants who had been students for one program year and beyond was conducted with the assistance of the Even Start program staff. The researcher hopes that accurate, rather than socially acceptable responses were given since the participants completed the survey under the guidance of a familiar person, such as the teacher and/or program director.

Data Analysis and Synthesis

The acquired data were quantitatively analyzed using the software program Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS)™. The statistical measures of factor analysis, frequency response, Chi-Square, and General Linear Model (GLM) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), were employed. Factor analysis was employed in order to reduce data; ANOVA was used to compare groups based on interval scores. With the Eigenvalue set at 1, a Varimax rotation revealed 5 classifications of assistors; those assistors selected to be included in each classification were those with a factor loading of .4 or higher. An *a priori* alpha level of .05 was used for Chi-Square analyses while an *a priori* Bonferroni adjusted alpha level for ANOVA was .01. GLM and Bonferroni was

used since there were five different variables with each group having a unique number of participants. When determining whether a statistical significance was large, medium, or small, Cohen's effect size index was used (as cited in Spatz, 2001). An effect size of .40 was deemed large; .25, medium; and .10 small.

Frequency response was used to ascertain how many participants responded to each statement according to the scales of *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree*, *strongly disagree*, and *does not apply*. Chi-Square was used to examine these responses, except the response of *does not apply*, according to: (a) participants' ages - 18 to 21 year olds compared to 22 year olds and older; (b) adult participants' enrollment level - ESL compared to ABE/GED; (c) children's ages - parents with children who are 4 years old and younger compared to those with children enrolled in Pre-Kindergarten and higher grades; and (d) location of program - rural, urban, or metropolitan. Based upon the 2000 Census definitions that the United States Census Bureau offers, the researcher identified each program as rural, urban, or metropolitan. Chi-Square was used since a comparison of the per-item summaries of the questionnaire was calculated using the obtained frequency counts. To probe group summary responses, ANOVA was utilized. The groups were formed in terms of the demographical variables of participants' ages, enrollment level, children's ages, and location of program.

Qualitative analysis on the free response items was conducted through the use of coding and categorizing. Summaries of the free responses were then created to identify salient themes. A complete list of the free-response items has been placed in Appendix C.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Response Rate

Of the 28 Even Start Programs that were first contacted, 2 program directors declined participation due to their involvement in other research studies. One program director indicated that her program was not yet operational due to lack of staff and 3 additional directors did not return any of the three phone messages that were left. Of the 22 remaining programs, all volunteered to participate. After having asked the program directors for the number of participants who needed questionnaires written in Spanish and in English, a total of 369 Spanish questionnaires and information sheets and 168 English questionnaires and information sheets were mailed along with 22 postage paid envelopes for the return of the completed questionnaires to the researcher. Four of the 22 programs returned the questionnaires within 3 weeks. A follow-up phone call was placed to the remaining 18 programs; within 3 weeks, 11 of these programs' directors had returned the completed questionnaires. One program director explained apologetically that there were no longer any participants enrolled for a second program year. Second and third follow-up calls were placed to the remaining 6 programs whose questionnaires had not been submitted after 6 weeks of receiving them. Within 2 weeks (8 weeks after the initial mailing), 2 additional programs' questionnaires were received. After a fourth follow-up contact with the 4 programs that were part of the first mailing whose questionnaires had not yet been received, 3 programs mailed questionnaires within a 3-week period. One program never responded. Therefore, within 11 weeks of

the initial sampling and mailing, 20 programs had returned questionnaires: 223 Spanish and 57 English. Of these 280 questionnaires, 61 were not valid questionnaires due to two reasons: (a) enrollment was not for a second program year, and (b) gender was male, not female. Hence, at the end of collecting data from the first 24 participating Even Start programs, a total of 219 participants had been surveyed. A minimum of 50 additional participants was needed.

The researcher then attempted contact with the remaining 5 Even Start Programs that were included in the random-sampling. Of these 5, 4 programs elected to participate. One program director did not respond to 3 phone messages. Of the 4 programs that did participate, 1 program was located within 30 miles of the researcher's home and that director requested that the researcher administer the questionnaires due to the lack of available staff. The researcher did administer the questionnaire (11 Spanish; 5 English) after formally introducing herself, stating her reason for being there, and distributing the information sheet. Of these 16 questionnaires, 4 (3 Spanish, 1 English) did not meet the enrollment requirement of this study; only 12 of the 16 questionnaires were included in the final data analysis. A total of 58 Spanish and 7 English questionnaires and information sheets were mailed to the other 3 participating programs. Forty of the mailed questionnaires were completed: 35 Spanish and 5 English. Of these 40, 1 Spanish questionnaire was not included in the analysis because the participant had not been enrolled longer than one program year; therefore, only 39 of these questionnaires were included in the final data analysis. Therefore, the total number of women participants in Texas Even Start Programs who had been enrolled for one

program year or longer and were included in this study's sample was 270. These data are in Table 1.

	Number Mailed	Number Received ^a	Response Rate
Spanish	438	224	51.0%
English	180	46	25.6%
Total	618	270	n/a

^aQuestionnaires from participants who have been enrolled longer than one program year.

Demographic Data

Program location. The majority of the 270 participants attended programs located in urban areas: 149 (55.2%). One hundred one (37.4%) were enrolled in programs found in metropolitan areas while 20 (7.4%) participated in Even Start Programs in rural areas.

Participants' ages. Of the 270 women, only 231 stated their age on the questionnaire. Seventeen (7.4%) women were between the ages of 18 to 21 while 208 (90%) were 22 years old or older. Responses from 6 (2.6%) females who were younger than 18 years were not included in the final analysis. The researcher, for the sake of statistical analysis, established the minimum age of enrollees to be 18 since much of society recognizes 18 years as the age an individual is an adult. Four of the six women were 17 years old with the remaining two being 16 and 14 years old.

Years of enrollment. Thirty-six women did not share how many years they had been enrolled in Even Start. For those who did share, the majority 124 (53%) had been enrolled in Even Start for a period of 1 to 2 years. Seventy-one (30.3%) were a part of Even Start for 2 to 3 years and 34 (14.5%) had enrollment periods lasting from 3 to 5 years. One (.43%) participant had been a student of Even Start for 10 years. Four (1.7%) participants had not been enrolled for a calendar year but are participating in their second program year.

Enrollment level. A greater number of women were enrolled in ESL courses: 175. Sixty-eight women replied that they were enrolled in GED classes with 12 of them indicating enrollment in various types of coursework, e.g. Pre-GED (ABE/ASE), computer, and high school completion.

Frequency tables for all demographic data are in Appendix D.

Research Questions

A factor analytic solution was conducted. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure for Sampling Adequacy measured .828 whereas Bartlett's Test of Sphericity measured a significance of .000 (Appendix G). Fifteen of the 17 assistors loaded into *five* components or categories. The assistors of learning new things, making better personal decisions, having teacher support, enjoying school, and liking the class scheduled loaded into category one and were named *dispositional* assistors. The assistors of other parents as encouragement, assist children more with learning and homework, and participate more at school loaded into category two and were labeled *parental* assistors. Even Start's program location, early childhood education, and no cost loaded into the third

category and were titled *institutional* assistors. Support from a significant other or partner and support from family loaded into category four and were named *situational* assistors. The assistors of provided transportation and summer programs loaded into the fifth category, which was labeled *specific program* assistors. Compared to previous research (Quigley, 1997), this was the first time that these *five* categories were identified. In using the *three* categories of situational, institutional, and dispositional, Quigley stayed within the confines of the research that Cross (1981) conducted. Data from this study expanded beyond those three categories.

Two of the assistors, parenting class and increased job skills, did not load into any of the five categories since they did not have a factor loading of .4 or higher (Appendix E). Upon examining each of the five categories, categories one, three, and four were respectively categorized as *dispositional*, *institutional*, and *situational* assistors. These labels were given based upon using the models of the barriers that Cross (1981) and Quigley (1997) presented along with the assistors found in Perry (2002). For the additional two categories, which were not found in previous research (Cross, 1981; Quigley, 1997), the label of *parental* assistors was given to category two since these assistors focused upon the participants' role as parents. For category five, the label *specific program* assistors was assigned since these two assistors, provided transportation and summer program, are unique to each Even Start Program (E. Franklin, personal communication, February 21, 2003). Some programs offer transportation and others do not. The curriculum and length of summer programs vary as well. One program might offer only parenting education and parent and child together activities

whereas another may provide adult education, early childhood education, parenting education, and parent and child together activities. A list of which assistors comprise each category is in Table 2.

Category	Assistors
Situational	Significant support, family support
Institutional	Program location, early childhood education, no cost of Even Start
Dispositional	Learning new things, better personal decisions, teacher support, always enjoyed school, class scheduling
Parental	Other parents as encouragement, assist child w/learning, participate more at school
Specific Program	Provided transportation, summer program

Question 1. According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what situational assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start? Based upon the factor analysis that was conducted, 2 of the

17 statements from the questionnaire (Appendix A) were classified as *situational* assistors:

1. My significant other or partner supports me coming to Even Start.
2. My family (parents, brothers, sisters) supports my coming to Even Start.

Of those participants who responded to these 2 statements, *strongly agree* was the most selected response. For the women in Texas Even Start programs who responded to this questionnaire, the data have revealed that the *situational* assistor that most enables them to continue their participation is the support received from their spouse or significant other. Having family such as parents and siblings support their Even Start enrollment was the other *situational* assistor identified in this study. Comments concerning the situational assistors included:

- My husband supports me because he wants me to be able to go out and advance in this country.
- I strongly agree; my husband and I are very happy.
- ...they give me spirit, strength.
- They help me by telling me that I am not less and that I have great courage for learning English.

The support of a significant other and/or family members was mainly given in the forms of encouraging words. The participants' loved ones wanted them to be able to effectively communicate with others in society. Once the significant others and family members witnessed the increase in the participants' abilities to do so, they provided

continuous support. In Table 3, there is a listing of the response frequencies for the *situational* assistors; for a more detailed analysis of the frequencies, see Appendix D.

Assistor	n	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Significant other support	252	180	63	7	2
Familial support	247	173	66	7	1

Question 2. According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what institutional assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start? Based upon the results of the factor analysis measure, *institutional* assistors were identified as those related to the system of the Even Start Program. These included both the components and physical location of the program. Three statements were categorized as *institutional* assistors:

1. If Even Start weren't near my house, then I would not attend.
2. I could not attend Even Start if childcare weren't provided.
3. If I had to pay to come to Even Start, then I would not be able to attend.

As with *situational* assistors, the response most chosen for *institutional* assistors was *strongly agree* except for one assistor, location of the Even Start Program; for this assistor, the most selected response was disagree (73 out of 266 total responses). The *institutional* assistor that was most selected addressed the provision of early childhood

education. Two hundred twenty-one of the 266 (83.1%) who responded and selected a response other than *does not apply* stated that they *strongly agree* or *agree* that having early childhood education provided at no cost allowed them to attend. The women said that they had no one else whom they trusted nor could they afford to pay to care for their children. They added that having early childhood education as part of Even Start allowed them to focus on their studies. Several of their responses were:

- If there were no assistance, then I would no be able to study well.
- ...since I do not have to pay [for child care], I believe it helps my husband to support my attending.
- I am not confident with someone else caring for my children...

Similarly, 195 out of the 266 (73.3%) responders to the statement “If I had to pay to come to Even Start, then I would not be able to attend” selected *strongly agree* and *agree*. However, when the free responses were analyzed, two themes emerged. One group of women did state that they could not afford to pay tuition in order to attend Even Start. The other group stated that they might be able to afford tuition, depending upon the cost. Statements from both groups include:

- Yes, because sometimes I have no money; we have many bills.
- I could attend if the cost was low.
- I would not be able to because only my husband works and there are 5 in our family.
- I’d pay if I had to; ...I feel blest (sic). This program helped me [to get] back on my feet.

The responses to the data revealed that having Even Start near the participants' homes was the least selected *institutional* assistor. One hundred sixteen women (48.5%) either *disagree[d]* or *strongly disagree[d]* that Even Start's nearby location was an assistor as opposed to the 123 women (51.5%) who *agree[d]* and *strongly agree[d]*.

Here are a few of the mixed responses:

- I disagree because if the program were farther away; I would still attend; it is great help for my learning.
- It would be a little bit difficult [to attend if Even Start were not near my house].
- The distance is not important to me; I only wish to do better for my family and for me.
- [I strongly agree] because I do not have a vehicle accessible to me.

Further frequency response data regarding institutional assistors are listed in Table 4 and may also be found in Appendix D.

Assistor	n	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
ECE provided	266	172	79	16	12
No cost of ES	266	113	82	43	14
Program location	239	66	57	73	43

Question 3. According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what dispositional assistors promote their continual participation? Attitudes and behaviors identified as *dispositional* assistors were those that the factor analysis grouped. Through these experiences, the students' beliefs regarding the importance of increasing their educational knowledge and skills, and their ability to succeed and to recognize how Even Start has influenced changes in their own and their families' lives were examined. Five statements from the questionnaire were coded as *dispositional* assistors:

1. The opportunity to learn new things helps me to remain in the program.
2. Even Start helps me make better decisions for myself.
3. The teachers support me.
4. I have always enjoyed going to school.
5. The times that the classes are offered allows me to attend.

The *dispositional* assistor that received the most responses of *strongly agree* and *agree* was the one that addressed how the opportunity to learn new things promoted retention. Of the 267 responses that were applicable to the statement, 223 (83.5%) were *strongly agree* and 40 (15.0%) were *agree*. These two choices captured 98.5% of the total applicable responses for the statement. In stating their reasons for these choices, the women explained how their academic growth has increased not only their self-esteem but also their knowledge regarding the growth and development of their children. Five of the participants shared these statements:

- Learning new things keeps me excited about life.

- Each time that we discuss new things, I learn more, and am motivated not to leave.
- I [think] more positive than negative.
- I am learning English and...more about the growth and education of my child.
- I learn about my children's feelings, how to take to my children, and to do things together.

In addressing whether the 263 responding participants felt that Even Start has allowed them to make better personal decisions, 262 (99.6%) *strongly agreed* and *agreed*; the remaining response was *disagree* (0.4%). One woman shared that Even Start "...has taught us that we have many options" and a second one expressed "...it has helped me to understand how to correct my errors, faults". The participants felt that in making better decisions for themselves, they have grown in their roles as students, mothers, and women. Two hundred sixty-two women [of the 265 (98.9%) who responded and to whom the assistor was applicable] also *strongly agreed* and *agreed* that the times that the classes were offered allowed them to attend. Even Start's schedule allowed them time to study, attend conferences and activities involving their children, and complete household chores. Likewise, the participants responded as *strongly agree[ing]* and *agree[ing]* for the two remaining *dispositional* assistors at a rate of 90.3% or higher: teacher support - 97.3%; always enjoyed school - 95.8%.

The women recognized and valued how the teachers assisted their learning and their children's learning. "They are important to me and my daughter; the great support that they give is not only for us, but also for our children" were 2 of the sentiments that the

women shared. One participant gave an example of how Even Start teachers helped her to help her son: “My son was having a hard time adjusting to new people. His teacher suggested going to parks and let him play with other children.” A summary of the frequency responses for the *dispositional assistors* may be found in Table 5. For a complete listing of all frequency responses regarding *dispositional* assistors, refer to Appendix D.

Assistor	n	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Learn new things	264	223	40	3	1
Better personal decisions	263	176	86	1	0
Class scheduling	265	198	64	3	1
Teacher support	263	187	69	4	3
Always enjoyed school	263	179	73	8	3

Question 4. Compared to students who are 22 years old and older, what are the perspectives of 18 to 21 year olds with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start? In order to examine the perspectives of the participants based upon their ages, two age categories were created: (a) 18 to 21 year olds, and (b) 22 year olds and older. These categories were created based upon reviewing postings to an electronic mailing list of Texas Even

Start Family Literacy Coordinators (V. Hoffman, personal communication, July 12, 2000) for a period of two years. Numerous messages posted and discussed related to how Even Start Program Staff have effectively addressed the needs of the increasing number of participants who are 21 years old and younger. Even though there are participants who are younger than 18 who are enrolled in Even Start, the researcher, for the sake of statistical analysis, established the minimum age of enrollees to be 18. This is the age that much of society recognizes and labels an individual as an adult. The statistical measures of Chi-Square (χ^2) and GLM ANOVA were used to analyze participants' responses according to the factor of age.

There were a total of 225 respondents who were 18 years of age and older; 39 participants did not respond and 6 were younger than 18 years. Seventeen women were between the ages of 18 to 21 leaving the number who were 22 years and older at 208. In examining the 18 to 21 year old participants' frequency responses, the Chi-Square statistical analysis was found to be statistically significant: $\chi^2(1, n = 225) = 162.14, p = .000$. This statistical significance was matched with that of the responses of the 22 years old and older participants. When the Chi-Square test was used to analyze the 22 years old and older participants' frequency responses, $\chi^2(1, n = 231) = 148.16, p = .000$. (See also Appendix F.) Therefore, the importance of situational, institutional, dispositional, parental and program specific assistors in promoting the continuation of 18 to 21 year olds compared to 22 year olds and older is equal. However, when each type of assistors was analyzed according to the factor of age, differences were calculated.

The mean (M) was first calculated for each type of assistor (Table 6); an ANOVA was computed second. For those categories that were found to be statistically significant, a Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F (R-E-G-W F) post-hoc analysis (alpha .01) was performed.

Assistor	M
Situational	8.7630
Institutional	11.4778
Dispositional	23.0444
Parental	12.9889
Specific Program	6.7815

Based upon the ANOVA analysis, three categories of assistors were found to be statistically significant (p) with each having a small effect size (d): parental ($p = .000$; $d = .057$), institutional ($p = .000$; $d = .064$), and situational ($p = .004$; $d = .041$). Power ($1 - \beta$) was also calculated for these analyses. $1 - \beta = .862$ for parental assistors, $.911$ for institutional, and $.687$ for situational. In the post-hoc analysis, the difference between the means for the two levels of age was not found to be statistically significant.

Table 7 provides the ANOVA data for each of the five types of assistors. Appendix G contains all mean, ANOVA, and R-E-G-W F data.

Table 7
ANOVA, Age of Students

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Age	64.908	2	32.454	3.237	.041	.024
Error	2676.559	267	10.025			
Corrected Total	2741.467	269				

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Age	95.079	2	47.540	8.055	.000	.057
Error	1575.888	267	5.902			
Corrected Total	1670.967	269				

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Age	122.953	2	61.476	9.147	.000	.064
Error	1794.414	267	6.721			
Corrected Total	1917.367	269				

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Age	35.889	2	17.945	5.752	.004	.041
Error	832.940	267	3.120			
Corrected Total	868.830	269				

Dependent Variable: Program Specific Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Age	1.018	2	.509	.085	.919	.001
Error	1601.089	267	5.997			
Corrected Total	1602.107	269				

Insight into why these assistors proved to be statistically significant was offered in some of the participants' free responses. "I have more of an insight in my children's school; a greater interest" was one mother's comment in reference to the fact that since being enrolled in Even Start, she participates more at her children's school. One participant stated that having early childhood education offered makes "it ... easier since I am able to concentrate in the classes." In explaining why she chose *strongly agree* when asked if her significant other supported her attending Even Start, one woman shared: "My husband wants me to see myself in a better way; after enrolling, I asked him to help with doing things with the children and to personally help me." All of the free responses regarding the statistically significant assistors of situational, institutional, and parental, when measured according to age, are in Appendix C.

Question 5. Compared to students enrolled in English as Second Language (ESL) classes, what are the perspectives of those students enrolled in Adult Basic Education/General Educational Development (ABE/GED) classes with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start? For the women enrolled in ESL courses, their frequency response rate was statistically significant when analyzed according to Chi-Square: $\chi^2(1, n = 235) = 56.28, p = .000$. When the responses of those women enrolled in ABE/GED were statistically measured using Chi-Square, the measurement was determined to be statistically significant as well: $\chi^2(1, n = 235) = 41.71, p = .000$. Therefore, when compared to ESL students, ABE/GED students find situational, institutional, dispositional, parental, and program specific assistors to be as important.

On using a different statistical measure, ANOVA, the responses of each assistor were analyzed based upon the factor of enrollment status. The results indicated only one of the assistors to be statistically significant when measured according to enrollment status: parental assistors ($p = .000$), with $d = .065$ (small) and $1-\beta = .877$. In the post-hoc analysis, the variation between the means of the two enrollment levels was not statistically significant. Despite this fact, some students candidly elaborated on why they *strongly agreed[d]* that parental assistors enabled their continuous enrollment in Even Start:

- Before I came to Even Start, I did not do learning activities. Now we do their homework and learning activities together. We go to the park, library, and we play games at home;
- I try to stay well-informed of my children's progress; and
- With time, I started speaking more with my son's teachers.

Appendix C contains additional comments that the participants made regarding these assistors and Appendix G has complete ANOVA tables. ANOVA data are in Table 8.

Table 8
ANOVA, Enrollment Status

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Enrollment	18.317	3	6.106	.596	.618	.007
Error	2723.149	266	10.237			
Corrected Total	2741.467	269				

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Enrollment	108.960	3	36.320	6.185	.000	.065
Error	1562.007	266	5.872			
Corrected Total	1670.967	269				

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Enrollment	74.736	3	24.912	3.596	.014	.039
Error	1842.630	266	6.927			
Corrected Total	1917.367	269				

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Enrollment	18.633	3	6.211	1.943	.123	.021
Error	850.197	266	3.196			
Corrected Total	868.830	269				

Dependent Variable: Program Specific Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Enrollment	18.658	3	6.219	1.045	.373	.012
Error	1583.450	266	5.953			
Corrected Total	1602.107	269				

Question 6. Compared to parents with children enrolled in Pre-Kindergarten and higher grades, what are the perspectives of parents with children who are 4 years old and younger with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start? There were two groups of parents whose children were 4 years old and younger: parents of 0 to 3 year olds and parents of 3 to 4 year olds. The parents of both age groups believed that their children had developmentally progressed and were ready for school due to the Even Start Program. A Chi-Square analysis of the parents' responses revealed that for parents of 0 to 3 year olds, $\chi^2(3, n = 179) = 272.87, p = .000$, and for parents of 3 to 4 year olds, $\chi^2(3, n = 134) = 203.51, p = .000$. Based upon ANOVA, there were 4 assistors that were statistically significant for When the frequency responses of parents with children enrolled in PK and higher grades were tested using Chi-Square, the responses tested to be statistically significant as well $\chi^2(3, n = 152) = 136.16, p = .000$. Hence, situational, institutional, dispositional, parental, and program specific assistors are equally important to parents of 0 to 3 year olds and 3 to 4 year olds as well as those with children enrolled in PK and higher grades. For the statistical measure ANOVA, the responses were analyzed for the factor of child(ren)'s age(s).

ANOVA calculations identified only one type of assistor as statistically significant: parental assistors ($p = .000, d = .075, 1 - \beta = .932$). The results of the R-E-G-W F post hoc test revealed no significant difference between the levels of children's ages. While Appendix G provides complete ANOVA tables for these groups of parents, lists of ANOVA data are in Table 9 as well.

Table 9
ANOVA, Child(ren)'s Age(s)

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Child Age	108.481	3	36.160	3.653	.013	.04
Error	2632.985	266	9.898			
Corrected Total	2741.467	269				

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Child Age	125.570	3	41.857	7.205	.000	.075
Error	1545.397	266	5.810			
Corrected Total	1670.967	269				

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Child Age	66.073	3	22.024	3.165	.025	.034
Error	1581.293	266	6.960			
Corrected Total	1917.367	269				

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Child Age	7.001	3	2.334	.720	.541	.008
Error	861.828	266	3.240			
Corrected Total	868.830	269				

Dependent Variable: Program Specific Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Child Age	45.311	3	15.104	2.581	.054	.028
Error	1556.797	266	5.853			
Corrected Total	1602.107	269				

Question 7. Do participants in rural, urban, and metropolitan locations differ in their perceptions of the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start Programs? Chi-Square analysis revealed that when the participants' responses were analyzed according to the factor of location, $\chi^2(2, n = 270) = 94.47, p = .000$. Therefore, location appears to be a significant factor when examining situational, institutional, dispositional, parental, and program specific assistors. ANOVA analysis showed that when location was an independent factor, none of the assistors were statistically significant. (Table 10 and Appendix G).

Now that all statistical *a priori* data analysis has been conducted and presented along with each research question to which it pertains, a summary of the data is now necessary.

Table 10
ANOVA, Location

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Location	7.397	2	3.698	.361	.697	.003
Error	2734.070	267	10.240			
Corrected Total	2741.467	269				

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Location	.777	2	.388	.062	.940	.000
Error	1670.190	267	6.255			
Corrected Total	1670.967	269				

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Location	5.323	2	2.661	.372	.690	.003
Error	1912.044	267	7.161			
Corrected Total	1917.367	269				

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Location	13.362	2	6.681	2.085	.126	.015
Error	855.468	267	3.204			
Corrected Total	868.830	269				

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Effect Size
Location	17.876	2	8.938	1.506	.224	.011
Error	1584.231	267	5.933			
Corrected Total	1602.107	269				

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

There is a need for research regarding women and literacy in the U.S. (Quigley, 1997), particularly women in Even Start Family Literacy Programs located in the State of Texas (D. F. Seaman, personal communication, April 27, 2001). According to data from the U.S. Department of Education (1998), approximately 40% of the families enrolled in Even Start are not enrolled for a second program year. Even Start Program Directors in Texas have expressed concern regarding the low retention of families in their programs (R. M. Chahin, personal communication, October 31, 2001; A. P. Hitchcock, personal communication, November 27, 2001). Therefore, in response to the question of how to retain families in Even Start Programs in the State of Texas, this research was conducted using the following seven questions as guidance.

- According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what situational assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start?
- According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what institutional assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start?
- According to the perspective of Texas women enrolled in the Even Start Family Literacy Program, what dispositional assistors promote their continual participation in Even Start?

- Compared to students who are 22 years old and older, what are the perspectives of 18 to 21 year olds with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start?
- Compared to students enrolled in English as Second Language (ESL) classes, what are the perspectives of those students enrolled in Adult Basic Education/General Educational Development (ABE/GED) classes with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start?
- Compared to parents with children enrolled in Pre-Kindergarten and higher grades, what are the perspectives of parents with children who are 4 years old and younger with regard to the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start?
- Do participants in rural, urban, and metropolitan locations differ in their perceptions of the situational, institutional, and dispositional assistors that promote their continual participation in Even Start Programs?

In order to ascertain which assistors were most effective in retaining women for a second program year or longer, a questionnaire was developed based upon the findings of Cross (1981), Quigley (1997), and Perry (2002). Cross and Quigley reported findings regarding three types of barriers that prevent adults from continuing enrollment in adult education programs: situational, institutional, and dispositional. Perry discovered events and experiences that both support and hinder women from continuing enrollment in Even Start programs. Taking the findings of Perry and reversing the barriers presented

in Cross and Quigley, a questionnaire containing statements and space for free-responses regarding what assistors have allowed the women to continue enrollment was created first in English and then translated into Spanish. Demographic data regarding the participant's age, enrollment level, and age of children were included as well on the questionnaire.

An estimated average of 10 adults per Even Start program was the first calculation used to determine how many people were in the study's targeted population (D. F. Seaman, personal communication, September 19, 2002). According to the Texas Center for Adult Literacy and Learning's web site, there were 86 Texas Even Start Programs in the 2001-2002 Program Year. Therefore, approximately 860 persons were enrolled in Even Start during 2001-2002 and according to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a sample size of 269 is sufficient when a population numbers 900. To reach the intended sample, a random sample of 33 Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs was drawn.

The program directors of these 33 programs were contacted via telephone to invite them to participate in the study. Twenty-six programs initially agreed to participate; 618 questionnaires were mailed along with a postage-paid return envelope. Twenty-four programs returned 330 questionnaires, 270 of which met the enrollment requirement of being in the program one year or longer. Obtaining these questionnaires involved as many as four follow-up contacts with four program directors. Once the questionnaires were obtained, the data were entered into SPSS™ and then quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed.

Using the statistical software SPSS™, a template was created and the quantitative data from the questionnaires were entered. These data were subjected to the statistical tests of factor analysis, frequency response, Chi-Square, and ANOVA (Appendix D, E, F, and G). The *a priori* alpha level for Chi-Square was .05; for ANOVA, .01. The free response comments (Appendix C) from the questionnaire were coded, categorized, and then summarized. Both the quantitative and qualitative data provided the following major findings of this study:

- The support of a significant other or partner is the situational assistor that greatly promotes the continuous enrollment of the women in Even Start. Family support (parents and siblings) was the other situational assistor.
- Institutional assistors that promote Even Start retention are early childhood education, no cost of Even Start, and program location.
- Dispositional assistors promoting continuous enrollment include learning new things, making better personal decisions, having teacher support, enjoying school, and having convenient class schedules. .
- Parental assistors that promote continuous participation in Even Start are having other parents enrolled, assisting children more with their learning and homework, and participating more at children's school.
- Specific program assistors that help women to remain enrolled in Even Start are providing transportation and having a summer program.
- The ability to make better personal decisions is most vital in participants' remaining in the program. New learning helps them to discover what options are

available when decisions regarding their lives and the lives of their families, i.e. their children, must be made. Having a sense of choices promotes the feeling of empowerment and empowerment promotes self-confidence, which in turn enables a woman to remain in Even Start until she has obtained her goals.

- Class schedules, ability to assist more with children's learning/homework, learning new things, and teacher support are the four assistors that complete the list of the top 5 assistors (of those 15 that were factored into the categories) that help women continue in Even Start.
- Two assistors did not factor into any of the 5 categories: parenting class and improving job skills.
- Even though the assistor parenting class is not categorized as part of the 5 categories of assistors, the participants feel extremely strong about this supporter (Appendix E).
- The participants do feel that increasing their job skills is important. Acquiring a job at the present time is not as important as completing their academic goals, e.g. understanding English and/or obtaining a GED.
- According to the factor of student age, institutional, parental, and situational assistors are statistically significant in promoting the continuous enrollment of the participants.
- The group of assistors that tested statistically significant when analyzed according to the factor of enrollment status is parental assistors.

- Parental assistors was also the only group to be found statistically significant when measured for the factor of child(ren)'s age(s).
- Location, as a factor, is not statistically significant when analyzed according to ANOVA. The free responses about program location revealed that the women are of two groups: those who felt that having the program located near their homes was important and those who felt that having the program located near their homes was not important.
- Parental assistors, as a category, are the main supporters of retention in Even Start. Most of the *strongly agree* responses as well as the ANOVA statistically significant measures are matched to parental assistors.
- Both institutional and situational assistors measured statistically significant for factor: age of students.
- Dispositional and specific program assistors did not measure statistically significant for any of the factors.
- The effect size for all statistically significant measures was small.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based upon the findings of this research study.

1. Ascertaining an accurate number of Texas Even Start participants who have been enrolled for one program year or longer is challenging. In contacting Even Start Program Directors and requesting the number of participants who have been enrolled for a period of one program year or longer, a realization emerged: to maintain accurate numbers of these participants is difficult. The difficulty is partially due to the fact that

program participants are quite transient; they may be enrolled today and not enrolled tomorrow (J. Lopez, personal communication, February 21, 2003).

2. Obtaining responses from women enrolled in Even Start for one program year or longer is difficult. In order to ask women to participate in the study, the researcher had to first receive the consent of the program director. Due to lack of staff, numerous job duties, and unexpected events, several program directors did not respond or respectfully declined participation in this particular research study (V. Miller, personal communication, January 27, 2003; K. Miller-Chaney, personal communication, March 24, 2003). For those attending programs that did participate, attendance was an obstacle. Many women were excessively absent due to personal or family illness (K. Miller, personal communication, March 17, 2003; S. Robinson, personal communication, March 24, 2003). Surveying the participants during the winter months, i.e. flu season, is not an easy feat. Other participants were not eager to participate since they had recently participated in similar research and simply did not want to complete another questionnaire (B. Macias, personal communication, May 13, 2003). Factors such as these greatly impacted the questionnaire response rates (Table 1, p. 37).

3. Parental assistors are the most supportive for women continuing enrollment in Texas Even Start Programs. Parental assistors are those that are connected with the most demanding role in the participants' lives: their role as parents. Once the participants are able to witness the academic and social development of their children as a result of their participating in Even Start, then they are motivated to continue for the sake of their children. This is why these assistors were found to be statistically significant more often

than other assistors. In summarizing the free response comments regarding the parental assistors (Appendix C), the women realize that as they interact with other parents, they find support and also learn practical parenting techniques. The mothers became more involved with their children's learning as they helped more with homework and participated more in parent-teacher conferences and school events. Being able to be more knowledgeable about and active in their children's development is extremely important to the mothers.

4. Situational assistors are important in promoting the retention of women in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs. Of the five assistor categories, situational assistors were found to be significant when measured according to the age of the participants. This is perhaps due to the nature of situational assistors. Situational assistors' value and importance is not static; the circumstances of people's lives frequently change. As the structure and content of the lives of the women's significant others and family members change, the level of support that these two groups offer may change as well. The changes in the women themselves often bring about a change in the dynamics of their relationships with their significant others and other family members.

5. Institutional assistors play a role in retaining women in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs. Institutional assistors are those that are provided through the system of Texas Even Start Programs; the participants are not able to readily change these assistors. Despite this condition, the participants chose this group of assistors to be influential in their continuing enrollment. The convenience of having early childhood

education provided along with the ability to attend Even Start without having to pay tuition is key in sustaining enrollment of the families.

6. Dispositional assistors play a non-statistically significant role in retaining women in Texas Even Start Programs. Dispositional assistors are those assistors that are experientially-based. As the women continue enrollment in the program, they are able to reflect on whether their lives and their children's lives have positively changed. Based upon the responses of these 270 participants, the experiences gained due to Even Start have promoted positive changes in their personal lives and their children's lives. According to their free responses (Appendix C), the women realized that as they learned to make better personal decisions, their decisions and actions regarding their children changed as well. Over half of the participants stated that they have always enjoyed school (Appendix D), and having this prior experience has influenced their being able to reflect on how the Even Start Program has changed their lives.

7. Specific program assistors support the retaining women in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs. Providing transportation to program members is a nice component for an Even Start to have, but it is not crucial in convincing a woman to remain the program. Most respondents indicated that this assistor did not apply to them. The women either owned their own transportation or had secured another means of transportation, e.g. walking or carpooling. The respondents did indicate that having Even Start near their homes helped them but successfully completing their education goals and witnessing the academic and social development of their children are the reasons why they often travel far and overcome transportation obstacles to attend.

8. Improving job skills is not effective as either a recruiting or a retention factor in Even Start. Factor analysis did not place improving job skills into any of the 5 categories of assistors. A summary of the free responses reveals that the women did recognize that the academic, language, and computational skills they have acquired will enable them to get “good job[s]”, but in the future. At the moment, most are focused on completing their educational goals. For a few participants, however, they did indicate that the skills and knowledge in Even Start have helped them in their current workplace (Appendix C).

9. Parenting class is vital in changing the families’ lives. Even though parenting class did not factor into any of the 5 categories of assistors, the mothers expressed their strong opinion that this class has promoted positive changes in their roles as parents. They are able to more calmly, logically, and lovingly teach, support, and discipline their children thereby promoting a more supportive environment within their homes.

Recommendations

Recommendations for research. The following recommendations are made in regard to conducting future research of this nature.

- Acquire data at a time other than the first half of the spring semester. Many participants who were eligible to participate, based upon the number of requested questionnaires, did not complete a questionnaire due to absence. The greatest factor affecting this was that the questionnaire was disseminated in the spring semester, which includes the winter and flu seasons.

- Contact program directors on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday.

Because many adult education providers do not offer classes on Fridays, many programs do not schedule adult education or early childhood education lessons on Fridays. Therefore, the directors are often in meetings and professional development sessions or attending conferences.

- Replicate the study for a population that includes women who exited Texas Even Start Programs after having reached their educational goals. This study limited

the population to those who are currently enrolled for a second program year or more. The participants are planning to remain in the program until they have accomplished their goals; however, there is no guarantee that they will.

Therefore, replacing this population with those who have exited Even Start will offer perhaps a different insight as to what enabled them to remain enrolled until they reached their educational goals.

- Replicate the study on a national level. The findings of this study may or may not be unique to the State of Texas. Having data drawn from a national sample of ethnically-diverse Even Start participants that focuses upon assistors will be valuable to many audiences. Even Start professionals, family literacy professionals, and state as well as federal legislators are all interested in quantitative evidence of the value of Even Start.

Recommendations for practice. With regard to operating an Even Start Program, the recommendations from this research study are:

- Even Start Programs should focus on the parenting aspects of the program and the parents' lives. The results of this study show that assistors which affect the participants' lives as parents are most important. Allowing parents to establish camaraderie with one another and to exchange experiences builds both friendships and the number of practical parenting techniques that the parents can use in their daily lives. Assisting them to acquire more academic knowledge, skills, and abilities increases their self-confidence and level of involvement in their children's cognitive development.
- Even Start Program Staff should continuously monitor their program's institutional assistors. According to this study's findings, institutional assistors are important. Providing quality early childhood education not only fosters cognitive and social development in children, but also fosters the parents' belief in the capabilities of their children. Some parents do not believe that their children are capable of learning at great heights until they witness their children learning and achieving success at high academic levels. Many of the families do not have the financial resources to provide quality care for their children and to attend ESL, ABE, or GED classes. Offering these services to them at no cost provides them with an immeasurable opportunity.
- Even Start Programs need to consider situational assistors. Based upon the findings of this study, the situational assistors - the support of

significant others or partners and of family members - is a factor the women continuing their enrollment in the Even Start Program. The support that the participants receive must be from a variety of sources. If the women receive support only from the staff and other parents of Even Start, then their continuing in the program is extremely difficult. Having persons who are part of their households and have been a part of their lives for many years support their involvement is a great need.

Recognizing the influence of these assistors as well as welcoming and including the significant others, partners, and/or family members in program events may prove to be a successful tool in retaining the women.

- Even Start Program staff should assist participants in frequent review of the progress toward their (participants') goals. Based upon this research, dispositional assistors matter to participants even though they are not statistically significant. To promote continuous enrollment in Even Start, program staff should periodically, e.g. quarterly, assist each participant as she reviews her progress in obtaining her educational goals. Helping a mother to see how her life and her children's lives have benefited from the Even Start Program will influence her to seek and create solutions to any obstacles that may be inhibiting her continuation in the program.
- Even Start Programs need to offer quality summer programs. Specific program assistors are to be considered even though they measured as non-statistically significant. The free responses indicated that having a

summer program was extremely important to the participant's personal academic development as well as that of their children. Some programs lessen the intensity of services during the summer thinking that many of the participants will not attend. Qualitative data from this research warrants greater examination of this assumption as well as of the assumption that transportation is a solvable problem. For some of the women, transportation is a major inhibitor in continuing their enrollment. For those who said they had considered leaving Even Start, lack of transportation ranked as the second highest reason. Not having transportation was also cited as the reason why others have not been able to maintain enrollment in Even Start. Obviously, providing quality summer programs and transportation is important, just not statistically significant.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. C., Cervero, R. M., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2001, August). Black women in nursing completion programs: Issues affecting participation. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 51 (4), 306-321.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Belzer, A. (1998, March). Stopping out, not dropping out. *Focus on Basics*, 2(A), 15-17.
- Bombach, K. (2001, December 11). Re: Barriers to family literacy [Msg 503]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0849.html>
- Care, W. D., & Udod, S. A. (2000, Spring). Women in distance education: Overcoming barriers to learning. *New Horizons in Adult Education*, 14 (2), 4-12. Retrieved October 31, 2001, from <http://www.nova.edu/~aed/horizons/vol14n2.html>
- Carney-Crompton, S., & Tan, J. (2002, February). Support systems, psychological functioning, and academic performance of nontraditional female students. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 52(2), 140-154.
- Carpenter, L. (2001, December 10). Re: Barriers to family literacy [Msg 476]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0822.html>
- Cline, C. (2001, December 7). Re: Barriers to family literacy [Msg 449]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0795.html>

- Comings, J., & Cuban, S. (2000, August). *So I made up my mind: Introducing a study of adult learner persistence in library literacy programs*. Pleasantville, NY: DeWitt Wallace/Reader's Digest Fund. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED446772)
- Comings, J., Parrella, A., & Soricone, L. (2000, March). Helping adults persist: Four supports. *Focus on Basics*, 4(A), 1, 3-7.
- Comings, J. P., Cuban, S., Bos, J. M., & Taylor, C. J. (2001, September). *"I did it for myself": Studying efforts to increase adult learner persistence in library literacy programs* (Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation). Retrieved December 18, 2002, from <http://mdrc.org/Reports2001/LibraryLiteracy/IDiditforMyself.pdf>
- Comings, J. P., Parrella, A., & Soricone, L. (1999, December). *Persistence among adult basic education students in pre-GED classes* (NCSALL Report #12). Cambridge, MA: The National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 437579)
- Corley, M. A. (2001, May 17). Response from Allan Quigley to recent postings on resistance [Msg 1453]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-womenlit/2001/0338.html>
- Cross, K. P. (1981). *Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dini, L. (2001, December 8). Re: Barriers to family literacy [Msg 470]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0816.html>

- Donaldson, J. F., & Graham, S. (1999, November). A model of college outcomes for adults. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 50 (1), 24-40.
- Drake, K. (1999, September). How adults learn [Summary of the conference]. In R. Riley (Secy.), *How adults learn: A conference held April 6-8, 1998*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.
- Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy (2000). *Mission*. Retrieved January 10, 2003, from <http://www.ed.psu.edu/goodlinginstitute/main.asp>
- Greenberg, D. (2002, February 24). Re: Families and family literacy [Msg 2054]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-womenlit/2002/0206.html>
- Hayes, E., Flannery, D. D., Brooks, A. K., Hugo, J., & Tisdell, E. (2000). *Women as learners: The significance of gender in adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Hendrick, M. (2002, June 21). RE: retention rate [Msg 1193]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2002/0616.html>
- Isaac, E. P., Guy, T., & Valentine, T. (2001, November). Understanding African American learners' motivations to learn in church-based adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 52(1), 23-38.
- Jenkins, L. B., & Kirsch, I. S. (1994). *Adult literacy in Texas (Results of the state adult literacy survey)*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.

- Milton, M. J. (1999, February). Perceptions about women's nonparticipation in workplace literacy courses. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 42 (5). Retrieved December 17, 2002, from Academic Search Premier Database.
- Moorish, E. (2002, February). Reflections on the women, violence, and adult education Project. *Focus on Basics*, 5(C), 15-20.
- National Center for Family Literacy. (n.d.). *What is family literacy?* Retrieved September 8, 2002, from http://verizon.ask.com/verizon/Followup.asp?ask=What+is+family+literacy%3F&origin=1&qSource=0&snapshot=vzrd&vPartner=NCFL&strCategory=NCFL&aj_ques=snapshot%3Dvzrd%26kbid%3D763644&aj_logid=3AAD9BEB0D4C7B4E9947061D39541282&aj_rank=1&aj_score=40.01&Ask.x=11&Ask.y=7
- Neuman, S. B., Caperelli, B. J., & Kee, C. (1998, November). Literacy learning, a family matter. *The Reading Teacher*, 52 (3), 244-252.
- Padak, N., Sapin, C., & Baycich, D. *A decade of family literacy: Programs, outcomes, and future prospects* (Information Series No. 389). Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED990013)
- Perry, Y. D. (2002). *Las experiencias de Even Start de Tejas: Como la madre, como la persona, y como la mujer (Texas Even Start experiences: As a mother, as a person, and as a woman)*. Manuscript in preparation, Texas A&M University at College Station.

- Peyton, T. (2002, December 17). Even Start funding [Msg 1350]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2002/0773.html>
- Peyton, T. (2003, February 13). Great news for Even Start [Msg 1402]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2003/0046.html>
- Potts, M. (2001, December 7). Re: Barriers (learning on one's own) [Msg 448]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0794.html>
- Purcell-Gates, V., Degener, S., Jacobson, E. & Soler, M. (2000, November). *Affecting change in literacy practices of adult learners: Impact of two dimensions of instruction* (NCSALL Report #17). Cambridge, MA: The National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.
- Quigley, B. A. (1987). Learning to work with them: Analyzing nonparticipation in adult basic education through resistance theory. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, 11(2), 63-71.
- Quigley, B. A. (1990). Hidden logic: Reproduction and resistance in adult literacy and adult basic education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 40(2), 103-115.
- Quigley, B. A. (1992). Looking back in anger: The influences of schooling on illiterate adults. *Journal of Education*, 174(1), 104-121.
- Quigley, B. A. (1997). Rethinking literacy education: The critical need for practice-based change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Quigley, B. A. (1998, March). The first three weeks: A critical time for motivation. *Focus on Basics*, 2(A), 6-11.

- Rainwater, S. (2001, December 11). Re: Barriers to family literacy [Msg 500]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0846.html>
- Reder, S., & Strawn, C. (2001, April). The K-12 school experiences of high school dropouts. *Focus on Basics*, 4(D), 13-15.
- Rodriguez-Brown, F. V., Li, R. F., & Albom, J. B. (1999, November). Hispanic parents' awareness and use of literacy-rich environments at home and in the community. *Education and Urban Society*, 32 (1), 41-58.
- Rubin, B. (2001a, December 6). Re: Barriers to family literacy [Msg 445]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0791.html>
- Rubin, B. (2001b, December 6). Re: Barriers to family literacy [Msg 446]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0792.html>
- Sledd, N. (2001, September 4). Fw: Literacy month article [Msg 224]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0569.html>
- Smith, T. (2001, December 6). Barriers to family literacy [Msg 443]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2001/0789.html>
- Spatz, C. (2001). *Basic statistics: Tales of distribution* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Stalker, J. (2001, August). Misogyny, women, and obstacles to tertiary education: A vile situation. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 51 (4), 288-305.
- Texas Center for Adult Literacy and Learning (2002). *Texas Even Start Programs 2001-2002*. Retrieved May 16, 2002, from Texas A&M University, Texas Center for Adult Literacy and Learning Web site: <http://www-tcall.tamu.edu/>

- Tice, C. J. (2000). Enhancing family literacy through collaboration. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(2), 138-145.
- United States Census Bureau. (n.d.). *Glossary*. Retrieved September 23, 2002, from <http://factfinder.census.gov>
- United States Department of Education. (1998). *Even Start: Evidence from the past and a look to the future*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Planning, and Evaluation Service.
- United States Department of Education. (2002, March 26). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved September 8, 2002, from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/beginning.html#sec6>
- United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002, November). *Short-term enrollment in postsecondary education: Student background and institutional differences in reasons for early departure, 1996-98* (NCES 2003-153). Retrieved January 13, 2003, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003153>
- Wat, A. (2002, June 21). Retention rate [Msg 1192]. Message posted to <http://www.nifl.gov/nifl-family/2002/0615.html>
- Willard, A. (1998, March). Staying in a literacy program. *Focus on Basics*, 2(A), 13-15.
- Yaffe, D., & Williams, C. L. (1998, September). Why women chose to participate in a family literacy program and factors that contributed to the program's success. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 42(1), 8-18.

Young, E. & Padilla, M. (1990, February). Mujeres Unidas en Accion: A popular education process. *Harvard Educational Review*, 60 (1), 1-18.

APPENDIX A
IRB INFORMATION SHEET AND QUESTIONNAIRE

INFORMATION SHEET FOR TEXAS EVEN START PARTICIPANTS

ASSISTORS TO CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT IN TEXAS EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS: THE VOICE OF TEXAS WOMEN PARTICIPANTS

You have been informed by Yvette Dunn Perry, Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development, College of Education, Texas A & M University, that you have been selected to participate in a survey regarding the reasons why you continue enrollment in the Even Start Program beyond one year. You will be one of approximately 269 persons participating in this study.

1. You understand that you will be asked to complete a questionnaire. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer.
2. You are aware that this information is for research purposes and may be available to the general public in the form of conference presentations, journal or newspaper articles. You will not be personally identified in any reports.
3. You are free to ask for clarification on any question.
4. You are free to withdraw from the research project at any time.
5. You have been assured that steps will be taken to ensure the anonymity of your responses.

You understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects in Research, Texas A & M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, you can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067.

You have read and understand the explanation provided to you. You have had all your questions answered to your satisfaction, and you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

You have been given a copy of this information sheet.

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date Signed

Contact Information:

Yvette Dunn Perry, Principal Investigator
703 Brushy Glen Drive
Houston, TX 77073-5466
(832) 215-3057

Don F. Seaman, Advisor
EAHR - College of Education
Texas A & M University
4226 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-4226
(979) 845-5472

Assistors to Continuing Enrollment in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs: The Voice of Texas Women Participants

Directions: This questionnaire has been created to learn why you have continued being a part of the Even Start Program for more than one year. Please read each sentence and then place an "x" in the oval that best describes whether or not you agree with the sentence. If a sentence does not describe you or describe your Even Start Program, then put an "x" in the oval next to "does not apply." On the lines following the word 'Comment,' please write why you chose the oval that you did.

1. The parenting class helps me make better decisions for my child or my children.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

2. My significant other or partner supports me coming to Even Start.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

3. If Even Start weren't near my house, then I would not attend.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

4. I could not attend Even Start if childcare weren't provided.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

5. The opportunity to learn new things helps me to remain in the program.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

6. Even Start helps me make better decisions for myself.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

7. The transportation that Even Start provides helps me because I don't have any other way to get here.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

8. The teachers support me.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

9. I have always enjoyed going to school.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

10. The times that the classes are offered allows me to attend.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

11. Having other parents in the program encourages my attendance.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

12. Even Start has enabled me to help my child or children more with homework/learning activities.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

13. Since my enrollment in Even Start, I participate more at my child's school.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

14. If I had to pay to come to Even Start, then I would not be able to attend.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

15. My family (parents, brothers, sisters) supports my coming to Even Start.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

16. Being able to come to Even Start in the summer is important to me.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

17. What I have learned in Even Start has prepared me for getting a job or for getting a better job.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Comment: _____

If you have a child less than 3 years old, then respond to this question:

I see progress in my child or children because he/she/they have been a part of Even Start.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

If you have a child 3 or 4 years old, then respond to this question:

I feel that my child is more ready to go to Pre-K or Kindergarten because of Even Start.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

If you have a child who is in Pre-K, Kindergarten, or older, then respond to this question:

I feel that my child is successful in school because of Even Start.

Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Does Not Apply

Have you ever thought of leaving Even Start? ___Yes* _____No

If you answered "yes", then were any of these factors a reason or reasons why? You may select more than one factor.

- _____ lack of family support
- _____ the times that classes were offered
- _____ poor health
- _____ no transportation
- _____ fear of failing
- _____ the way the teacher taught
- _____ needed money to pay bills
- _____ too many papers to be completed for registration
- _____ not enough time to study and to do assignments
- _____ the attendance policy
- _____ pregnancy
- _____ no one helped me when I was having trouble understanding in class

Are there any other things that help you to attend classes here at Even Start that are not listed on this questionnaire? If so, then please write them here.

Are there any other things that are not listed on this questionnaire that may stop you from attending classes here at Even Start? If so, then please write them here.

Do you know someone who has stopped attending classes at Even Start?
_____Yes _____No

Did that person tell you why they stopped coming to Even Start?
_____Yes* _____No

*If she or he did, then please write their reason below.

How many years have you been coming to Even Start? _____

How old are you? _____

What is your gender? _____Female _____Male

What class are you in? _____ESL _____GED

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Yvette Dunn Perry

703 Brushy Glen Drive

Houston, TX 77073-5466

(832) 215-3057

(Date)

(Even Start Program)

Attn: (Director)

(Street Address)

(City, TX Zip Code)

Dear (Director's First Name)

Thank you for your willingness to assist me in gathering data for my doctoral research. Because of your kindness in allocating program time and effort to this project, your program as well as other Even Start Programs throughout Texas and the United States will benefit from the responses that the participants will provide.

As I stated in our phone conversation, I have enclosed (1) the questionnaires to administer to your program participants who have been enrolled for at least one year and (2) the postage-paid envelope for returning the completed questionnaires to me. Please remind the participants that their responses are to be anonymous; their **names** and **TESPIRS numbers** are **not to be included** on the questionnaire. Once all questionnaires have been collected, the data will be analyzed and reported in my doctoral dissertation. A copy of your specific program's data will be sent to you as well.

You understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects in Research, Texas A & M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, you can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067.

Once again, I express my gratitude to you for assisting me in completing my research. Through our combined efforts, it is my hope that the data these questionnaires will provide will enhance all our efforts as we assist the participants in the Even Start Family Literacy Programs in Texas and in the United States to achieve their goals. If you should have any questions, then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Yvette Dunn Perry

Doctoral Candidate

Department of Educational Administration

and Human Resource Development

Texas A & M University - College Station

APPENDIX C
FREE RESPONSES

Assistors to Continuing Enrollment in Texas Even Start Family Literacy Programs: The Voice of Texas Women Participants

1. The parenting class helps me make better decisions for my child or my children.

Comments: I am better at learning and understanding my children.(2)
 It has helped me to be more patient and to be able to give more attention to understanding them while I am loving (caring) for them.
 Yes, it helps me.(2)
 The classes has helped me to know the way to teach and communicate with my child and how to make decisions with a bit more certainty.
 They have helped me mature as a mother, person, and friend.
 It helps me to be a better mother to my children.
 It has greatly helped me to give more attention and interest in what they're doing and in checking their work.
 They have helped me make decisions about my children and to do things for them.
 It has taught me how to guide me in reacting in difficult moments.
 Sometimes.
 Because I receive good advise, counseling.
 I no longer embarrass him.
 The classes help me understand how to better educate my children.
 The classes help me to react more calmly and how to compare this situation with prior ones.
 Now, I am able to reflect before reacting to my children's errors.
 My child is going through terrible twos right now. This class helps to remind me that he's only human too.
 I am a mother for the first time and in some aspects, I am ignorant. Many things in the classes has helped me understand.
 Because I learned that what I do now, will affect my children later in life.
 Because I am able to give a correct answer for each question depending upon their age.
 Because I learn how to read and work w/them in school.
 Keeps me focused on children's needs.
 The classes help me to have better communication with my adolescent children and to make better decisions.
 It's good for the entire family.
 I believe, with confidence, that I am able to handle any situation in my family; I understand my children more.
 Because they have classes that had been helping me a lot because sometimes, is hard to make decisions with kids.
 To attend the parenting class teaches me new techniques for teaching and motivating my daughter.
 I strongly agree because I am able to help my children with the education and understanding.
 I strongly agree because this is my first child and sometimes I don't know what to do.
 Before being in this program, I did not know how to act in various situations with my children.
 There's valuable information being taught, family issues, community, self-enrichment issues.
 I get along better with my children.
 Yes because it helps me to help my children with their questions, things, and character.

2. My significant other or partner supports me coming to Even Start.

Comments: I understand the language and can help my children.
 My husband helps me. (2)
 Sometimes he helps me, sometimes no because it is a lot of time.
 The way that my husband helps me is by giving me free time during the day because he knows that it is necessary to attend classes.
 He does not like for me to go to many places.
 My husband wants me to see myself in a better way; after enrolling, I asked him to help with doing things with the children and to personally help me.
 He wants me to be a better wife and mother and I want to be a better person.
 He wants me to be a better person, to grow.
 If I did not have my husband's help, then I would have it very hard to attend school.
 He says it a good program.

My husband wants me to learn English and to better myself, that is why I continue to study.
My husband supports me because he wants me to be able to go out and advance in this country.

Does not apply because we are separated.

He helps me to understand and apply what I learn; because of the hours he works, he is not able to attend.

We're separated for the time being so he doesn't agree with me right now. But he feels that our son's education is important.

He tells me that there's no other opportunity like this that's going to help me out.

I don't have any family members near who had help care for my child. Daycare is very expensive.

He knows that is good for the entire family.

Sometimes lacks encouragement.

We have been separated for 2 years.

Sometimes, he cares for my children while I have some time to be with my friends.

I agree because I am a better example, model for my children.

Because I have small children who are now enrolled in (regular) school.

I strongly agree; my husband and I are very happy.

I strongly agree because for the moment, I am not able to work since I have two children who are not going to school and I have no money to pay for childcare.

My husband approves because our daughter is growing intellectually and interacting with the other children is good for her.

Yes, he has decided that the program is good for both our children and me.

I have support from family to come to this program. I'm divorced.

He comments that since I have been going to the program, I have more self-confidence.

Before he did not wish for me to come to school, I came. Now he is supportive.

3. If Even Start weren't near my house, then I would not attend.

Comments:

I do not believe that the bus goes by my house.

If I had a car, then I would be able to come.

It makes it much easier to attend.

Because I do not have a vehicle accessible to me.

It helps so that I can attend because I want to learn English.

If the program was inside the city limits and I had a vehicle, then I would be able to attend. (2)

Yes, because in the other town, there is no assistance.

I would still attend even if it were not near my house.

The program is not near my house and I have no transportation.

If I lived farther away.

I live far away but I come to the program because it interests me.

It would be a little bit difficult.

I've moved since we've been coming here, I would travel through snow to get my son to his school.

I lived in an area that is farther away but I moved to the area so I could continue participating.

I am interested in learning English.

The program has transportation for those who need it.

I have no transportation; I try to attend as much as possible because I am interested in learning. However, sometimes I have to remain home with my children.

Sometimes; I believe that I continue because I feel that I have to for my children.

Possibly no.

The distance is not important to me; I only wish to do better for my family and for me.

I disagree because if the program were farther away, I would still attend; it is great help for my learning.

I disagree because this is a unique program that educates us and accepts us with our children.

Yes, because I have problems with the car.

As long as it's in Houston vicinity, it's ok.

I have the strength, will to continue and to learn.

(strongly disagree) I walk everyday.

4. I could not attend Even Start if childcare weren't provided.

Comments: If there were no assistance, then I would not be able to study well.
 If there were no assistance, then I would not be able to be in Even Start.
 It is much easier since I am able to concentrate in the classes.
 I do not have the money to pay.
 Because I have help with my children, I am able to learn a great deal more.
 I agree; since I do not have to pay, I believe it helps my husband to support my attending.
 Right now, I do not need childcare services.
 It is possible.
 I am person doe's need childcare (sic).
 The childcare allows me to study.
 I have no one to care for my children so I would not be able to attend.
 I am here because I am interested in learning and need childcare for my daughter.
 The program is for the children.
 This program has taught both; my son & I have grown stronger.
 I am not confident with someone else caring for my children if daycare weren't given.
 Because I do not feel comfortable leaving my child. I breastfeed my baby so it is easy for me.
 My older children help with the baby.
 Childcare is the only support that is not necessary for me to attend Even Start.
 Sometimes, no.
 I strongly agree; I am in this program because they offer childcare and I don't have the money to pay for other care.
 Absolutely because my daughters are very small and I have no money to pay for someone else to care for them. I think that this program is fabulous for the parents who are wanting to continue learning and who have small children.
 The safety, well-being of my children is important.
 My child is in kinder(garten).

5. The opportunity to learn new things helps me to remain in the program.

Comments: Even Start has motivated me to continue learning all that I can in the program.
 I am interested to learn how to treat my children in a more correct manner.
 Effectively.
 I am enthusiastic because I believe that it gives me understanding. Before, I did not correctly speak English but each day, I understand new things and try to achieve my personal goals.
 Because I want to learn more each time and the program helps me.
 I understand how to be a better mother.
 It is interesting to learn.
 Since I have been attending this program and participating in different classes, trainings, and practices, it has helped me in different aspects.
 So far the community has become important to us.
 I strongly agree, there's always a great and interesting topic.
 Each time that we discuss new things, I learn more, and am motivated to not leave.
 I learn about my children's feelings, how to take to my children, and to do things together.
 Because I learn more in the program.
 Learning new things keeps me excited about life.
 That is very true.
 We are beginning to understand how much we enjoy learning.
 Because I have learn a lot about our community, new things, programs, & everything.
 It motivates me to be a better parent for my family.
 It has provided me help with my English and with my children.
 I am learning English and I seeing how to learn more about the growth and education of my child.
 Certainly because I see the difference in how to learn and I am also able to help my children and be a better person.
 I thank (sic) more positive than negative.

6. Even Start helps me make better decisions for myself.

Comments: It helps me in all things especially in being a better mother.

Yes, in a certain way before I had a little impression of myself before coming to this program.

That is right; it has taught us that we have many options.

I make better decisions because I want to improve myself and be someone in life.

Yes, because it has helped me to understand how to correct my errors, faults.

It has made me stronger and helped me to be a better mama.

Yes, because it has helped me make better decision for me and my family.

In certain things, yes; but more in decisions regarding school, academics.

In some instances, I now am able to understand the education of children.

My son and I have been a part in each other's lives.

Yes, there are some things that I don't know and in different conversations, I understand and learn more.

For example, I need to take care of myself before I can take care of my children.

Because talking with others helps me.

Let's me stay focused on why I'm trying to obtain my GED.

Now, I can go alone to the clinic and communicate in English; before, I could not go without a translator.

Because we can discuss the problem & they help me & we have people coming over helping us how we can do better with our family, like on parenting classes.

To receive new learnings helps me to increase my self-knowledge.

To learn new teaching methods has motivated me a new set of tools to use at home with the computer.

For me and my children.

Yes, now that I am better able to understand and speak English, I have better opportunities in my job.

It motivates me because I wish to be my daughter's first teacher.

I really do feel better for myself. Before I starting coming to school I was starting to have signs of depression. Now, I feel a lot better of myself.

7. The transportation that Even Start provides helps me because I don't have any other way to get here.

Comments: I am frequently late because of the time it takes with my children at school.
I currently have no transportation.
If there were no transportation, then I would not be able to attend.
Yes, I have no vehicle accessible to me.
Yes, it is a problem for those who have no way to get to class since they do not know how to drive a car.
I have my own transportation.
I have my own way of getting here but it would be a good option for the day that I needed it.
It helps me because I do not live close by.
I live relatively close to the school; I have no problems with transportation.
It would help if there were regular transportation.
I believe that providing transportation is needed.

8. The teachers support me.

Comments: More or less.
I really like the teachers' help.
They have helped me to learn or create other ways that are necessary in studying. (study skills)
They always try to help me.
The Even Start personnel always help and always gives me confidence in everything.
They give us much help.
Without their support and teaching, it would be very difficult to learn.
They help us to be able to go out and understand the language of this country.
The great support that they give is not only for us, but also for our children.
I like the way that the teachers treat me.
I agree with how they help me to understand, teach my child at home.
They are important to me and my daughter.
My son was having a hard time adjusting to new people. His teacher suggested going to parks let him play with other children.
I am very tranquil, peaceful to see my children with their teachers.

They work very hard and I greatly appreciate that.
 The teachers are sincere, supportive to better our educational level, etc.
 If I have a problem with my child, the teacher will give an example how to sort out my problems.
 Excellent
 I could not ask for a more supportive and encouraging lady.
 The teacher is very consistent.
 Yes because if I have a question the teacher would help me & look for a good answer if she doesn't know, the next (day) they (sic) she will
 I strongly agree because the teachers do not explain in Spanish because they want us to learn and understand English.
 Our teachers are excellent.
 Yes, she always takes the necessary time to clarify when a problem, misunderstanding exists.
 They are attentive.
 They are responsible people.
 The teacher support is great. They are interested in you learning.

9. I have always enjoyed going to school.

Comments: Sometimes, I don't have the courage to come.
 I like to come to school; I want to learn English.
 The place here is very pretty, and tranquil and there is much respect.
 Yes, except before there were times when I needed help but did not receive it.
 I like to come to school because I learn new things.
 Yes, I have always.
 Yes, because everyday I learn a new word and that motivates me.
 Is good to attend and meet people.
 I am sure that my child is well cared for.
 Each day we are taught different things, and for me, I like to improve day to day.
 I knew my son was safe. So I had (no) trouble in leaving him @ his school while Mommie went to hers.
 My children learn how to go to school with my example.
 I have different perspectives now that I am in a different culture, I enjoy it.
 It's different now.
 When I was in school, I did not like it because I did not know how to read.
 Because I like to learn more and more.
 Very much
 Because there's nothing you can do sometimes when you don't have your GED, not good works & love to be learning
 I am happy that I am learning and am able to interact with my teacher and friends.
 For sure, I am a better woman and I want a professional career.
 Yes, in reality, I have always enjoyed going to school but until now, I didn't have the opportunity.
 Never to (sic) old to learn- always something to learn.
 As long as there is a teacher there who doesn't have so many students that she doesn't have time to help each student one on one. At Even Start the teachers are able to help each student who needs extra help with a specific lesson.
 I am learning how to understand English and my children are growing intellectually.

10. The times that the classes are offered allows me to attend.

Comments: Yes, because I have time for everything.
 The time for classes is perfect for me. (2)
 It is favorable for me and my child.
 It permits me to learn with my children. It is not important that I understand everything but I do not wish to be in ignorance.
 Because I work.
 That's true.
 I have the entire day available.
 On occasions, it is a bit difficult because we have other appointments with the doctor or dentist.
 I worked and went to school. I still made all the meetings.

Conferences with my children's teachers and doctors appts. etc.
 Because I work during the day.
 Night classes allows me to be able to get my supper out of the way.
 It is good for me that the classes begin much later.
 Yes; I have an older daughter who is in school and this allows me to go to my school.
 Yes; because my husband is the only one who works and there is no one else in my home
 to care for my daughter.
 Yes, in reality the time is very flexible to meet our needs.

11. Having other parents in the program encourages my attendance.

Comments: To be with other parents has helped me learn and understand different things.
 To listen to the different comments, stories have helped me to be more positive.
 Sometimes.
 I am very spirited because within our group there are persons who do not understand
 English and have no job; I like to be able to help a little bit.
 Yes, because we have shared ideas once or twice.
 To talk with the other parents is enjoyable but it is not fundamental.
 It allows me to get to know other people and build friendships.
 Yes because it let's me know I'm not alone.
 We receive mutual help during classes.
 Yes because when I think of all the problems we have, we are able to support one another.
 I enjoy seeing the children interact with there(sic) mothers.
 It has been seeing that other person have situations that are similar to mine.
 Because I feel more comfortable with parents.
 Knowing there are other parents in my shoes helps.
 I disagree because it all depends upon me for my future and not on the other women
 and to be certain.
 Yes, because we come together to share our opinions and learn other things, subjects.
 Yes, because we share ideas about how to teach our children.
 For sure, I like to listen to others' opinions about the education of children.
 Yes because in many occasions, the experiences of the other parents have taught me a
 great deal.
 I understand other cultures and also interact, communicate with more people.
 Some good peers and some not so good.
 Other parents in the program are an encouragement to me because I enjoy nearby people.
 Because we share ideas.

12. Even Start has enabled me to help my child or children more with homework/learning activities.

Comments: Because I am better able to help them. (2)
 Even Start has been the place that allows me to help my children learn, understand.
 Yes, before I was only able to help a little bit; now I like to work with him.
 I do not have much time to participate since I have to depend upon the bus for
 transportation.
 I am able to help talk with him about his day at school.
 Yes, it helps me to teach them how to do their tasks.
 Yes, because I have learn how to better relate to them.
 We read when we're home together.
 Since my child is young, I have learned and realized activities that stimulate his learning.
 Before I came to Even Start, I did not do learning activities. Now we do their homework
 and learning activities together. We go to the park, library, and we play games at
 home.
 I understand more how important my children doing good on homework is.
 Because my children like it.
 Because they explain to me how important it is for parents to be involved in school.
 Yes, it aids me because I always need to be patient and to be motivated to help my children
 with their homework.
 I disagree because they are in classes when I am in classes also.
 Yes, because I was not able to help them at home.
 In my house, we only speak Spanish but my daughter understands a lot of English. This
 program has helped me to understand.
 I am learning how to motivate them in their learning.

13. Since my enrollment in Even Start, I participate more at my child's school.

Comments: I disagree since I am not able to communicate in English with the teachers.
 Yes, he is in school here but I try to speak with his teacher.
 I visit his school more consistently.
 Yes, I think it has been a good program.
 I have always participated in school activities.
 I try to stay well-informed of my children's progress.
 I love being here. My son's education is #1 in my book.
 With time, I started speaking more with my son's teachers.
 I go to lunch with children, parties, and conference.
 Because I care more about them and how they are doing in school.
 I strongly disagree; I do not assist at school.
 I disagree because I always had communication with my son's teacher because it interests me and worries me how he progresses in his education.
 I disagree because I always assisted at the school, before coming to Even Start.
 Before I didn't go because I couldn't understand what they were telling me about my child.
 Yes, because before there were many things that I did not understand.
 I have more of an insight in my children's school; a greater interest.

14. If I had to pay to come to Even Start, then I would not be able to attend.

Comments: Yes, I believe that it should be free, without cost (tuition). (2)
 Yes, because sometimes I have no money; we have many bills.
 Because I have no way to pay for services.
 It depends upon how much it would cost.(2)
 I could attend if the cost was low.
 I disagree because I am working and would be able to pay with great appreciation.
 My child is happy, I am happy, and he is very content in this program.
 I'd pay if I had to. Again I feel blest (sic). This program helped me back on my feet.
 I disagree; When a person truly wants to learn, then to pay is not an important concern.
 I would not be able to because only my husband works and there are 5 in our family.
 I do not have money to pay.
 My children have learned new things and it wouldn't matter if I had to pay since my daughter is getting benefits from school,.

15. My family (parents, brothers, sisters) supports my coming to Even Start.

Comments: To better understand
 Yes, they help me.
 I have no family members near me; just my husband and children.(3)
 Yes, they give me spirit (alientos), strength.
 They help me because they know that some day I will be someone in life.
 They help me by telling me that I am not less (falte) and that I have great courage for learning English.
 Yes, because they tell me that they can see growth in my daughter and in me.
 My parents feel that my son has great manners and is learning to conversate and play well.
 They say there's no other program like this one, and that there should be more opportunities.
 Somewhat at times.
 My father and sisters are happy that I am learning.
 My children and my sister support me.
 My family supporting me so that I do not leave the program is great help.
 They are supportive of my studying.
 Does not apply because I have no family in this country other than my husband and kids.
 To live in this country, I need to know the language.

16. Being able to come to Even Start in the summer is important to me.

Comments: Because I am able to have my children with me.
 Yes, it is important.
 It is important that I practice more and not waste time.

Yes because we learn more things and at home, we do not have many learning games, activities.

I have other children so I couldn't come to the Even Start in summer (sic).

I disagree; there is not transportation for us.

Yes, it is important; since I have older children, it is important for them to make use of all their time.

It is important to go to school.

Sometimes, our adult class are during the evening and we need the program for caring for our children.

The summer was very good because I was not tired, and it passed quickly since my son and I were engaged.

I need to be able to continue in my classes.

I strongly agree because my kids could attend school and learn and enjoy the summer.

Yes because I am able to be with my children.

Because I like to learn in the summer too.

I would like to continue learning during the summer so I don't forget things.

Because there are occasions in which my husband wants to go on vacation and I am not able because of the classes.

I strongly agree; I do not wish to lose time.

It is important only because I have a 7 year old daughter who is not in school and is able to come here.

I strongly agree because I need to obtain better fluency in English.

Being able to come to Even Start at any time is important to me.

It is important to spend time with my family.

17. What I have learned in Even Start has prepared me for getting a job or for getting a better job.

Comments: No, because I cannot get a job since I do not have a GED.

To speak a little bit of English has helped me to get a job.

I will be able to get a job in the future; I am prepared (2)

Yes, I'm going to school study to get my GED.

I do not have a job; I am studying.

I don't work because I have 4 children; 2 are in school, the other 2 are here with me.

Once I am able to understand English.

If I hadn't enrolled my son I probably start working @ McDonalds.

Yes, because the program has encouraged me to get my GED and has really supported me through it.

My English and skills with computers have increased.

Now that I know enough English to continue and to participate in parenting class discussions, it has given me more confidence.

Everyday, I don't want to continue but it is hope in God that gives me great strength to do so.

Because if their (sic) were better jobs I can get one.

Helped me learn how important good education is for obtaining a good job.

I disagree because this program is for educating our children and not for finding us jobs.

I am not looking for a job.

I am more confident in communicating in English.

I believe that today, I am not prepared enough but this is my way to become better prepared to have a good job in the future.

Not at the precise moment because I am able to help with the activities and lessons of my children.

If you have a child less than 3 years old, then respond to this question:
I see progress in my child or children because he/she/they have been a part of Even Start.

Comments: My daughter is very curious, intelligent and I know that she knows more than most children her age.

She has developed a great deal, and interacts with her teachers.

She is very independent and capable of doing things for herself.

Very much.

He is very active and has a better ability to understand.

Because she likes playing with books, she likes singing songs, and gets along with other children. She is 1 ½ years old.

Because my child has developed a great deal.
 She knows many things: words, games, songs.
 He has learned sufficiently (well) in the program.
 My child does thing that I didn't think she could till (sic) later.

If you have a child 3 or 4 years old, then respond to this question:
I feel that my child is more ready to go to Pre-K or Kindergarten because of Even Start.

Comments: My daughter has been here for a short time but she is very confident,
 secure.
 He has learned how to follow rules, socialization, and many other skills.
 Yes, my child went to PreKinder better prepared.

If you have a child who is in Pre-K, Kindergarten, or older, then respond to this question:
I feel that my child is successful in school because of Even Start.

Comments: I do not have a child in Even Start Program of this age.
 My daughter is very intelligent; however part of her success is due to her.
 They are not in Even Start.
 Many people compliment my children and say they are very smart. This is
 because they work and help them a lot in Even Start.
 Yes, she knows how to succeed and that things must continue.
 I believe that it has helped my child a great deal.
 Sometimes I help my child and he gains confidence.
 I strongly agree because he is ready, not shy, and able to communicate with
 children and the teacher and able to participate in the activities.
 I disagree; my son was successful in school, long before coming to Even Start.
 They are successful in their school work.
 I like the after school program it lets her be creative.

Are there any other things that help you to attend classes here at Even Start that are
 not listed on this questionnaire? If so, then please write them here.

The transportation and the help with my children.

I really like the program since I do not have to leave my children. My children have learned a lot here in Even Start.
 I greatly appreciate the transportation because I would not be able to walk here.

Helping with personal problems.

Teacher support.

When I finish this course, I will not be able to come because I have a 3 year old child who has a disability and he
 attends school the same hour that I do. When I pass pre-GED, I will have to go in the mornings and I will not have
 someone else to help me with him.

I am motivated to attend because my daughter receives a Montessori education and she has greatly developed
 (intellectual).

Because I work here (in the center).

To see my daughter share with her companions and to see the great potential that is in her.

To far for everyone to meet the family.

Yes, I believe we need more programs like this because it gives lots of people many opportunities and great results.

Only that my children learn how to get along.

I have seen growth and development in my child and me in many ways; I am very happy.

Helping me understand more.

This program is good for me; it greatly motivates me so in the future I am able to help my child in his work and in my
 personal life.

Personal growth

The interaction of my child with other children and me with the other mothers.

We learn different things each day.

There is nothing else because the program helps me and my children to read and to resolve the problems that we have.

I am enthusiastic because I am learning and my child likes to come here and it is good for her future.

To take English classes helps me.

They offered me help with my children.

Because I wish to continue studying without interruptions.

Only that I think better of myself. Being able to find people to talk too. I really hope this school continue. It does help a
 lot of people.

The English classes and the manner in which the teacher explains the class.
 To understand how to use the computers.
 It is good for me that Spanish GED is in the mornings.
 The strength of growing and finding a better job to maintain (care) for my three children. I am raising them alone and depend upon no one.
 Wanting to have a betted (sic) education. Friends that I've made at the program.
 Always to be punctual and pay attention.

Are there any other things that are not listed on this questionnaire that may stop you from attending classes here at Even Start? If so, then please write them here.

Sometimes I do not have gasoline in the car or do not have a car/way to get here.

I need to work.

Only if I am sick or die.

I think that there should be not boundrie (sic) line (only "x" district) that is able to attend because there's many more people who would want to attend that don't live in "x".

I have to study 3 evenings per week. In the mornings, I am here at the program and sometimes it is tiring for me.

I have many activities every day and I decided to continue this semester. I have delicate health since November and for other reasons.

Sometimes, the hour is excessively long.

Only if Even Start would no longer let me come. (For example, being here to long).

Only if my children were sick or myself.

It is necessary that I work to help my husband with the bills but I want to leave work in order to study.

I think to work and to try to attend day classes.

Sometimes my daughter arrives at home at the same time that classes begin.

Moving from one place to another (other state)

Yes, my job on many occasions.

I wish to have a teacher for my group. The teacher has too many groups to dedicate her time to two classes plus mine.

Therefore, I want a teacher for my group.

Because we have little time to learn well; it would be better if we came 5 days a week.

We are short of one teacher.

I would like to see Spanish classes being taught at Even Start that would help me to continue in Even Start.

Spanish GED

We have to (sic) many activities going on in the classroom, like, cooperative learning. I just think that it takes to much of my studying time and I'm sometime's (sic) lucky if I get one page done. That's the only thing that frustrate's (sic) me.

Do you know someone who has stopped attending classes at Even Start? _____ Yes

_____ No

Did that person tell you why they stopped coming to Even Start? _____ Yes*

_____ No

*If she or he did, then please write their reason below.

Because of the time (hours) and sometimes because that person has other things that will not allow her/him to take English classes.

Needed to work.

Did not have transportation and lived too far from the program.

Her daughter was very ill.

She did not have medical care and the program required medical records stating that her children were in good health (immunization records?).

They didn't learn anything.

Her children were sick.

Less quality time for her home, husband, and children.

She had only a small amount of time to take care of her house due to all the things in Even Start.

At times, they did not have sufficient time to participate in all parts of the program and time was needed for other activities such as work, to study.

She couldn't attend anymore because she did not live in "x" and had no one else to care for them.

Moved to a home outside the area.

Health.

Pregnancy.

Lack of time and had to work more hours because of the economy.

She moved to the New Mexico side.
Family problems, economics, pregnancy.
Her child was very sick.
Problems with her husband and no money to pay for GED tests.
Moved out of the area or city.
She had to stop attending because she did not have support from her family. So she had to go to work.
She was embarrassed and did not have good thoughts to attend school.
She had to take therapy because she was sick.
Moved out of the house.
Because there was no place in the school.
Because they did not like how their children were cared for in the school.
Did not like her companions.
Because she was teased, mocked when she made an error in English class.
Lack of transportation.
This person was in ESL and had learned enough to transfer into GED. But, she found it very difficult to stay in GED because she did not understand much.
Was not motivated.
The time that the classes were offered were not convenient because that person had to work.
Because the same thing is always taught.
Because she was not able to come to the classes until a later time.
Many people have left because they feel that one teacher is not sufficient for all in the group. There are three different groups. If there were 1 teacher per class, then they would return.
This is not the area where she lives and she has no transportation.
They do not have transportation.
She has a newborn and a child in kindergarten that goes to school at 12:30 and she thinks she can't make it.
Did not like the English class.
The schedule and the distance.
Lack of transportation and the cancellation of the English classes for the parenting classes.
Moved away and when returned, there was no space in the program.
Because she had a baby.
Because she was sick.
Lack of teachers' attention.
Because she is pregnant and expecting her child in April.
Because she moved from her house and does not live in this district. Where she lives did not accept her.
Because her child is in Pre-k from 8 to 11 and the Even Start classes are from 8 to 11:30 and 12:30 to 3:30.
Did not care for the schedule of the classes.
Because she was advancing quickly and finished all of the program.
That the teachers did not pay attention to her.
Illness, and left the city.
Her husband did not support her.
Because of all the other activities we have and the time we don't have for our studies. They said it was just taking too long.

APPENDIX D
DATA ANALYSIS, FREQUENCY RESPONSE

Rural, Urban, Metropolitan		Frequency	Percent Valid Percent		Cumulative Percent
Valid	Rural	20	7.4	7.4	7.4
	Urban	149	55.2	55.2	62.6
	Metropolitan	101	37.4	37.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Parenting Class		Frequency	Percent Valid Percent		Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	2	.7	.7	.7
	Does Not Apply	6	2.2	2.2	3.0
	Agree	77	28.5	28.5	31.5
	Strongly Agree	185	68.5	68.5	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Significant Support		Frequency	Percent Valid Percent		Cumulative Percent
Valid	Does Not Apply	18	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Strongly Disagree	2	.7	.7	7.4
	Disagree	7	2.6	2.6	10.0
	Agree	63	23.3	23.3	33.3
	Strongly Agree	180	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
ES Program Location		Frequency	Percent Valid Percent		Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	4	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Does Not Apply	27	10.0	10.0	11.5
	Strongly Disagree	43	15.9	15.9	27.4
	Disagree	73	27.0	27.0	54.4
	Agree	57	21.1	21.1	75.6
	Strongly Agree	66	24.4	24.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
ECE Provided		Frequency	Percent Valid Percent		Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	4	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Does Not Apply	17	6.3	6.3	7.8
	Strongly Disagree	12	4.4	4.4	12.2
	Disagree	16	5.9	5.9	18.1
	Agree	49	18.1	18.1	36.3
	Strongly Agree	172	63.7	63.7	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Learning new things		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	2	.7	.7	.7
	Does Not Apply	1	.4	.4	1.1
	Strongly Disagree	1	.4	.4	1.5
	Disagree	3	1.1	1.1	2.6
	Agree	40	14.8	14.8	17.4
	Strongly Agree	223	82.6	82.6	100.0
	Agree				
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Better Personal Decisions		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	5	1.9	1.9	1.9
	Does Not Apply	2	.7	.7	2.6
	Disagree	1	.4	.4	3.0
	Agree	86	31.9	31.9	34.8
	Strongly Agree	176	65.2	65.2	100.0
	Agree				
	Strongly Agree				
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Provided transportation		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	9	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Does Not Apply	117	43.3	43.3	46.7
	Strongly Disagree	14	5.2	5.2	51.9
	Disagree	9	3.3	3.3	55.2
	Agree	48	17.8	17.8	73.0
	Strongly Agree	73	27.0	27.0	100.0
	Agree				
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Teacher support		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	6	2.2	2.2	2.2
	Does Not Apply	1	.4	.4	2.6
	Strongly Disagree	3	1.1	1.1	3.7
	Disagree	4	1.5	1.5	5.2
	Agree	69	25.6	25.6	30.7
	Strongly Agree	187	69.3	69.3	100.0
	Agree				
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Always enjoyed school					
Valid	Did Not Respond	4	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Does Not Apply	3	1.1	1.1	2.6
	Strongly Disagree	3	1.1	1.1	3.7
	Disagree	8	3.0	3.0	6.7
	Agree	73	27.0	27.0	33.7
	Strongly Agree	179	66.3	66.3	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
	Class scheduling				
Valid	Did Not Respond	4	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Does Not Apply	1	.4	.4	1.9
	Strongly Disagree	3	1.1	1.1	3.0
	Disagree	64	23.7	23.7	26.7
	Agree	198	73.3	73.3	100.0
	Strongly Agree				
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
	Other parents as encouragement				
Valid	Did Not Respond	2	.7	.7	.7
	Does Not Apply	4	1.5	1.5	2.2
	Strongly Disagree	2	.7	.7	3.0
	Disagree	9	3.3	3.3	6.3
	Agree	90	33.3	33.3	39.6
	Strongly Agree	163	60.4	60.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
	Assist child(ren) w/learning, hw				
Valid	Did Not Respond	5	1.9	1.9	1.9
	Does Not Apply	6	2.2	2.2	4.1
	Strongly Disagree	3	1.1	1.1	5.2
	Disagree	69	25.6	25.6	30.7
	Agree	187	69.3	69.3	100.0
	Strongly Agree				
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Participate more @ school		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	7	2.6	2.6	2.6
	Does Not Apply	27	10.0	10.0	12.6
	Strongly Disagree	4	1.5	1.5	14.1
	Disagree	11	4.1	4.1	18.1
	Agree	102	37.8	37.8	55.9
	Strongly Agree	119	44.1	44.1	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
No cost of Even Start		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	4	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Does Not Apply	14	5.2	5.2	6.7
	Strongly Disagree	14	5.2	5.2	11.9
	Disagree	43	15.9	15.9	27.8
	Agree	82	30.4	30.4	58.1
	Strongly Agree	113	41.9	41.9	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Familial support		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	4	1.5	1.5	1.5
	Does Not Apply	19	7.0	7.0	8.5
	Strongly Disagree	1	.4	.4	8.9
	Disagree	7	2.6	2.6	11.5
	Agree	66	24.4	24.4	35.9
	Strongly Agree	173	64.1	64.1	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Importance of summer program		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	8	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Does Not Apply	22	8.1	8.1	11.1
	Strongly Disagree	5	1.9	1.9	13.0
	Disagree	15	5.6	5.6	18.5
	Agree	75	27.8	27.8	46.3
	Strongly Agree	145	53.7	53.7	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Increased job skills		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	17	6.3	6.3	6.3
	Does Not Apply	57	21.1	21.1	27.4
	Strongly Disagree	5	1.9	1.9	29.3
	Disagree	14	5.2	5.2	34.4
	Agree	83	30.7	30.7	65.2
	Strongly Agree	94	34.8	34.8	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Progress in 0-3 year old due to ES					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	59	21.9	21.9	21.9
	Does Not Apply	32	11.9	11.9	33.7
	Strongly Disagree	2	.7	.7	34.4
	Disagree	2	.7	.7	35.2
	Agree	38	14.1	14.1	49.3
	Strongly Agree	137	50.7	50.7	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
School readiness in 3-4 year old					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	80	29.6	29.6	29.6
	Does Not Apply	52	19.3	19.3	48.9
	Strongly Disagree	2	.7	.7	49.6
	Disagree	1	.4	.4	50.0
	Agree	31	11.5	11.5	61.5
	Strongly Agree	104	38.5	38.5	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
School achievement in PK and older					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	71	26.3	26.3	26.3
	Does Not Apply	47	17.4	17.4	43.7
	Strongly Disagree	2	.7	.7	44.4
	Disagree	8	3.0	3.0	47.4
	Agree	51	18.9	18.9	66.3
	Strongly Agree	91	33.7	33.7	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Considered leaving ES					
Valid	Did Not Respond	14	5.2	5.2	5.2
	Yes	47	17.4	17.4	22.6
	No	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Lack of familial support					
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	6	2.2	2.2	7.8
	No	40	14.8	14.8	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Scheduling of classes					
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	3	1.1	1.1	6.7
	No	43	15.9	15.9	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Poor health					
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	9	3.3	3.3	8.9
	No	37	13.7	13.7	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Lack of transportation					
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	11	4.1	4.1	9.6
	No	35	13.0	13.0	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Fear of academic failure					
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	8	3.0	3.0	8.5
	No	38	14.1	14.1	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Teaching style		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	5	1.9	1.9	7.4
	No	41	15.2	15.2	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Fiscal needs		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	12	4.4	4.4	10.0
	No	34	12.6	12.6	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Registration paperwork		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	1	.4	.4	5.9
	No	45	16.7	16.7	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Lack of time for studying		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	7	2.6	2.6	8.1
	No	39	14.4	14.4	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Attendance policy		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	4	1.5	1.5	7.0
	No	42	15.6	15.6	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Pregnancy		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	7	2.6	2.6	8.1
	No	39	14.4	14.4	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Lack of academic assistance		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	15	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Yes	2	.7	.7	6.3
	No	44	16.3	16.3	22.6
	Not applicable	209	77.4	77.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Know someone who left ES		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	39	14.4	14.4	14.4
	Yes	145	53.7	53.7	68.1
	No	86	31.9	31.9	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Know reason why someone left		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	43	15.9	15.9	15.9
	Yes	87	32.2	32.2	48.1
	No	54	20.0	20.0	68.1
	Not applicable	86	31.9	31.9	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	
Number of years enrolled		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	36	13.3	13.3	13.3
	6 months	1	.4	.4	13.7
	7 months	1	.4	.4	14.1
	8 months	2	.7	.7	14.8
	1.00	102	37.8	37.8	52.6
	1.16	1	.4	.4	53.0
	1.25	3	1.1	1.1	54.1
	1.33	5	1.9	1.9	55.9
	1.42	1	.4	.4	56.3
	1.50	9	3.3	3.3	59.6
	1.58	1	.4	.4	60.0
	1.67	1	.4	.4	60.4
	1.83	1	.4	.4	60.7
	2.00	65	24.1	24.1	84.8
	2.25	1	.4	.4	85.2
	2.50	5	1.9	1.9	87.0
	3.00	23	8.5	8.5	95.6
	3.50	1	.4	.4	95.9
	4.00	7	2.6	2.6	98.5
	5.00	3	1.1	1.1	99.6
	10.00	1	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Age of student 18 to 21		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did not respond	39	14.4	14.4	14.4
	Yes	17	6.3	6.3	20.7
	No	208	77.0	77.0	97.8
	17 years	4	1.5	1.5	99.3
	16 years	1	.4	.4	99.6
	14 years	1	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Age of student 22 older		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did not respond	39	14.4	14.4	14.4
	Yes	208	77.0	77.0	91.5
	No	23	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Gender		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	20	7.4	7.4	7.4
	Yes	250	92.6	92.6	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Enrolled in ESL		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did not respond	35	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Yes	175	64.8	64.8	77.8
	No	60	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

Enrolled in ABE/GED		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Did Not Respond	35	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Yes	68	25.2	25.2	38.1
	No	167	61.9	61.9	100.0
	Total	270	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX E
DATA ANALYSIS, FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor Analysis

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.828
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1047.286
	df	136
	Sig.	.000

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Parenting Class	1.000	.246
Significant Support	1.000	.640
ES Program Location	1.000	.651
ECE Provided	1.000	.648
Learning new things	1.000	.638
Better Personal Decisions	1.000	.615
Provided transportation	1.000	.601
Teacher support	1.000	.600
Always enjoyed school	1.000	.655
Class scheduling	1.000	.679
Other parents as encouragement	1.000	.561
Assist child(ren) w/learning, hw	1.000	.640
Participate more @ school	1.000	.558
No cost of Even Start	1.000	.520
Familial support	1.000	.554
Importance of summer program	1.000	.413
Increased job skills	1.000	.363

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Total Variance Explained				Extraction		
Initial Eigenvalues				Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.429	26.052	26.052	4.429	26.052	26.052
2	1.639	9.643	35.695	1.639	9.643	35.695
3	1.251	7.361	43.056	1.251	7.361	43.056
4	1.155	6.792	49.849	1.155	6.792	49.849
5	1.107	6.511	56.359	1.107	6.511	56.359
6	.964	5.672	62.031			
7	.893	5.256	67.287			
8	.815	4.795	72.082			
9	.783	4.603	76.685			
10	.651	3.828	80.513			
11	.613	3.609	84.122			
12	.588	3.457	87.578			
13	.529	3.109	90.688			
14	.457	2.690	93.378			
15	.448	2.632	96.011			
16	.366	2.153	98.164			
17	.312	1.836	100.000			

Rotation			
Sums of Squared Loadings			
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.168	18.637	18.637
2	2.179	12.817	31.454
3	1.503	8.841	40.295
4	1.390	8.176	48.472
5	1.341	7.888	56.359
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix					
	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Parenting Class	.351	.105	-.142	-.287	9.792E-02
Significant Support ES Program	.349	-9.078E-02	-.330	.628	7.901E-02
Location ECE Provided	.197	.417	.342	.512	.242
Learning new things	.191	.568	.494	.197	-7.477E-02
Better Personal Decisions	.645	-.257	.292	-.206	-.165
Provided transportation	.739	-.210	9.966E-02	.118	-3.134E-02
Teacher support	.177	-.173	4.427E-02	-.114	.724
Always enjoyed school	.674	-.337	7.143E-02	.160	-3.465E-02
Class scheduling	.699	-.241	.228	4.396E-02	-.233
Other parents as encouragement	.750	-.255	.216	-6.763E-02	-5.292E-03
Assist child(ren) w/learning, hw	.651	.334	-.124	9.909E-02	-1.259E-02
Participate more @ school	.586	.313	-.278	-.233	-.259
No cost of Even Start	.480	.322	-.377	-4.165E-02	-.282
Familial support	.167	.621	.138	-.254	.151
Importance of summer program	.414	8.698E-02	-.550	.163	.214
Increased job skills	.464	-7.177E-02	-5.366E-02	-.172	.400

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 5 components extracted.

Rotated Component Matrix
Component

	1	2	3	4	5
Parenting Class	.134	.394	-5.001E-02	-4.931E-02	.262
Significant Support	.179	2.573E-02	6.994E-02	.776	-1.957E-02
ES Program Location	4.028E-02	-8.834E-02	.752	.262	8.172E-02
ECE Provided	9.347E-02	.115	.769	-.137	-.126
Learning new things	.757	.167	-8.912E-03	-.164	9.820E-02
Better Personal Decisions	.709	.176	7.821E-02	.235	.143
Provided transportation	5.184E-02	-.152	-2.402E-03	7.466E-02	.754
Teacher support	.709	7.175E-02	-1.934E-02	.277	.120
Always enjoyed school	.789	.153	6.388E-02	6.498E-02	-2.664E-02
Class scheduling	.771	.167	4.566E-02	3.862E-02	.229
Other parents as encouragement	.299	.541	.304	.274	.104
Assist child(ren) w/learning, hw	.253	.757	2.307E-02	4.344E-02	-3.319E-02
Participate more @ school	.141	.686	2.732E-02	.215	-.141
No cost of Even Start	-.151	.424	.453	-.261	.211
Familial support	1.726E-02	.411	-8.811E-02	.560	.252
Importance of summer program	.264	.196	-1.180E-02	8.881E-02	.545
Increased job skills	.210	.375	.134	-.122	.382

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Component Transformation Matrix

Component	1	2	3	4	5
1	.761	.512	.167	.249	.261
2	-.463	.550	.685	-.092	-.076
3	.381	-.480	.569	-.548	-.008
4	.025	-.387	.398	.773	-.306
5	-.245	-.235	.148	.176	.912

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

APPENDIX F
DATA ANALYSIS, CHI-SQUARE

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Rural, Urban, Metropolitan			
Rural	20	90.0	-70.0
Urban	149	90.0	59.0
Metropolitan	101	90.0	11.0
Total	270		

Test Statistics

	Rural, Urban, Metropolitan
Chi-Square	94.467
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 90.0.

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

	Progress in 0- 3 year old due to ES	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	Strongly Disagree	2	44.8	-42.8
2	Disagree	2	44.8	-42.8
3	Agree	38	44.8	-6.8
4	Strongly Agree	137	44.8	92.3
Total		179		

Test Statistics

	Progress in 0- 3 year old due to ES
Chi-Square	272.866
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 44.8.

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

	School readiness in 3-4 year old	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	Strongly Disagree	2	34.5	-32.5
2	Disagree	1	34.5	-33.5
3	Agree	31	34.5	-3.5
4	Strongly Agree	104	34.5	69.5
Total		138		

Test Statistics

	School readiness in 3-4 year old
Chi-Square	203.507
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 34.5.

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

		School achievement in PK and older			
		Category	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	Strongly Disagree		2	38.0	-36.0
2	Disagree		8	38.0	-30.0
3	Agree		51	38.0	13.0
4	Strongly Agree		91	38.0	53.0
Total			152		

Test Statistics

		School achievement in PK and older	
Chi-Square		136.158	
df		3	
Asymp. Sig.		.000	

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 38.0.

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

		Age of student 18 to 21			
		Category	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	Yes		17	112.5	-95.5
2	No		208	112.5	95.5
Total			225		

Test Statistics

		Age of student 18 to 21	
Chi-Square		162.138	
df		1	
Asymp. Sig.		.000	

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 112.5.

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

		Age of student 22 older			
		Category	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	Yes		208	115.5	92.5
2	No		23	115.5	-92.5
Total			231		

Test Statistics

		Age of student 22 older	
Chi-Square		148.160	
df		1	
Asymp. Sig.		.000	

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 115.5.

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

	Enrolled in ESL	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	Yes	175	117.5	57.5
2	No	60	117.5	-57.5
Total		235		

Test Statistics

	Enrolled in ESL
Chi-Square	56.277
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 117.5.

Chi-Square Test
Frequencies

	Enrolled in ABE/GED	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1	Yes	68	117.5	-49.5
2	No	167	117.5	49.5
Total		235		

Test Statistics

	Enrolled in ABE/GED
Chi-Square	41.706
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 117.5.

APPENDIX G
DATA ANALYSIS, ANOVA

Univariate Analysis of Variance: Age of Students

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors			
Age of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	21.9778	4.26129	45
18 to 21	22.8235	1.81091	17
22 and older	23.2933	2.96934	208
Total	23.0444	3.19239	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors								
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power	
Corrected Model	64.908	2	32.454	3.237	.041	.024	.372	
Intercept	54009.148	1	54009.148	5387.680	.000	.953	1.000	
AGE	64.908	2	32.454	3.237	.041	.024	.372	
Error	2676.559	267	10.025					
Total	146124.000	270						
Corrected Total	2741.467	269						

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .024 (Adjusted R Squared = .016)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors			
Age of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	11.8667	3.68412	45
18 to 21	12.0000	2.39792	17
22 and older	13.3125	2.06967	208
Total	12.9889	2.49234	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors								
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power	
Corrected Model	95.079	2	47.540	8.055	.000	.057	.862	
Intercept	16100.582	1	16100.582	2727.895	.000	.911	1.000	
AGE	95.079	2	47.540	8.055	.000	.057	.862	
Error	1575.888	267	5.902					
Total	47223.000	270						
Corrected Total	1670.967	269						

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .057 (Adjusted R Squared = .050)

Post Hoc Tests Parental Assistors
Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F

	N	Subset	
Age of student		1	2
Did not respond	45	11.8667	
18 to 21	17	12.0000	12.0000
22 and older	208		13.3125
Sig.		.847	.033

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed. Based on Type III Sum of Squares The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 5.902.

a Alpha = .01.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Age of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	9.9778	3.32681	45
18 to 21	12.0588	1.74895	17
22 and older	11.7548	2.46570	208
Total	11.4778	2.66979	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	122.953	2	61.476	9.147	.000	.064	.911
Intercept	13300.099	1	13300.099	1978.989	.000	.881	1.000
AGE	122.953	2	61.476	9.147	.000	.064	.911
Error	1794.414	267	6.721				
Total	37487.000	270					
Corrected Total	1917.367	269					

a Computed using alpha = .01

b R Squared = .064 (Adjusted R Squared = .057)

Post Hoc Tests Institutional Assistors

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F

	N	Subset	
Age of student		1	2
Did not respond	45	9.9778	
22 and older	208		11.7548
18 to 21	17		12.0588
Sig.		1.000	.642

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed. Based on Type III Sum of Squares The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 6.721.

a Alpha = .01.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Age of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	7.9556	2.52222	45
18 to 21	9.1176	1.61564	17
22 and older	8.9087	1.57158	208
Total	8.7630	1.79718	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	35.889	2	17.945	5.752	.004	.041	.687
Intercept	7862.898	1	7862.898	2520.461	.000	.904	1.000
AGE	35.889	2	17.945	5.752	.004	.041	.687
Error	832.940	267	3.120				
Total	21602.000	270					
Corrected Total	868.830	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .041 (Adjusted R Squared = .034)

Post Hoc Tests Situational Assistors

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F

	N	Subset	
Age of student		1	2
Did not respond	45	7.9556	
22 and older	208		8.9087
18 to 21	17		9.1176
Sig.		1.000	.639

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed. Based on Type III Sum of Squares The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 3.120.

a. Alpha = .01.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Age of student	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	6.6444	2.53301	45
18 to 21	6.8235	2.21459	17
22 and older	6.8077	2.44782	208
Total	6.7815	2.44045	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	1.018	2	.509	.085	.919	.001	.014
Intercept	4788.423	1	4788.423	798.524	.000	.749	1.000
AGE	1.018	2	.509	.085	.919	.001	.014
Error	1601.089	267	5.997				
Total	14019.000	270					
Corrected Total	1602.107	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)

Univariate Analysis of Variance: Enrollment Status

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors

Enrollment status	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	22.6286	4.18742	35
ESL	23.2470	3.20877	166
ABE/GED	22.7869	2.52398	61
ESL and ABE/GED	22.6250	2.55999	8
Total	23.0444	3.19239	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	18.317	3	6.106	.596	.618	.007	.058
Intercept	47351.818	1	47351.818	4625.374	.000	.946	1.000
ENROLL	18.317	3	6.106	.596	.618	.007	.058
Error	2723.149	266	10.237				
Total	146124.000	270					
Corrected Total	2741.467	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .007 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors

Enrollment status	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	11.7429	3.91335	35
ESL	13.4277	2.02205	166
ABE/GED	12.7049	2.23118	61
ESL and ABE/GED	11.5000	3.11677	8
Total	12.9889	2.49234	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	108.960	3	36.320	6.185	.000	.065	.877
Intercept	13852.792	1	13852.792	2359.044	.000	.899	1.000
ENROLL	108.960	3	36.320	6.185	.000	.065	.877
Error	1562.007	266	5.872				
Total	47223.000	270					
Corrected Total	1670.967	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .065 (Adjusted R Squared = .055)

Post Hoc Tests Parental Assistors
Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F

	N	Subset	
Enrollment status		1	2
ESL and ABE/GED	8	11.5000	
Did not respond	35	11.7429	
ABE/GED	61	12.7049	12.7049
ESL	166		13.4277
Sig.		.112	.093

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed. Based on Type III Sum of Squares The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 5.872.

a Alpha = .01.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Enrollment status	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	10.1714	3.45122	35
ESL	11.5904	2.51799	166
ABE/GED	11.8033	2.40707	61
ESL and ABE/GED	12.3750	2.50357	8
Total	11.4778	2.66979	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	74.736	3	24.912	3.596	.014	.039	.575
Intercept	11992.172	1	11992.172	1731.176	.000	.867	1.000
ENROLL	74.736	3	24.912	3.596	.014	.039	.575
Error	1842.630	266	6.927				
Total	37487.000	270					
Corrected Total	1917.367	269					

a Computed using alpha = .01

b R Squared = .039 (Adjusted R Squared = .028)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Enrollment status	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	8.1714	2.36998	35
ESL	8.9398	1.58286	166
ABE/GED	8.6230	1.94220	61
ESL and ABE/GED	8.7500	1.66905	8
Total	8.7630	1.79718	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	18.633	3	6.211	1.943	.123	.021	.267
Intercept	6756.991	1	6756.991	2114.051	.000	.888	1.000
ENROLL	18.633	3	6.211	1.943	.123	.021	.267
Error	850.197	266	3.196				
Total	21602.000	270					
Corrected Total	868.830	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .021 (Adjusted R Squared = .010)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Enrollment status	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	6.2000	2.77383	35
ESL	6.8012	2.54468	166
ABE/GED	7.0984	1.98918	61
ESL and ABE/GED	6.5000	1.51186	8
Total	6.7815	2.44045	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	18.658	3	6.219	1.045	.373	.012	.115
Intercept	4020.348	1	4020.348	675.369	.000	.717	1.000
ENROLL	18.658	3	6.219	1.045	.373	.012	.115
Error	1583.450	266	5.953				
Total	14019.000	270					
Corrected Total	1602.107	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .012 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

Univariate Analysis of Variance: Child(ren)'s Age(s)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors

Child(ren)'s age(s)	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	21.6765	5.67675	34
0 to 4 Years	22.7262	2.46592	84
PK or higher	23.6875	1.97464	32
0 to 4 and PK or higher	23.4833	2.81647	120
Total	23.0444	3.19239	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	108.481	3	36.160	3.653	.013	.040	.584
Intercept	103655.370	1	103655.370	10471.889	.000	.975	1.000
CHILDAGE	108.481	3	36.160	3.653	.013	.040	.584
Error	2632.985	266	9.898				
Total	146124.000	270					
Corrected Total	2741.467	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .040 (Adjusted R Squared = .029)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors

Child(ren)'s age(s)	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	11.8529	3.98583	34
0 to 4 Years	12.4286	2.29345	84
PK or higher	13.9688	1.30716	32
0 to 4 and PK or higher	13.4417	2.11356	120
Total	12.9889	2.49234	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	125.570	3	41.857	7.205	.000	.075	.932
Intercept	33029.174	1	33029.174	5685.117	.000	.955	1.000
CHILDAGE	125.570	3	41.857	7.205	.000	.075	.932
Error	1545.397	266	5.810				
Total	47223.000	270					
Corrected Total	1670.967	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .075 (Adjusted R Squared = .065)

Post Hoc Tests Parental Assistors

Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch F

Child(ren)'s age(s)	N	Subset 1	Subset 2
Did not respond	34	11.8529	
0 to 4 Years	84	12.4286	
0 to 4 and PK or higher	120		13.4417
PK or higher	32		13.9688
Sig.		.424	.471

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed. Based on Type III Sum of Squares The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 5.810.

a. Alpha = .01.

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Child(ren)'s age(s)	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	10.1765	3.09908	34
0 to 4 Years	11.6667	2.26196	84
PK or higher	11.5938	2.79238	32
0 to 4 and PK or higher	11.6833	2.70071	120
Total	11.4778	2.66979	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	66.073	3	22.024	3.165	.025	.034	.499
Intercept	25164.868	1	25164.868	3615.772	.000	.931	1.000
CHILDAGE	66.073	3	22.024	3.165	.025	.034	.499
Error	1851.293	266	6.960				
Total	37487.000	270					
Corrected Total	1917.367	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .034 (Adjusted R Squared = .024)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Child(ren)'s age(s)	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	8.5000	2.21906	34
0 to 4 Years	8.6190	1.71390	84
PK or higher	8.9063	1.69171	32
0 to 4 and PK or higher	8.9000	1.75566	120
Total	8.7630	1.79718	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	7.001	3	2.334	.720	.541	.008	.072
Intercept	15077.608	1	15077.608	4653.646	.000	.946	1.000
CHILDAGE	7.001	3	2.334	.720	.541	.008	.072
Error	861.828	266	3.240				
Total	21602.000	270					
Corrected Total	868.830	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .008 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Child(ren)'s age(s)	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Did not respond	6.1471	3.07613	34
0 to 4 Years	6.4048	2.33939	84
PK or higher	6.9688	1.85758	32
0 to 4 and PK or higher	7.1750	2.39629	120
Total	6.7815	2.44045	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	45.311	3	15.104	2.581	.054	.028	.389
Intercept	8809.082	1	8809.082	1505.152	.000	.850	1.000
CHILDAGE	45.311	3	15.104	2.581	.054	.028	.389
Error	1556.797	266	5.853				
Total	14019.000	270					
Corrected Total	1602.107	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .028 (Adjusted R Squared = .017)

Univariate Analysis of Variance: Location

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors

Rural, Urban, Metropolitan	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rural	23.4500	1.95946	20
Urban	23.1141	2.97860	149
Metropolitan	22.8614	3.67159	101
Total	23.0444	3.19239	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	7.397	2	3.698	.361	.697	.003	.030
Intercept	72357.359	1	72357.359	7066.175	.000	.964	1.000
PROGSETT	7.397	2	3.698	.361	.697	.003	.030
Error	2734.070	267	10.240				
Total	146124.000	270					
Corrected Total	2741.467	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors

Rural, Urban, Metropolitan	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rural	12.8000	2.26181	20
Urban	13.0000	2.58373	149
Metropolitan	13.0099	2.41866	101
Total	12.9889	2.49234	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Parental Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	.777	2	.388	.062	.940	.000	.013
Intercept	22611.532	1	22611.532	3614.726	.000	.931	1.000
PROGSETT	.777	2	.388	.062	.940	.000	.013
Error	1670.190	267	6.255				
Total	47223.000	270					
Corrected Total	1670.967	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Rural, Urban, Metropolitan	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rural	11.2500	2.88143	20
Urban	11.3893	2.84204	149
Metropolitan	11.6535	2.36405	101
Total	11.4778	2.66979	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Institutional Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	5.323	2	2.661	.372	.690	.003	.031
Intercept	17654.238	1	17654.238	2465.258	.000	.902	1.000
PROGSETT	5.323	2	2.661	.372	.690	.003	.031
Error	1912.044	267	7.161				
Total	37487.000	270					
Corrected Total	1917.367	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Rural, Urban, Metropolitan	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rural	9.3000	1.45458	20
Urban	8.8591	1.75922	149
Metropolitan	8.5149	1.89005	101
Total	8.7630	1.79718	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Situational Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	13.362	2	6.681	2.085	.126	.015	.211
Intercept	10681.158	1	10681.158	3333.695	.000	.926	1.000
PROGSETT	13.362	2	6.681	2.085	.126	.015	.211
Error	855.468	267	3.204				
Total	21602.000	270					
Corrected Total	868.830	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .015 (Adjusted R Squared = .008)

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Rural, Urban, Metropolitan	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rural	7.6000	2.03651	20
Urban	6.8121	2.67463	149
Metropolitan	6.5743	2.11351	101
Total	6.7815	2.44045	270

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Specific Program Assistors

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
Corrected Model	17.876	2	8.938	1.506	.224	.011	.138
Intercept	6611.778	1	6611.778	1114.323	.000	.807	1.000
PROGSETT	17.876	2	8.938	1.506	.224	.011	.138
Error	1584.231	267	5.933				
Total	14019.000	270					
Corrected Total	1602.107	269					

a. Computed using alpha = .01

b. R Squared = .011 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)

VITA

YVETTE TERESA DUNN PERRY

**703 BRUSHY GLEN DRIVE
HOUSTON, TX 77073-5466**

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND**PhD, Educational Human Resource
Development
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
August 2003****MEd, Educational Administration
and Supervision
Northwestern State University
Natchitoches, LA
August 1996****BA, Social Sciences Education
Northwestern State University
Natchitoches, LA
December 1990****PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE****Intern, Curriculum and Instruction
District Services & Training Center
North Harris Montgomery
Community College District
The Woodlands, TX
September 2002 to May 2003****Graduate Assistant, Texas Center
for Adult Literacy & Learning
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
July 2000 to September 2002****Social Studies Department Chair &
Teacher, MacArthur High School
Aldine I.S.D.
Houston, TX
August 1991 to June 2000**