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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Chapter I describes the problem of foster care as a national, state, and local phenomenon. The problem of foster care is discussed from an historical perspective to illustrate why foster care is an important social concern that needs further research. This chapter also presents the problem statement and purpose of the study. Additionally, chapter I provides an explanation regarding the significance of the study as it relates to foster care interventions to increase academic performance among foster care students in elementary and middle schools. Chapter I also contains the research question, definitions, hypothesis, and chapter summary.

Foster care is a planned service for children who cannot live with either parents for a period of time. Children in foster care may live with unrelated foster parents, with relatives, with families who plan to adopt them, or in group homes or residential treatment centers. The general expectation is that children who enter state care will return to their parents as soon as possible or be provided a safe, stable, and loving environment through placement with relatives or adoption (National Center for Resource Family Support, 2002). All children do best when they live in a safe and nurturing environment, yet too many children lack this fundamental foundation. Every year, millions of children are abused or neglected. For too many of these children, foster care is no safe haven.
Instead, children drift from foster home to foster home, lingering in care while awaiting a permanent, “forever family.” Public opinion polls revealed that the public is largely uninformed about foster care, yet highly critical of the system. In a 2003 poll of voters by the Pew Commission on Children in Foster Care, most respondents were generally unfamiliar with the child welfare system that administers foster care, but more than 50% believed it needed major changes, if not a complete overhaul. These impressions were no doubt fueled by media accounts of tragic incidents, such as the death of 2-year-old Brianna Blackmond in Washington, D.C., two weeks after a judge returned her to her mother’s custody without reviewing the child welfare agency’s report recommending that she not be reunified; or the inability of child welfare workers in Florida to find 5-year-old foster child Rilya Wilson and 500 others like her over the past decade; or reports of Brian Jackson, a 19-year-old adopted foster youth in New Jersey who weighed only 45 pounds and was found rummaging through a garbage can for food because he and his brothers were apparently being starved by their adoptive parents (Bass, Shields, & Behrman, 2004).

Bass, et al., (2004) further commented, in an article titled, “A Child’s Journey Through Foster Care,” “for some children, the journey begins at birth, when it is clear that a mother cannot care for her newborn infant” (p. 4). The authors assert that “other children come to the attention of child welfare when a teacher, a social worker, a police officer, or a neighbor reports suspected child maltreatment to child protective services” (p. 4). Bass, et al., also stated “some of these children may have experienced physical or sexual abuse at the hands of a loved and trusted adult. More often, parents battling
poverty, substance addiction, or mental illness woefully neglect their children’s needs” (p. 4).

In 2001, approximately 3 million referrals were made to child protective services, and more than 900,000 children were found to be victims of maltreatment. When child maltreatment is determined, caseworkers and courts must decide whether the child can safely remain in the home if the family is provided with in-home services, or whether the child should be placed into state care. There are over 500,000 children that currently reside in our nation’s foster care system (Bass, et al., 2004).

Chapter I describes the problem of foster care as a national, state, and local phenomenon. The background of the problem of foster care is discussed from a historical perspective to demonstrate why foster care is an important social concern that is worth researching, a statement of the problem is provided and the purpose of the study is briefly presented. In addition, chapter I includes a discussion of the significance of the current study as it relates to the issue of foster care interventions to increase academic performance among foster care students in elementary and middle schools. Chapter I also includes the, research question, theoretical frameworks, definitions, hypothesis, limitations, and chapter summary.

Background of the Problem

Many students in foster care are not being provided equitable education or opportunities for achievement. Large numbers of them do not have access to the many special programs, advance placement courses, extracurricular clubs and sports, and other activities that vital to obtaining a well-rounded education (Schwartz, 2000). Further
more, many of them are stimulated to pursue thither education. The following are a few of the nationwide educational implications of placement in state-sponsored out of home care; high rates of absenteeism and tardiness, high rates of school changes in midyear, more likely to have been disciplined or suspended from school, significant numbers below grade level in reading or math (studies found a range of 30%-96%), scores that are 15 to 20 percentile points below non-foster care students on statewide achievement tests, high proportion repeating one or more grades (26%-40%), less likely to take college preparatory courses than other youth (15%-32%), more apt to drop out of high school than non-foster care students (50%-16%), and higher proportion not completing high school even after exiting care (37%-80%) (Casey Family Programs, 2001).

Statement of the Problem

In 2003, there were approximately 600,000 children in foster care in the United States, of which about 70%, or 420,000, were of school age. The ethnic distribution of these children include the following: Black, 39%; White, 34%; Hispanic, 17%; American Indian/Alaskan Native, 2%; Asia Pacific Islander, 1%; and unknown, 7% (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2003). Many students in foster care are not being provided equitable education or opportunities for achievement. Large numbers of them do not have access to the many special programs, advance placement courses, extracurricular clubs and sports, and other activities that are vital to obtaining a well-rounded education (Schwartz, 2000). Furthermore, many of them are not stimulated to pursue further education. The following are a few of the nationwide educational implications of placement in state-sponsored out of home care: High rates of absenteeism
and tardiness, High rates of school changes in midyear, More likely to have been disciplined or suspended from school, Significant numbers below grade level in reading or math (studies found a range of 30%-96%), Scores that are 15 to 20 percentile points below non-foster youth statewide achievement tests, High proportion repeating one or more grades (26%-40%), Less likely to take college preparatory courses than other youth (15% vs. 32%), More apt to drop out of high school than non-foster children (50% vs. 16%), Higher proportion not completing high school even after exiting care (37%- 80%) (Casey Family Programs, 2001). Many students living in foster care struggle academically in school. Compared with other children in similar classes or normed expectations, children in foster care have weaker cognitive abilities, poorer academic performance.

Many students in foster care are not being provided equitable education or opportunities for achievement. Large numbers of them do not have access to the many special programs, advance placement courses, extracurricular clubs and sports, and other activities that are vital to obtaining a well-rounded education (Schwartz, 2000). Furthermore, many of them are not stimulated to pursue further education. The following are a few of the nationwide educational implications of placement in state-sponsored out of home care: High rates of absenteeism and tardiness; High rates of school changes in midyear; More likely to have been disciplined or suspended from school; Significant numbers below grade level in reading or math (studies found a range of 30%-96%); Scores that are 15 to 20 percentile points below non-foster youth statewide achievement tests; High proportion repeating one or more grades (26%-40%); Less likely to take college preparatory courses than other youth (15% vs. 32%); More apt to drop out of high
Many students living in foster care struggle academically in school. Compared with other children in similar classes or normed expectations, children in foster care have weaker cognitive abilities, poorer academic performance and classroom achievement, including grade retention and higher rates of placement into special education have demonstrated in appropriate school-related behaviors more frequently and they have poorer attendance records and change schools more frequently. Poor educational functioning while in foster care has led to poorer outcomes of adult functioning (Fanshel & Shinn, 1978; Fox & Arcuri, 1980).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to assess teachers' perceptions of the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance of foster care and non-foster care students in selected elementary and middle schools in Atlanta, Georgia. The identified independent variables are motivation, behaviors, and academic performance. The dependent variable is teachers' perception.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study will enable teachers to find an alternative method of meeting the educational needs of children in foster care and non-foster care students. It is critically important that teachers identify strengths and functional adaptations of foster care and non-foster care children that are essential for them to receive and achieve educational freedom.
This study not only expands the body of literature related to foster care and education, the results could be of value to teachers and other professionals interested in helping foster care students began to connect to their educational processes in a way that motivates them to achieve academic success.

Research Question

This study examines teachers' perceptions of the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

Research Question: Do teachers perceive any difference between motivation, behaviors and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools?

In summary, Chapter I discussed teachers' perceptions of the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance of foster care and non-foster care students in selected elementary and middle schools in Atlanta, Georgia. The identified independent variables are motivation, behaviors, and academic performance. The dependent variable is teachers' perception.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter II provides a discussion and synthesis of the literature about the historical and present reality of children in the foster care system. This chapter also provides detailed information about motivation, behaviors, academic performance, and educational challenges for foster care and non-foster care students as well as the theoretical frameworks that guide the study. The three frameworks used to guide this study are Systems Theory, Social Learning Theory, and the Afrocentric Perspective.

This review of the literature is to examine empirical literature related to teachers’ perceptions of motivation, behaviors, and academic performance of foster care and non-foster care students. As well, this literature covers the historical background of foster care, definitions of motivation, behaviors, academic performance, and educational challenges for foster care and non-foster care students.

Historical Background

The idea of care for orphans has a long tradition. During the sixteenth century, “The Blur Coat School” of Christ’s Hospital was established by King Edward VI to house and care for orphans of London streets. The concept of the London orphan as a pauper was reflected not only in the meanness and brutality of the life in the school but in the matter of fact paternalism toward the school’s pupils expresses by the London public.
From the mid-nineteenth century through the Great Depression, most dependent children in the United States were cared for in 353 orphanages, 276 accepting mostly white children, 68 some black children and 9 sheltered black children exclusively. From 1890 to 1933 the overall number of orphanages increased while the number of integrated orphanages decreased. By 1960 the orphanages were transformed into private residential treatment centers and they began to admit a significant number of black children (Nowak-Fabrykowski & Piver, 2000).

As noted in the History of Foster Care in the United States (2006), the English Poor Laws actually led to the development and eventually regulation of family foster care in the United States. In England, these laws allowed the placement of poor children into indentured service until they became of age. This practice was imported to the United States and was the beginning of placing children into homes (National Advocate, 2006).

During the 1840's, a crisis developed among youth in America with the increased social problem of pauperism and the many teenagers who found themselves without work opportunities at the end of apprenticeship program. Youth were forced to roam the streets and countryside and American reformers were forced to devise major strategies to deal with these issues. The two strategies that directly affected children were increasing the number of almshouses and the establishment of personal contact with millions of low income youth to prevent pauperism. For much of the 18th and 19th centuries most poverty relief was provided in the almshouses and poorhouses. Traditionally, Churches and/or philanthropists funded these relief programs. An example of this was Benjamin Franklin, who participated in many partnerships between the public and private sectors such as libraries, firefighting services, orphanages, and educational programs. These houses
generally did not offer education or provide services that would enhance youth
development such as, learning a trade. Many children who resided in the houses
experienced abuse and neglect (Jansson, 2005).

Jansson (2005) further states, eventually, American reformers moved to specialize
these services by building new institutions that focused on the specific needs of these
children. Institutions such as Sunday Schools were formed to educate and provide
training services to low income street children. In addition, Character Building
Institutions were set up for orphanages and the focuses of their services were to educate
and teach children how to behave morally. Sunday Schools and Character Building
Institutions were similar in that they developed educational programs to help these
children socialize appropriately in the New World. Other institutions such as the House
of Refuge were created for delinquent and neglected children only. The courts referred
these children to the house/program, these programs provided several services; however,
the primary focus was to provide lecture study and physical labor to these children.

Charles Loring Brace began the free foster home movement. He was a minister
of immigrant children sleeping in the streets of New York. Charles devised a plan to
provide them homes by advertising in the south and west for families willing to provide
free homes for these children, whether for charitable reasons or for whatever help these
children could be to them. In many cases, these children were placed in circumstances
similar to indentured servants. However, Brace’s daring and creative action became the
foundation for the foster care movement, as it exits today. Social agencies and state
governments therefore became involved in foster home placements. Three states led the
movement, Massachusetts, prior to 1865, began paying board to families who took care
of the children too young to be indentured, Pennsylvania passed the first licensing law in 1885, which made it a misdemeanor to care for two or more unrelated children without a license, South Dakota began providing subsidies to the Children’s Home Society after it was organized in 1893 for its public childcare work. During the Progressive Era, the U.S. Children’s Bureau was created in 1912 at the behest of Theodore Roosevelt, who several years earlier convened his first White House Conference on Children. The Children’s Bureau was responsible for all issues pertaining to the welfare of children, including legislation, oversight of children’s institutions, and statistics on birth rates and infant mortality (Jansson, 2005).

Americans have always arranged for some children to be reared by adults other than their own parents. In colonial America, children from all classes were indentured into new homes to learn a trade. In the 1850’s, the Children’s Aid Society began sending improvised urban children to western states to be placed in rural homes. By 1900, some private placing agencies were making board payments to foster parents. Over the course of the twentieth century, boarding out developed into the modern family foster care system as social work gained prominence and the role of state and federal government in child welfare grew (Jansson, 2005).

Throughout American history, some children from improvised families have always been reared in the homes of other people, but the ways that they were cared for have changed. In colonial America, children from all classes were sometimes indentured to families where they were to live, work, and learn a trade; this was an especially common way of caring for orphans and other dependent children, but it was seen as appropriate for children from other classes as well. Between 1800 and 1850, orphan
asylums became widespread way of caring for children from improvised families; at the same time, changing conceptions of childhood helped narrow the use of indenture to children from very poor families (Hacsi, 1995).

In the 1850’s, a variation on indenture, placing out, began moving children from poor urban families to rural homes. Unlike indenture, placing out was based on an anti-urban, anti-immigrant ideology. In the 1880’s and 1890’s, some agencies began to pay foster parents for boarding young children, so that the children would not be forced to work, as well as for caring for children who were difficult to live with or who had special needs. This boarding out system gradually evolved into the modern family foster care system as government became increasingly involved in the welfare of children (Hacsi, 1995).

Hacsi (1995) further states that certain underlying elements have always shaped the ways that improvised children were treated. Parental poverty has always increased the risk of children being removed from their families and placed elsewhere, whether in other homes or institutions. Society’s reluctance to provide sufficient aid to keep improvised families together has made it necessary for private agencies and government officials to arrange care for children whose parents cannot care for them. Child abuse and neglect, much of which arises from the strains created by severe poverty, became headline news in the 1870’s, and have been major public issues in recent decades.

The role of government in funding and supervising child welfare has grown gradually over the past century. Between 1900 and 1930, the gradually professionalization of social work went hand and hand with increased government involvement in child welfare to cause a shift towards the boarding out system and away
from institutional care of children. But institutional care and child placement are not opposing systems; whichever has been the dominant system has always made use of the other as a supplement (Hacsi, 1995).

A century ago, orphan asylums often placed children with families for indenture or adoption, and the late twentieth century, institutions and other forms of group care function as part of the out of home care system. Changing conceptions of the nature of childhood have also played an important role in shaping child placement systems. In colonial America, children were viewed as miniature adults who were expected to grow up as quickly as possible. Teaching children we the value of hard work and skills of a trade was at the heart of indenture (Hacsi, 1995).

In the early nineteenth century, a new view of childhood as a separate stage of life emerged. Childhood began to be seen as a stage of innocence that should be cultivated and nurtured; children should be allowed to be children, not turned into small adults as quickly as possible. Some reformers saw it as essential that children be removed from improvised families in crowded cities and placed in “pure” rural settings. Today, the out of home care system is populated by children who are deemed neglected by standards of child care that would have seemed very strange to colonial parents (Hacsi, 1995).

In the eighteenth century, local government officials known as the overseers of the poor were charged with distributing poor relief. These officials had the authority to indenture children from poor families in lieu of providing relief, and they did so regularly. In the colonial era, the duties of masters under indenture were spelled out in practical terms; children were to be fed, clothed, housed, and taught skills. Some children were taught to read and write, but education was not a universal component of
indenture contracts. The indenture relationship was primarily economic rather than emotional or psychological in nature (Mintz & Kellogg, 1998). Though many improvised children were indentured by public officials, some parents entered into indentured agreements without any government involvement. Although used as a placement for children from low income families, indenture in colonial America was by no means limited to children of the poor. It was commonplace for children from families that were not poor to be sent to other people’s homes at the age of 13 or 14, sometimes a formal contract of indenture was drawn up or in other cases the arrangement was informal.

In the first few decades of the nineteenth century, an urban middle class emerged with a new conception of childhood as a distinct phase of human development. Children’s character was to be shaped not by breaking their wills as in the colonial area, but by leading them to internalize beliefs about behavior and morality. Consequently, children stayed at home longer, and child rearing methods changed. By the early nineteenth century, indenture was no longer used by all classes; only children from low income families were indentured. Public officials continued to indenture orphans, half orphans, and other dependent children whose parents were unable to provide for them or were for some reason deemed unfit. Masters had to meet somewhat higher expectations about what to provide apprentices. For example, after Pennsylvania established free public schooling in 1834, masters were legally required to supply indentured children with “three month schooling” each year. Although still widely used, indenture was clearly on the wane by the middle of the nineteenth century (Hacsi, 1993).
Indenture contracts were still employed on occasion in the early twentieth century, but they were a rarity, having been gradually supplanted by other child welfare services half a century earlier. In a reaction to the cholera epidemic of 1832 and poverty in the nations’ rapidly growing urban centers, numerous religious and charitable organizations found orphan asylums. Although institutional care has often been seen as competing with indenture and other plans that place children with families, in practice the services were often used conjointly. Many orphan asylum superintendents placed small children with their families where they would receive more individual attention than was possible in an asylum. Asylums also indentured older children in the hope that they would learn a trade, although by the late nineteenth century, asylums were increasingly likely to provide some form of manual training within the institution itself (Hacsi, 1993).

Nevertheless, between 1830 and 1860 orphan asylums became the nation’s predominant method of caring for dependent children. By the 1880’s, however, orphan asylums were facing heavy criticism, usually accompanied by arguments favoring placing children with families. It was no coincidence that Charles Loring Brace, the most famous critic of asylums, was also the nations’ most influential advocate of placing out. Under Brace’s guidance, the old concept of indenture took on a new form that shared as much with modern day family foster care as with indenture (Hacsi, 1993).

In 1853, the idea of placing children in homes rather than institutions gained new life when Brace founded the New York Children’s Aid Society (CAS). CAS’s fundamental assumptions were that children should be placed in rural homes rather than institutions. Brace was anti-urban, anti-immigrant, and anti-catholic. Like
many reformers in the second half of the nineteenth century, he idealized rural America and feared urban growth. As a result, CAS’s child placing approach combined anti-institutional thought with anti-urban fears by trying to place children from urban slums in the country, usually with Protestant farmers (Hacsi, 1993).

Children came to CAS in a variety of ways. Agents swept the streets looking for street children and vagrants who did not have homes. Orphan asylums and infant asylums brought children to CAS, as did public officials. Most child placing agencies that came into existence later found homes for their children within day’s travel of their original homes, but CAS wanted to move children as far from the city as possible. The CAS “orphan trains” became famous. Aside from the distance children traveled, these placements were similar to those made by asylums. Younger children were to be taken in and care for as members of the family. Older children were expected to perform a considerable amount of work on the farms where they were placed (Hacsi, 1993).

CAS avoided using indenture contracts because it considered them too binding, but older children were placed largely in response to the needs of rural western states for more farm labor. In this respect, placing out was quite like informal indenture. A 14 or 15 year old child working for a living was commonplace in the late nineteenth century. Middle class children might still be in school at that age, but working class and improvised children were almost always employed to help their families. CAS’s rationale for shifting children from their biological parents to new homes, however, was a dramatic departure from the ideas behind indenture. On the one hand, children had been indentured as a way to prepare them for adult life and work. Only rarely had children been indentured out of a desire to sever ties between child and parent. On the other hand,
CAS's placing out system was designed to protect children from the urban environment and from their own parents, who were presumed to be unworthy individuals incapable of rearing children properly. All ties between children and their biological parents were to be ended (Hasci, 1995).

Like orphan asylums and other nineteenth century charities for the poor, child placing organizations were usually founded by individuals or groups with strong religious views; unlike orphan asylums, however, the placing organizations were almost always Protestant. Denominational groups often founded their own agencies. By the mid 1850's, for example, the Home Missionary Society of Philadelphia, a Methodist Episcopal organization, had added placing dependent children in rural homes to its other activities. Although some Catholic groups did place children in families, they usually favored institutional care, partly because of the difficulty in finding rural Catholic homes for placement. But the few Catholic agencies that regularly placed children in families used placing out as a complement to Catholic orphan asylums; unlike CAS, they were not opposed to institutional care. The desire to remove children from supposedly, unworthy, perhaps even dangerous, parents created a sense of urgency among placing out advocates (Shackelford, 1991).

Brace's writings were suffused with a sense of impending disaster, and he was hardly alone. When Edmond T. Dooley became superintendent of the San Francisco Boys and Girls Aid Society in 1882, he actively sought out children, removing them from their own homes or taking them in off the streets, and placed them under the agency's care. Dooley's haste was so great that children were placed in families without the
agency bothering to gain legal custody of them; adults applied for children were not investigated and placed children were not visited (Shackelford, 1991).

Placed agencies usually found homes by advertising for them, but rarely bothered to screen the respondents. After children were placed, agencies maintained little or no contact with them. Even when agencies wanted to check up on placement homes, insufficient funds often kept them doing so. Those agencies that did not check on children often found that placements were not working and that the children had to be moved. Children under the care of Pennsylvania’s Children’s Aid Society for more than a year, for example, often experienced four or more placements. Just as placing out advocates had criticized orphan asylums for producing "institutional" children unprepared to function as self-reliant citizens, asylum supporters criticized placing out agencies because they did not carefully examine the new homes they found for their children. In particular, Catholics attacked CAS for placing Catholic children in Protestant homes (Shackelford, 1991).

In the late nineteenth century, placing agencies’ methods of finding homes began to change; at least partly in response to criticism, they began to recognize that not all rural homes were automatically good homes. Some agencies’ investigations of prospective home became thorough; neighbors and influential community members, such as ministers, were interviewed before placing of children. Not surprisingly, the more careful the examination of prospective placement homes, the lower the rate of acceptance. Children under the age of five who were placed were the most likely to be adopted (whether legally or de facto) by their new parents (Shackelford, 1991).
An 1884 survey, conducted by Hastings H. Hart, found that children placed before the age of 12 were more likely to stay throughout the terms of their placement than were older children. Unfortunately, most placements seem to have involved older children. Of the more than 22,000 children placed in “permanent” homes by CAS between 1854 and 1900, over 17,400 (78%) were older than 10. Since most placement homes wanted children who could work to earn their keep, a disparity existed between the best age for children to be placed and the request from potential parents (Ross, 1977).

A disparity also existed between what placement agencies wanted and what the parents of the children wanted. In the late nineteenth century, placing out (like institutional care) was often used by families to help them weather difficult times brought on by a death, serious illness, or long period of unemployment. The majority of children who entered the care of placement agencies were brought by parents or other relatives, many of whom tried to reclaim their children when the family was back on its feet. Despite the hopes of most placing out advocates, many children returned to their families within a few years of being placed elsewhere (Hacsi, 1995).

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, child abuse and parental neglect began to be recognized as important problems. During the 1870’s, Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (SPCC) began to appear in eastern cities. SPCC’s often removed children from abusive or neglectful homes and placed them in other homes or orphan asylums. Courts granted these societies what amounted to police powers to remove children when they saw fit, largely as a result of the work of the SPCC’s, other agencies and governments began to acknowledge the existence of child abuse and neglect. In the 1890’s, Massachusetts recognized “three classes of children” in
its “child saving” work. Dependent children whose main problem was poverty, neglected children, and juvenile offenders. The main problem of dependent children was their families poverty, but neglected children were “the offspring of them,” in practice, once children were in the child welfare system, “dependent” and “neglected” children were treated the same. The line distinguishing dependent children from neglected children was elusive; though some of these parents undoubtedly were “bad” parents, most were simply improvised (Hacsi, 1995).

Hacsi (1995) further states, expectations about how much a child should work and about the importance of emotional ties between parent and child shaped views about how children should be treated in placement homes. Older children placed in “free” homes, like indentured children, were to be taken in for love. Ironically, placement agencies began making payments for foster families in an effort to ensure that children would not be valued exclusively for their labor.

In the 1880’s, Boston’s Temporary Home for the Destitute began to make board payments to families. During the 1890’s, board payments completely replaced the agency’s previous method of free placements. The State Primary School of Massachusetts also began experimenting with pacing children under the age of 10 in boarding homes in 1882. In 1883, Homer Folks wrote that another reason for boarding out was that otherwise it might prove impossible to find homes for “children who are unattractive in appearance or who have some slight physical, mental, or moral defect or peculiarity which turns the balance against then when foster parents are making their choices. Changing to boarding out led placing agencies to look more closely at the situation within the placement home. After all, agencies did not want to pay people to
rear children unless they were doing a good job. For example, the State Primary School checked much more closely on its placement homes where children were boarded than agencies using “free” placement homes had customarily done. In Massachusetts, no family could take in more than two children unless they were siblings, and only state wards came into the boarding system (Hacsi, 1995).

Between 1880 and 1920, the question of whether to pay adults who took in other people’s children complicated the debate on home placement versus institutional care. When the 1899 National Conference of Charities and Corrections came out in favor of home placement over institutional care for dependent children, it did not take a stand on whether board payments should be made. Supporters of board payment hoped to ensure that young children were not worked to earn their keep. Gradually, boarding out won the battle, but it took more than half a century (Hacsi, 1995).

In the South, where child welfare developments lagged, placing out remained far more common than boarding out in the late 1920’s; in fact, orphan asylums still held far more children than placement homes. The growing popularity of boarding out, sometimes known as foster care was intimately tied to the growth of the juvenile court system in the three decades after 1900. Although some dependent children had come under court supervision throughout American history, the creation of a court system specifically for minors greatly increased the number of children who became state wards (Pelton, 1989).

Juvenile courts spoke a great deal about maintaining families. In practice, however, they were far more prone to remove children from their parents than try to help the family as a whole. In many states, mothers’ pensions, the successor to outdoor relief
and the predecessor of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, were awarded on the basis of an investigation by an officer of the juvenile court. If the officer found the mother to be unworthy of aid, as often happened, the result might be worse for the family than if the family had not sought help. In such cases, the court might remove the child to a foster home (Pelton, 1989).

The growing involvement of government in child welfare, first at the state and later at the federal level, was a central reason for the expansion of foster care in the twentieth century. The rise of the juvenile court, which now plays a crucial role in the out of home care system, is the most obvious example, but not the only one. State Boards of Charity, which proliferated in the late nineteenth century and gained increased powers during the Progressive Era, strongly favored home placement over asylums. The 1906 Biennial Report of California’s State Board of Charities and Corrections reflected most states’ attitudes. The best place for a child is a good home. The asylums, however good work they may do, are unnatural and can not be a parent. The State should encourage the placing out of all children possible into good homes. They should be placed out at as early an age as possible, so that they can grow up in the family and become a part of it (Pelton, 1989).

Although California’s state government made regular payments to orphan asylums to care for dependent children, it did not make payments to families caring for dependent children. Even though many private placing agencies had already begun to shift from free to boarding placements, the state legislature favored placing out. The legislature was trying to save money by shifting away from asylum care, and boarding out was far more expensive than placing out. There were also philosophical reasons for
California’s shift away from asylum care; placing out was intended to break all ties
between “bad” parents and their children. In fact, the state board’s next biennial report
called for increasing judicial powers so that courts could “sever forever the parents rights
and control over the child” (Holt, 1992, p. 22) if that parent was “morally” delinquent, or
if the parent had “abandoned” a child by failing to pay an asylums fees, thus leaving the
state responsible.

The argument made half a century earlier by Brace and other reformers still had
resonance for many. When a state government became involved in placing or boarding
children in homes, some manner of state regulation usually followed. As in many other
aspects of child welfare, California acted well before most other states. By 1915,
California was licensing and regulating, if not only loosely, agencies that found
placement homes for children. By 1920, California was making payments to boarding
homes, including those arranged by private agencies, so long as the children had been
“committed by the juvenile courts of the state as needy” (Holt, 1992, p. 22). By the
1920’s, placing out had been replaced by boarding out in a number of cities. In New
Orleans, placing out had ceased to be of great value except as a preliminary stage toward
adoption of small children, but boarding children with foster families was an important
new development in the city’s child welfare work. It worked so well with dependent
children that delinquent children were also being placed in boarding homes. Though
placing out still existed, it was clearly going out of vogue. In the 1920’s, even CAS
stopped its orphan train shipments of children to the rural west (Holt, 1992).

By the 1930’s, it was becoming clear that boarding out was outpacing both
institutional care and free placing out. The decline of the latter methods became certain
with the creation of Aid to Dependent Children (ADC, later AFDC) as Title IV of the Social Security Act in 1935. Under ADC, available federal funds that could be used to keep impoverished families together rose dramatically. As a result, many families that previously would have turned to an orphan asylum or child placement agency were able to keep their children at home. At the same time, the increasing financial involvement of state governments in the child welfare system meant that when children were removed from their homes, they were more likely to be boarded in a family than placed in an asylum (Hacsi, 1995).

By 1950, more children were in foster homes than in institutions, by 1960, almost twice as many children were in foster care as were in institutions, and in 1968, more than three times as many children were in foster care as in institutions. In the 1940’s and 1950’s, as foster care expanded and the use of asylums declined, the total number of dependent children being cared for outside of their own homes stayed relatively stable, between 3.5 and 4.5 per thousand children under the age of 18. During the 1960’s and 1970’s, however, the foster care population exploded, reaching a peak in the late 1970’s. The most important factor driving skyrocketing foster care populations during this period was the rediscovery of child abuse. During the 1950’s, research led some physicians to conclude that large numbers of parents were abusing their children. In 1962, an article entitled “The Battered Child Syndrome” was published in an important medical journal; in short order, the popular press was running feature articles on child abuse. In fact, more children enter foster care due to neglect than abuse, although the lines between the two are often blurry, just as the distinction between neglect and simple poverty has never been absolutely clear (Hacsi, 1995).
According to Tedford (1992), federal funding was an additional reason for the dramatic rise in foster care population between 1960 and 1977. Although federal funds became directly available for foster care in urban areas in 1951, the amount of securable money became meaningful only in 1961. At that time, rules regarding AFDC payments were changed to allow payments for children in foster care whose biological families were eligible. Later amendments to the Social Security Act, Titles, IV-B and XX, also made federal matching payments available to states only for children placed in foster care by a court decision, whose families also meet other AFDC requirements. The availability of federal AFDC money for foster care clearly helped spur the growth of foster care caseloads. By 1976, the number of children in AFDC foster care was well over 100,000.

The most important federal legislation of recent years regarding foster care is the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980. This act targets money toward preventive services and efforts aimed at reuniting families, thus attempting to shift policy away from family break up and toward family maintenance. The argument that children should be kept with their families whenever possible, and reunited with their families as quickly as possible if they must be temporarily removed, fights against the ideology that has driven child placement since Charles Loring Brace’s time (Tedford, 1992).

In practice, family presentation programs have been implemented in many states over the past decade, and have had mixed results. Not surprisingly, given the history of child welfare, family preservation and reunification programs are often criticized for keeping children with “unfit” children. Although AFDC and foster care are separate systems (aside from the federal funding sometimes available for foster care), the availability and generosity of AFDC clearly affects the number of families that come
under the jurisdiction of foster care. The purchasing power of AFDC grants has dropped dramatically since 1970. In 1990 inflation adjusted dollars, the median monthly AFDC grant for a family of three with no other income fell from $601 in 1970 to just $364 in 1990. Under these conditions, it should be no surprise that, after dropping in the 1970 and early 1980’s, the number of children in foster care has risen rapidly over the last decade (Tedford, 1992).

This recent urban surge in the foster care population has other important aspects: the number of infants under one year of age in foster care has risen; and, in some cities, many children are born addicted to drugs, including crack. Not only are more children entering foster care, but on the average, they stay longer. The combined effect of more admissions and lengthier stays has been a foster care population that is growing by leaps and bounds. An important additional reason for the increase in foster care caseloads has been the growing popularity of foster placements with relatives, that is, kinship care. By 1990, formal kinship foster care had become an important part of foster care services. Informal care by relatives, however, has always been used for large numbers of children without viable parents, and remains far more common. Between 1980 and 1992, the number of children being reared by their grandparents rose from two to three million, a number that dwarfs the foster care population (Tedford, 1992).

We saw an increase of over 6,000 youth whose parents had their right terminated continue to languish in foster care as legal orphans; from 123,000 youth in 2007 to 129,000 youth in 2008. This count does not include youth 16-18 years of age who choose not be adopted. There are over 500,000 children that currently reside in our nation’s foster care system. Today, the foster care system serves a population, whose
central problem is poverty, as it always has been. Tragically, however, the children now coming into foster care are poorer, younger, and far more troubled than those in the past, and they are staying in care longer periods of time (Jansson, 2005).

One crucial thread in the history of child placement is the role played by state governments as they became increasingly involved in child welfare. Governments almost always preferred placing and boarding children over institutional care, took far more than private agencies in investigating prospective foster homes, and usually made it clear that the child remained a state ward who could be removed at any time. In the twentieth century, government worked hand in hand with new professions, particularly social work, to shape child welfare (Jansson, 2005).

One of the most dramatic differences between placing out and today’s foster care system is the foster care is usually intended to provide temporary care for children, with the hope that they can someday be returned to their parents. Whereas a century ago placing out advocates sought to break up families, today’s foster care system hopes to reunite families, so long as the home provides a safe environment for children. Or at least that is the law; in practice, old habits die hard. In fact, the question of whether families should be kept together or children should be permanently removed from their parents remain. Current debates over whether families should receive services or lose their children echo those of the past (Jansson, 2005).

The questions asked by Homer Folks in 1921 are still relevant; whenever the question arises of removing a child from its home, three questions might be asked and objectively answered: first, is there any real and conclusive reason why the child should stay where it is? Second, what is lacking in his/her present home which deem necessary
for the child’s care, and just how is that particular thing going to be provided under our proposed plan? Third, how much will our proposed plan cost and would that sum, if used to assist the child in his own home, secure better results? These questions remain at the heart of decisions made every day by social workers; they are also at the center of debates over how to reform the foster care system. Perhaps realizing that they are very old questions, and that they have already been answered in a number of ways, can make the current debate more productive, and help the children who, through no fault of their own, enter the foster care system (Bass, Shields, & Behrman, 2004).

During the Progressive Era, the U.S. Children's Bureau was created in 1912 at the behest of Theodore Roosevelt, who several years earlier convened his first White House Conference on Children (Jansson, 2005). The Children’s Bureau was responsible for all issues pertaining to the welfare of children, including legislation, oversight of children's institutions and statistics on birth rates and infant mortality. More than 800,000 children spent some time in the foster care system in 2001, with approximately 540,000 children in foster care at any one time (Jansson, 2005).

After children are removed from their homes and placed in foster care, caseworkers develop a permanency plan based on an assessment of the child's individual needs and family circumstances. The court then reviews the permanency plan. For most children, the primary permanency plan is reunification with their birth parents. According to federal law, states must make "reasonable efforts" to provide birth parents with the services and supports they need to regain custody of their children. However, there are exceptions to this requirement. States are not required to pursue reunification under certain conditions. In these circumstances, alternative permanency options such as
adoption or legal guardianship are the goal for these children (Bass, Shields, & Behrman, 2004).

Under current law, if children are in foster care for 15 out of the previous 22 months, states are to recommend that parental rights be terminated and the child be made available for adoption. In 2001, there were 126,000 children who were no longer legally connected to their parents awaiting adoption. However, the child welfare agency can waive the termination requirement if birth parents are making progress in their case plans and workers believe they can reunify with their children soon, or if workers believe that another placement that does not require termination of parental rights, such as legal guardianship, is in the child's best interests. The average length of stay for children in foster care is approximately 33 months, but some children stay a much shorter time and some much longer.

According to 2001 data from the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS), approximately 38% of children who exited foster care in 2001 had spent 11 months or less in the system. At the other end of the spectrum, approximately 32% of children had been in care for 3 years or longer. The longer a child remains in care, the greater the likelihood that he or she will experience multiple placements. On average, approximately 85% of children who are in foster care for less than 1-year experience 2 or fewer placements, but placement instability increases with each year a child spends in the system. More than half (57%) of the children in foster care exit through reunification with their birth parents, although in recent years, reunification rates have declined (Bass, Shields, & Behrman, 2004).
Children who entered the system in 1997 had a 13% slower rate to reunification than those who entered in 1990. During this same period, the number of children who were adopted from foster care increased substantially. Most states have more than doubled the number of adoptions from foster care over the last seven years and some states reported tripling the number. Additionally, many states have increased the number of children achieving permanence by offering caregivers the option of becoming legal guardians (Bass, Shields, & Behrman, 2004).

Eventually, American reformers moved to specialize these services by building new institutions that focused on the specific needs of these children. Institutions such as Sunday Schools were formed to educate and provide training services to low-income street children. In addition, Character Building Institutions were set up for orphanages and the focuses of their services were to educate and teach children how to behave morally (Jansson, 2005). Sunday Schools and Character-Building Institutions were similar in that they developed educational programs to help these children socialize appropriately in the New World. Other institutions such as the Houses of Refuge were created for delinquent and neglected children only. The courts referred these children to the house/program. These programs provided several services; however, the primary focus was providing lecture study and physical labor to these children (Jansson, 2005).

As indicated in the History of Foster Care in United States (2006), Charles Loring Brace began the free foster home movement. Brace was a minister and director of the New York Children's Aid Society, who was concerned about the large number of immigrant children sleeping in the streets of New York. Brace devised a plan to provide homeless children shelter by advertising in the south and west for families willing to
provide free homes for these children, whether for charitable reasons or for whatever help these children could be to them. In many cases, these children were placed in circumstances similar to indentured servants. However, Brace's daring and creative action became the foundation for the foster care movement, as it exists today (National Advocate, 2006). Social agencies and state governments therefore became involved in foster home placements. Three states led the movement. Massachusetts, prior to 1865, began paying board to families who took care of children too young to be indentured. Pennsylvania passed the first licensing law in 1885, which made it a misdemeanor to care for two or more unrelated children without a license. South Dakota began providing subsidies to the Children's Home Society after it was organized in 1893 for its public childcare work (National Advocate, 2006).

Motivation

The following definitions of motivation were gleaned from a variety of psychology textbooks and reflect the general consensus that motivation is an internal state or condition that serves to activate or energize behavior and give it direction. Motivation can also be defined as a willingness to actively participate in planning and implementing actions. The later of the definitions will be utilized for throughout the paper. Most motivation theorist assumes that motivation is involved in the performance of all learned responses; that is, a learned behavior will not occur unless it is energized. The major questions among psychologists, in general, are whether motivation is a primary or secondary influence on behavior. That is, are changes in behavior development, emotion, explanatory style, or personality or are concepts unique to
motivation more pertinent. For example, we know that people respond to increasingly complex or novel events (or stimuli) in the environment up to a point and then responses decrease. This inverted-U shaped curve of behavior is well known and widely acknowledged. However, the major issue is one of explaining this phenomenon. Is this a conditioning (is the individual behaving because of past classical or operant conditioning), a motivational process (from an internal state of arousal), or is there some better explanation (Huitt, 2001).

Huitt (2001) further states, the relationship of motivation and emotion is not complex. Emotion can be defined as, an indefinite subjective sensation experienced as a state of arousal. This is different from motivation in that there is not necessarily a goal orientation affiliated with it. Emotions occur as a result of an interaction between perceptions of environmental stimuli, neural/hormonal responses to these perceptions (often labeled as feelings), and subjective labeling of these feelings. Evidence suggests there is a small core of core emotions that are uniquely associated with a specific facial expression. This implies that there are a small number of unique biological responses that are genetically hard wired to specific facial expressions.

A further implication is that the process works in reverse; if you want to change your feelings, you can do so by changing your facial expression. That is, if you are motivated to change how you feel and your feeling is associated with a specific facial expression, you can change that feeling by purposively changing your facial expression. Since most of us would rather feel happy than otherwise, the most appropriate facial expression would be a smile. In general, explanations regarding the sources of motivation can be categorized as either extrinsic (outside the person) or intrinsic (internal
to the person). Intrinsic sources and corresponding theories can be further subcategorized as either body/physical, mind/mental (i.e. cognitive, affective, conactive) or transpersonal/spiritual (Huitt, 2001).

In current literature, needs are now viewed as dispositions toward action (i.e., they create a condition that is predisposed towards taking action or making a change and moving in a certain direction). Action or overt behavior may be initiated by either positive or negative incentives or a combination of both. Sources of motivational needs can be behavioral/external which is defined as elicited by stimulus associated/connected to innately connected stimulus, obtain desires, pleasant consequences (rewards) or escape/avoid undesired, unpleasant consequences; social can be defined as, imitate positive models and be a part of a group or a valued member; biological can be defined as, increase/decrease stimulation (arousal), activate senses (taste, touch, smell, etc.), decrease hunger, thirst, discomfort, etc., and maintain homeostasis; cognitive can be defined as, maintain attention to something interesting or threatening, develop meaning or understanding, increase/decrease cognitive disequilibrium or uncertainty, solve a problem or make a decision, figure something out, and eliminate threat or risk; affective can be defined as, increase/decrease affective dissonance, increase feeling good, decrease feeling bad, decrease security of or decrease threats to self-esteem, and maintain levels of optimism and enthusiasm; conactive can be defined as, meet individually developed/selected goal, obtain personal dream, develop or maintain self-efficacy, take control of one’s life, eliminate threats to meeting goal, obtaining dream, and reduce others’ control of one’s life; spiritual can be defined as, understand purpose of one’s life and connect self to ultimate unknowns (Huitt, 2001).
Many of the theories of motivation address issues introduced previously in these materials. The following provides a brief overview to any terms or concepts that have been previously discussed. Each of the major theoretical approaches in behavioral learning theory posits a primary factor in motivation. Classical conditioning states that biological responses to associated stimuli energize and direct behavior. Operant learning states the primary factor is consequences; the application of reinforcers provides incentives to increase behavior; the application of punishers provides disincentives that result in a decrease in behavior (Urdan & Maehr, 1995).

There are several motivational theories that trace their roots to the information processing approach to learning. These approaches focus on the categories and labels people use help to identify thoughts, emotions, dispositions, and behaviors. A first cognitive approach is attribution theory. This theory proposes that every individual tries to explain success or failure of self and others by offering certain "attributions." These attributions are either internal or external and are either under control or not under control. In a teaching/learning environment, it is important to assist the learner to develop a self-attribution explanation of effort (internal, control). If the person has an attribution of ability (internal, control) as soon as the individual experiences some difficulties in the learning process, he or she will decrease appropriate learning behavior (e.g., I'm not good at this). If the person has an external attribution, then nothing the person can do will help that individual in a learning situation (i.e., responsibility for demonstrating what has been learned is completely outside the person). In this case, there is nothing to be done by the individual when learning problems occur (Urdan & Maehr, 1995).
Urdan and Maehr (1995) further state that a second cognitive approach is expectancy theory which proposes the following equation: motivation = Perceived Probability of Success (Expectancy); connection of Success and Reward (Instrumentality) and Value of Obtaining Goal (Valance, Value). Since these formal states that the three factors of Expectancy, Instrumentality, and Valance or Value are to be multiplied by each other, a low value in one will result in a low value of motivation. Therefore, all three must be present in order for motivation to occur. That is, if an individual doesn’t believe he or she can be successful at a task or the individual does not see a connection between his or her activity and success or the individual does not value the results of success, then the probability is lowered that the individual will engage in the required learning activity. From the perspective of this theory, all three variables must be high in order for motivation and the resulting behavior to be high.

The third cognitive approach is cognitive dissonance theory which is in some respects similar to disequilibrium in Piaget’s theory of cognitive development. This theory was developed by Leon Festinger, as a social psychologist, and states that when there is a discrepancy between two beliefs, two actions, or between a belief and an action, we will act to resolve conflict and discrepancies. The implication is that if we can create the appropriate amount of disequilibrium, this will in turn lead to the individual changing his or her behavior which in turn will lead to a change in thought patterns which in turn leads to more change in behavior (Urdan & Maehr, 1995).

One of the most influential writers in the area of motivation is Abraham Maslow. Maslow attempted to synthesize a large body of research related to human motivation. Prior to Maslow, researchers generally focused separately on such factors as biology,
achievement, or power to explain what energizes, directs, and sustains human behavior. Maslow posited a hierarchy of human needs based on two groupings; deficiency needs and growth needs. Within the deficiency needs, each lower need must be met before moving to the next higher level. Once each of these needs has been satisfied, if at some future time a deficiency is detected, the individual will act to remove the deficiency.

According to Maslow, an individual is ready to act upon the growth needs if and only if the deficiency needs are met. Maslow’s initial conceptualization included only one growth need, which is self-actualization. Self-actualized people are characterized by; 1) being problem focused; 2) incorporating an ongoing freshness of appreciation of life; 3) a concern about personal growth; and 4) the ability to have peak experiences. Maslow later differentiated the growth need of self-actualization, specifically naming two lower level growth needs prior to the general level of self-actualization and one beyond that level (Urdan & Maehr, 1995).

Maslow’s basic position is that as one becomes more self-actualized and self-transcendent, one becomes more wise (develops wisdom) and automatically knows what to do in a wide variety of situations. Maslow published his first conceptualization of his theory over 50 years ago and it has since become one of the most popular and often cited theories of human motivation. There is much work still to be done in this area before we can rely on a theory to be more informative than simply collecting and analyzing data. However, this body of research can be very important to parents, educators, administrators and others concerned with developing and using human potential. It provides an outline of some important issues that must be addressed if
human beings are to achieve the levels of character and competencies necessary to be successful in the information age (Daniel, 2001).

Maslow’s work lead to additional attempts to develop a grand theory of motivation, a theory that would put all of the factors influencing motivation into one model. Social cognition theory proposes reciprocal determination as a primary factor in both learning and motivation. In this view, the environment, an individual’s behavior and the individual’s characteristics (e.g., knowledge, emotions, and cognitive development) both influence and are influences by each other two components.

Bandura highlights self-efficacy (the belief that a particular action is possible and that the individual can accomplish it) and self-regulation (the establishment of goals, the development of a plan to attain those goals, the commitment to implement that plan, the actual implementation of the plan, and subsequent actions of reflection and modification or redirection. One classification of motivation differentiates among achievement, power, and social factors. In the area of achievement motivation, the work on goal-theory has differentiated three separate types of goals; mastery goal (also called learning goals) which focuses on gaining competence or mastering a new set of knowledge or skills; performance goals (also called ego-involvement goals) which focus in achieving normative based standards, doing better than others, or doing well without a lot of effort and social goals which focus on relationships among people (Daniel, 2001).

In the context of school learning, which involves operating a relatively structured environment; students with mastery goals outperform students with either performance or social goals. However, in life success, it seems critical that individuals have all three types of goals in order to be very successful. One aspect of this theory is that individuals
are motivated to either avoid failure (more often associated with performance goals) or achieve success (more often associated with mastery goals). In the former situation, the individual is more likely to select easy or difficult tasks, thereby either achieving success or having a good excuse for why failure occurred. In the latter situation, the individual is more likely to select moderately difficult tasks which will provide an interesting challenge, but still keep the high expectations for success (Huit, 2001).

Stipek (1998) suggests there are a variety of reasons why individuals may be lacking in motivation and provides a list of specific behaviors associated with high academic achievement. There are nine reasons why individuals lack motivation; 1) Do not have a written list of important goals that define success for you personality; 2) Believe that present goals or activities are wrong with you; 3) Feelings/emotions about present activities are generally negative; 4) Don’t have or believe you don’t have the ability to do present activities or obtain future goals; 5) Satisfaction of achieving goals seems in distant future; 6) Present activities not seen as related to important goals; 7) Important goals conflict with present activities; 8) Extrinsic incentives are low; and 8) Personal problems interfere with present activities. This is an excellent checklist to help students develop the conactive component of their lives.

In addition, teacher efficacy is a powerful input variable related to student achievement. There are a variety of specific actions that teachers can take to increase motivation on classroom tasks. In general, these fall into the two categories discussed; intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. As a general rule, teachers need to use as much of the intrinsic suggestions as possible while recognizing that not all students will be appropriately motivated by them. The extrinsic suggestions will work, but it must be
remembered that they do so only as long as the student is under the control of the teacher. When outside of that control, unless the desired goals and behaviors have been internalized, the learner will cease the desired behavior and operate according to his or her internal standards or to other external factors (Stipek, 1998).

Behaviors

The well-being of children in care presents a challenge to child welfare systems internationally. Increasing attention is being paid to their education, emotional health and behavioral development. Several studies have suggested they are significantly more likely to exhibit psychological problems than children in the general population. Indications of emotional and behavioral concerns that are in the clinical range also come from studies on mental health service utilization by children and young people in care (Stahmer, et al., 2005). High rates of disturbance are attributed to the interaction of pre-care adversities and negative in-care experiences. A significant number of children come from deprived and disadvantaged backgrounds compounded by neglect, maltreatment and domestic violence.

Evidence is also cited that children in care do respond to positive change in environments and develop satisfying attachments with new care-givers. The phenomenon of children experiencing discontinuities in care is widely documented. There is a distressing level of placement instability in foster-care as the numbers of emotionally disturbed children and adolescents with high support needs escalate. Emerging research demonstrates a strong relationship between placement instability and high mental health service usage by children in care (Rubin, et al., 2006). Recent studies examining the
complex relationship between placement disruption and children's psycho-social problems note that children who experience multiple changes in care-givers tend to develop elevated emotional and behavioral problems, which, in turn, trigger placement breakdown. Children with externalizing behaviors are particularly vulnerable to placement breakdown.

Children's psychological needs are also evident in the educational context, as they impact on educational achievement and engagement with schooling. Studies undertaken internationally point to the educational deficits which children bring to the care experience. Among the factors uncovered by these studies is low educational attainment, poor attendance, overrepresentation in school exclusion, suspension, frequent school changes as a consequence of placement breakdown, low completion rates and high unemployment among those who age out of the system (Pecora, et al., 2006).

In sum, research draws attention to the negative impact of pre-care experiences as well as the role of both care and educational systems. In relation to the latter, failure to prioritize education, low expectations and disruption in the care environment accompanied by disrupted schooling combine to place children in care at risk of educational disadvantage (Elliot, 2002; Harker, et al., 2004).

Children in care experience a number of adversities which threaten their well-being. The combination of established factors, such as parental characteristics, maltreatment histories as well as experiences resulting from protective care interventions such as volatile placement trajectories, disrupted attachments and interrupted schooling experiences, influences emotional and behavioral outcomes (Stanley, et al., 2005). Previous research has identified relationships between unstable placement careers and
children's emotional and behavioral problem. While children's behavioral problems may impact on stability of placements, it may be simplistic to overlook system-related deficits that jeopardize placement outcomes.

Placement instability is the outcome of poor initial decisions and lack of support to foster-carers. Strengthening professional decision making to ensure children are less likely to move and investing in support of carers are important in improving stability. Planned monitoring of children at increased risk of instability in care, supported with additional professional services to deal with transitions and disrupted attachments, is crucial. Previous research has also shown stable care to have a positive impact on outcomes. James' (2004) statistical simulations conducted to evaluate the expected effects of placement stability on outcomes predict a 22 and 17.8 per cent decrease in negative outcomes in mental health and education, respectively. The level of emotional and behavioral concerns warrants attention.

There is a clear need for systems to identify children in need of professional support early and target necessary resources. Systematic gathering of foster-carers' perceptions early in placement to identify vulnerabilities of children is important. Documenting carers' experiences of and responses to children's emotional and behavioral impairments will help in targeting timely resources to children in need of them most, while recognizing carers as integral to the professional service team (Sinclair, Gibbs, & Wilson, 2004). The contribution of carers is examined more fully in separate analyses. There are also implications for supporting carers in enhancing their relationship with troubled children. Implied in this is a range of training needs focused on enabling carers to understand the impact of maltreatment and care histories on children, and
skilling foster parents in approaches needed for the sensitive management of children’s emotional and behavioral problems.

Much of the available literature also points to the negative impact of low expectations for the educational achievements of children in care. Found in their research into children’s views on what would assist them in their studies that children want an adult to take interest and encourage them to do well in their school work. Education for children in care must become a priority for social workers and carers when addressing care plans and for governments’ social investment agenda to compensate for previous social disadvantage (Berridge, 2007).

The social and economic environment in which children and adolescents develop appears to be the most important predictor of their overall well-being. A vast amount of research evidence demonstrates that children and adolescents living in poverty suffer from negative life events and persistent strains that are damaging to their positive development. In addition, studies indicate that there are strong and consistent links between poverty and children’s poor academic competence. Specifically, children in poverty are at high risk for academic problems (Ripple & Luthar, 2000). Overall, impoverished children are more likely to have difficulty in school, low academic performance, school dropout, low scores on standardized tests, and low levels of intelligence test scores, and are less likely to attend or graduate from high school or college, than are their more affluent counterparts (Caughy & O’Campo, 2006).
Academic Performance

O’Hare (2008) discusses the education of the 700,000 U.S. children in foster care and what the government may do for them. O’Hare of Kids Count comments on the ability of foster families to provide educational opportunities to foster children, which is likely due to a smaller income, lack of higher educations, and unemployment among foster parents. Foster children, research have shown, are more likely to dropout of school, be placed in special education, or repeat grades. A host of child, family, school, and community factors place children at increased risk for academic underachievement. For example, prenatal complications, social skills deficits, single parent status, large family size, parental psychopathology, family conflict, harsh and inconsistent parenting, peer rejection, lack of social support, neighborhood characteristics, and low teacher expectations have all been identified as risk factors. These factors influence each other as well as outcomes in complex ways that are both direct and indirect. The number of risks faced strongly predicts negative outcomes and low SES children are most vulnerable to these risk factors.

There has been some progress in uncovering processes, causality, and development is moderated by parent background and beliefs. Fortunately, not all who face these risks develop negative outcomes. Resiliency research increasingly emphasized in recent years is important conceptually in recognizing the strengths of children and families, and practically for promoting achievement. Resilience, competence, and related constructs are often defined differently, but consistent protective factors have been identified despite variation in operationalizing constructs, good cognitive functioning, positive temperament, high sociability, close peer friendships, internal locus of control,
sense of self-efficacy, high expectations for self, positive sense of self, engagement in activities, close relationship with an adult, effective parenting, access to consistent and warm care giving, presence of positive adult role models, and strong connections with school (Doll & Lyon, 1998).

Resiliency research has increasingly integrated school factors, and suggests that teachers’ interpersonal behavior (i.e., support, friendliness), teaching strategies, classroom environment, administrative policies, and student competencies can be a positive influence for at risk students. Less research has explored the mechanisms of these protective factors, in part because of conceptual and methodological challenges. For instance, a particular factor may be protective for one child, a risk factor for another, and neutral for another. Protective factors may reduce problems directly, lower risk factors, or interact with risk factors to diminish their influence, furthermore, children may be successful in some areas but not others, suggesting that thinking of resilience in simple undimensional terms may not be very useful. Nevertheless, the conceptualization of protective factors provides structure for learning about these processes within development and for translating findings to assist in prevention and intervention.

Parenting can protect child from negative educational outcomes. Appropriate and consistent discipline (firm, clear rules, appropriate consequences, and monitoring of behavior), in combination high parental warmth, is associated with achievement (Hill, 2002).

Positive relationships with family, teachers, and other adults are strong protective factors in providing guidance, mentoring, role models, feedback, and resources. Foster children attain higher levels of education when their parents and/or caretakers serve as
roles models. Feelings of social belonging and community at school have been associated with academic interest and psychological adjustment. Furthermore, children’s perception of supportive relationships with teachers is associated with school satisfaction, and children who enjoy school receive more support from teachers, suggesting that positive cycles can form (Hill, 2002).

Parent and/or caretaker involvement in education is another important factor for building social and academic competence. Examples include contacting teachers, attending schools functions, monitoring academic progress, and providing assistance with schoolwork. Increased parent and/or caretaker involvement in school reduces the negative effects of poverty on educational achievement and socioemotional adjustment. Successful early involvement has been shown to be a mechanism through which interventions can produce long-term effects on achievement and grade retention. Urban, low-SES children with parents and/or caretakers actively involved in their schooling showed less aggression despite exposure to violence than children with parents and/or caretakers who are less involved. Parents of low-SES children are likely to have had their own school difficulties, which in turn may decrease their comfort with parent school interactions (Miedel & Reynolds, 1999).

Any research that ties contextual influences to academic development will further educational research, but four specific research areas are suggested. First, the compelling data that show externalizing problems are a key risk in academic failure among boys justifies experimental evaluation that will incorporate externalizing treatments more directly into academic programs and settings. A second target for research is mental health influences on academic progress among girls. The utility of
addressing anxiety and depression, two of the most treatable problems in clinical psychology, is potentially high. Third, resiliency research has only recently been directly linked to education, and must be extended. We need to understand how educational resilience may operate differently depending in gender, SES, race, and ethnic background. Fourth, closer study of moderating factors associated with cultural differences would facilitate a better match of mental health programs to various cultural needs to promote mental health in minority communities (Arnold & Doctoroff, 2003).

Implementation barriers often prevent the results from clinical and developmental research. From being applied successfully to educational settings. Factors influencing participation require explicit research since families with multiple stressors are least likely to participate. An understanding of portability, trainability, and the factors influencing implementation choices are essential. Little is known about the supports necessary to move programs successfully from research to applied settings. Given the multiple factors related to academic success, reform has been predictably difficult (Greenberg, Domitrovich, & Bumbarger, 2001).

On the one hand, research is often misapplied, with a focus on isolated skills or child factors that do not sufficiently consider the context and are not broad enough to secure overall success. On the other hand, it is not practical to intervene in all aspects of a child’s life and overly broad attempts may be either overwhelming or too diffuse. Research and theory need to guide the choice of key leverage points and strategies for continued support. An ultimate goal is that careful research can be used to tailor programs to the specific needs of individual children, although with our current knowledge such a matching program is not yet feasible (Greenberg, et al., 2001).
Greenberg, et al. (2001) further states, extensive work remains in understanding and facilitating the educational achievement of low SES children. At the same time, tremendous progress has been recorded in some areas, and dramatic gains can be anticipated on several fronts. The recent burst of well planned research funding initiatives leaves us optimistic. Ultimately, the best solution for the educational difficulties of children raised in poverty will be poverty reduction; even ideal educational practices cannot eliminate the devastating impact of inadequate resources. Nevertheless, improved education for low SES children would promote success and thereby help reduce poverty and the host of associated disadvantages.

According to data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Service’s Children’s Bureau, the number of children in foster care nationwide increased 93 percent between 1986 and 1999, from approximately 280,000 children to 581,000 children. Approximately 70 percent of the children in foster care in 1999 (405,000) were school-age children. The following paragraphs provide a definition of foster care before discussing the influence of foster care on students’ academic growth and development. Foster care is a substitute arrangement for children whose families are not able to provide basic social, emotional, and physical care, and who therefore require a substitute caregiver to assume the parental role to provide care, supervision, and support, on a short- or long-term basis. According to the Child Welfare League of America, “children should be removed from their parents and placed in out-of-home care only when it is necessary to ensure their safety and well-being” (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2003, p. 19).
Foster care (i.e., out-of-home care) is part of an array of child-welfare services that includes family support programs, family preservation programs, and permanency planning. The array can be described as a continuum, with out-of-home care viewed as a third line defense, following family preservation programs. Family support efforts focus on the prevention of child abuse and neglect, working to educate parents and alleviate a multitude of stressors that may increase the likelihood of maltreatment. Family preservation programs, foster care, and permanency planning efforts occur after a charge of child abuse or neglect has been substantiated by the public child-welfare agency.

Family preservation programs, though not instituted in all abuse and neglect cases, provide intensive, in-home services in an effort to avoid out-of-home placement. Permanency planning - efforts to establish a permanent home for the child, either with his or her biological family, through adoption, or in legal guardianship - begins immediately, and permanency is the final goal for a child involved with the child-welfare system.

Foster care is defined as a temporary arrangement for children while their families work to resolve the issues that resulted in an out-of-home placement for the child. However, foster care may also be a long-term option when other permanency efforts (i.e., family reunification, adoption, legal guardianship) are not successful (Tremblay, 1999).

Children may live in a variety of foster-care settings, depending on the characteristics of their case. Children with urgent substitute care needs may be placed in receiving or shelter homes for a short period of time. Like the array of child-welfare services, the remaining foster-care placement settings can be viewed as a continuum from the least restrictive environment and level of service intensity to the most restrictive environment and level of service intensity. In kinship foster care, children are placed with
a relative; licensing requirements and eligibility for a foster-care payment for costs associated with raising the child depend on policies set by individual states. Family foster care is provided by foster parents who are licensed by a state or county after completing minimal training and meeting health and safety standards, and they receive a federal or state foster care payment for each child residing in their home (Seyfried, Pecora, Downs, Levine, & Emerson, 2000).

Foster family agencies are private agencies contracted and licensed by the state or county to provide substitute care similar to family foster care but often with a greater level of service intensity. Group homes and residential treatment centers serve children with more specialized needs (i.e., emotional and behavioral difficulties) than other placement settings, are generally operated by private agencies contracted and licensed by the state or county, are more restrictive in their environment and therapeutic in their focus, and are staffed by individuals with more specific skills (Seyfried, et al., 2000).

School-age children in foster care have any number of life experiences that make them vulnerable to bad outcomes, particularly if those experiences occurred at a young age. Judith A. Silver provides an overview of the risk factors frequently experienced by children who become involved with the child-welfare system and are placed in foster care. Citing Arnold Sameroff, Silver (1999) notes that the link between risk factors and outcomes is not deterministic, but the risk factors increase the likelihood of having a negative outcome, such as low test scores. Poverty, the principal risk factor, is a condition faced by the majority of families known to the child-welfare system. Poverty's impact ranges beyond low-socioeconomic status, influencing the effect of other risk factors.
A second risk factor, maternal substance abuse, is associated with negative outcomes for children (i.e., low birth weight, premature birth) that influence neurodevelopmental functioning. Exposure to violence, whether during pregnancy or in the home as a child, is another important risk factor that affects a child's mental health as well as his or her cognitive development and ability to learn. Attachment (the stable, emotional connection with a caregiver) is an important consideration for children in foster care, given that the natural parenting structure has collapsed, children have been removed from their biological families, and face placement within a new and unfamiliar home with new and unfamiliar people. Finally, a substantial proportion of children in foster care are there due to the maltreatment inflicted upon them by a caregiver. Maltreatment can vary (physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect), but “all forms have predictable outcomes: devastating effects on sense of self, and emotional, social, and cognitive capabilities” (Silver, 1999, p. 23).

Silver (1999) reported that the impact of foster care on student learning is difficult to assess. The difficulty is due to what Gilles Tremblay calls a "constellation of factors" that determines the influence of foster care on a child. Tremblay has organized the factors into five categories: (1) factors relating to the child; (2) familial factors; (3) placement factors; (4) factors related to professional assistance; and (5) external factors. Parsing out the influence of these additional variables to gauge the unique effect of being in care on student learning is problematic.

The educational standing of school-age foster children while in foster care and when leaving foster care is less ambiguous. Researchers using cognitive assessments, academic achievement outcomes, school completion outcomes, and school behavior
outcomes as a measure of scholastic achievement have found that children are not faring well while in foster care, or when they leave the foster-care system at the point of their eighteenth birthday. School-age children in foster care have not fared well in general IQ assessments or on more specific assessments of cognitive functioning. According to reports by Annick Dumaret (1985), Mary Fox and Kathleen Arcuri (1980), and Theresa McNichol and Constance Tash (2001), average IQ scores were 100 or below, and a high number of those studied (up to 46%) were rated as doing poorly on assessments of cognitive functioning.

Performance at the age-appropriate grade level, grade retention, course grades, test scores, and graduation are common indicators of academic performance. A number of studies have found that large percentages (up to 47%) of children in foster care were performing below grade level and that children in foster care were behind in their progress or performing below average across a range of academic subjects. In addition, a high percentage (up to 90%) of children in foster care repeated at least one grade over their academic career. Researchers also reported that low percentages of students in foster care achieved passing grades, and many had low grade point averages. Children in foster care did not make gains in standardized test scores over time while in care, and scores were below the fiftieth percentile. School completion percentages were low for children discharged from foster care on their eighteenth birthday and a high percentage of children in foster care reported dropping out of school (Silver, 1999).

School behavior outcomes are important components of educational progress. Attendance appeared to be problematic for some children in foster care, as did general classroom behavior. Study findings for suspension and expulsions were less definitive.
Assessing the impact of foster care on student learning is difficult due to the influence of various factors. However, research indicates that school-age children in foster care face difficulties in the learning process. Additional research, as well as policies and interventions, are required to assist children in achieving educational goals to ensure a lasting quality of life (Blome, 1997).

Education

**Foster Care and Non-foster Care Students**

Many students in foster care are not being provided equitable education or opportunities for achievement. Large numbers of them do not have success to the many special programs, advance placement courses, extracurricular clubs, and sports, and other activities that are vital to obtaining a well rounded education. Furthermore, many of them are not stimulated to pursue further education. Children in foster care have been labeled as abused, neglected, and throwaways, homeless, mentally ill, and a host of other titles, all conveying some form of dysfunction on the part of the individual (Schwartz, 2000).

Jacobson (2008) discusses the education of the 700,000 U.S. children in foster care and what the government may do for them. William O’Hare of Kids Count comments on the ability of foster families to provide educational opportunities to foster children, which is likely due to a smaller income, lack of higher education, and unemployment among foster parents. Research has shown that foster children are more likely to dropout of school, be placed in special education, or repeat grades. Policy makers from Congress to the state and local levels are sharpening their focus on the
educational needs of children in foster care, a population that can exceed 700,000
nationally in the course of a year and which has doubled in the past two decades.

Some of the signs that there is a renewed attention to the educational needs of
children in foster care are, the reauthorization of the federal Head Start preschool
program last fall lists children on foster care as one of the groups designated to receive
priority for enrollment, foster children are included in the federal McKinney Vento Act,
which is meant to provide school stability, transportation, and other educational services
for homeless children, and a six state project launched by the National Government
Association last month which included improved school performance for foster children
as one of its goals in an effort to cut the number of children in foster care by 50 percent
in the next 12 years (Jacobson, 2008).

Children who reside outside of their family of origin require, like all children,
unconditional love, adult guidance, emotional and financial support, a stable home, and
access to the education as possible. These requires responsible adults to care for them
and to utilize all available resources, talents, and gifts to access quality community based
services, including an academic environment that best fits the individual’s academic
potential.

One program noted for its exceptional educational success stories is Boys Hope
Girls Hope, a residential program for abused, neglected, and abandoned preadolescents.
There are 36 such homes in 17 states in the United States and three foreign countries.
This nationally and internationally known and recognized program is not part of the
traditional foster care system, where children are placed in group homes or foster homes
for up to two years. The program provides a host of services in many inner cities for
poor but academically capable youth, whose parents, grandparents, and legal guardians are unable to care for them. Children and adolescents reside in a community based program for several years, or until the family can take them back into the home, which unfortunately is not very often (DeCesare, 2004).

In this program, residents reside in homes located in a community where neighborhood youths play and attend many of the same schools as the young people of Boys Hope Girls Hope. There is no labeling or discriminatory behavior. There are no neighborhood and community planning board protests. The community accepts these individuals as a part of their own extended family, which greatly enhances the positive adjustment of the youth. Certainly, in today’s day and age of “no residential programs in my back yard” (DeCesare, 2004, p. 219) and “no homes for adolescents in my community” (p. 219), this relationship is extraordinary.

Perhaps the most outstanding service of this agency is its ability to place children and youth who are defined as “problematic” and “not working up to their academic potential” in an educational setting that best meets the individual’s academic needs. To place a young person, who is considered in residential placement (foster care), in one of the finest schools available requires the commitment of many thousands of privately committed dollars each year. It requires the willingness of board members, individuals, foundations, corporate sponsors, staff, educators, and above all, the youth themselves to think beyond attending the traditional public school (DeCesare, 2004).

The ability to think outside the box by exploring various alternative schools, most in the private sector of education, has offered these young people one of the finest educations imaginable. This process has continued to thrive, as over the last 12 years
100 percent of its graduates, now young adults, have gone on to colleges and universities, including Boston College, Harvard, and a litany of others. The program offers needy, but academically capable boys and girls, who are willing, an opportunity for higher education.

The program founders believe that every child, given the proper resources and means of support, will be able to finish his or her schooling and this graduate from the program with the resources necessary to be a responsible, contributing adult. In their minds and in the minds of young people they serve, there is no mountain too high to scale, no goal too large for attainment, and no young person who would be labeled as disposable. Graduates of the program are now practicing physicians, lawyers, social workers, bond traders, psychologist, and other well recognized and well offering troubled and “acting out” adolescents an alternative from the often over crowded, understaffed, and sometimes academically poor schools located in violent drug ridden neighborhoods can set the tone for a positive future (DeCesare, 2004).

Academic achievement has a positive effect on youth self-esteem (Trautwein, Ludtke, Koller, & Baumert, 2006), which is considered one of the primary contributors to the “positive identity” asset according to the Search Institute. For youth in foster care, such achievement may be facilitated by schools and/or district continuity, limiting residential placement changes, school record (including psychoeducational testing reports) maintenance and availability, tutoring and the active involvement of caseworkers, counselors, and mentors in youth’s academic lives. In addition, high quality foster care services have been found to help youth complete high school (Pecora, et al., 2006). Comprehensive educational assessments are recommended immediately
following entry into foster care. Among children and youth with learning challenges, early identification is now possible, often as early as kindergarten and needed remediation should begin as early as possible (Pratt & Patel, 2007).

Horwitz, Owens, and Simms (2000) examined educational needs identification rates for children and adolescents entering foster care. Rates of educational remediation referrals and services were significantly higher among the children and adolescents receiving assessments from a multidisciplinary team than among those followed by their usual community care providers and/or children that are not in the foster care system.

Zetlin, Weinberg, and Kimm (2004) examined the school performance of 120 youth in foster care the year before and the year after 60 of the youth were served by a program that promotes collaboration among multiple agencies to serve their academic needs and included an education specialist trained to work with youth in care. Results indicated that control group participants’ math and reading test scores declined over the interim, while the treatment group participants’ math and reading test improved. The education specialist involved in the program was assigned cases of youth in foster care by child welfare agency workers when they were unable to resolve youth’s education related problems. The education specialists reported resolution of 50 percent of the problems with one or two inquiries of actions.

Challenges

One of the major challenges in education today is improving of classroom instruction for students at risk of failure. Most of these students come from disadvantaged circumstances that heighten the probability that they will not be successful
in school. There are differential expectations for students who are considered disadvantaged, they have high non-completion rates, are unresponsive, have high truancy and disciplinary problems, or are not adequately prepared for the future (Waxman & Pardon, 1995). In recent years, the number of students who could be considered at risk of school failure or "educationally disadvantaged" has increased and their degree of "disadvantage" has also increased. In the 1988 National Education Longitudinal Study, for example, about 41 percent of foster care eighth grade students were characterized as having two or more risk factors (e.g., from single parent homes, having a sibling who dropped out of school, or home alone after school 3 or more hours a day).

Furthermore, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989, estimated that about 25 percent of 10 to 17 year old youth may be extremely vulnerable to multiple high risk behaviors (e.g., school failure and substance abuse) and another 25 percent may be at moderate risk. Another concern is that percentages of students performing below grade level significantly increases between the third and eighth grade. Furthermore, the discrepancy between foster care and non-foster care students also dramatically increases during this time span, with over 40 percent of foster care students being at least one grade level behind their expected normal achievement levels by the eighth grade (U.S. National Center for Education Statistics, 1991).

These findings and other indicators like the high drop out rates for foster care students and students in urban schools (Carson, Huelskamp & Woodall, 1993) and the failures of students who do well on high level applications, complex reasoning, and problem solving (Mullis, Owen, & Phillips, 1990) illustrate the critical status of students who are currently at risk for of failure in our nation's schools.
Another reason for the poor academic performance of foster children in school is the fact that so many are eligible for special education because they are exposed to alcohol before birth. As a result, many children are diagnosed with fetal alcohol syndrome or the effects of fetal alcohol syndrome. Some teachers’ and social workers’ attitudes also affect foster children’s performance in school. Some teachers and social workers are unaware of or are insensitive to the children’s problems and do not offer proper encouragement. Teachers and social workers may believe it is a waste of time to sustain commitments to these youth because they will not be at the school for a long period of time. Teachers and social workers may have the preconceived notion that the children who are in foster care are not bright enough to profit from their efforts; therefore they do not bother with them (Powers & Stotland, 2002).

According to Jacobson (2008), there are a range of challenges facing children in foster care placement. Foster care providers tend to have fewer resources to support learning than do traditional families, for example, the U.S. Census Bureau data shows the average income in foster households is lower than that of traditional homes with children (56,364 compared to 74,301). In addition, foster parents are more likely than traditional parents to be unemployed and have less than a high school education. These factors can have serious drawbacks for the educational success of children in foster care. Foster families that fewer human resources and fewer financial resources, which also has a negative impact on the educational success of children in foster care.

The association’s Center for Best Practices has chosen six states (Arkansas, Florida, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina) to participate in a pilot program that aims to bring down the number of children in out of home placements. One
of the state’s tasks will be to improve collaboration among various agencies that all might have an interest in helping the same child. A lack of cooperation between social workers and educators is often blamed for gaps in children’s learning and while the primary aim is to bring down the numbers of children in foster care, the initiative also will seek to improve school performance (Jacobson, 2008).

The estimated 518,000 American children currently in foster care are among the most at-risk children in American society. Research shows that adults who were formerly in foster care are more likely than the general population to succumb to poor life outcomes. Former foster children are more likely to become homeless, incarcerated, or dependent on state services. Foster children face many challenges in life. For those in long-term care, one major obstacle is the difficult transition out of state care into adulthood. Education is a key factor in determining whether a foster child successfully makes this transition. Regrettably, many foster children do not. Compared to their peers, foster children have lower scores on standardized tests and higher absenteeism, tardiness, truancy, and dropout rates. Policymakers should improve educational opportunities for children in foster care. One promising reform is to provide foster children with school choice options. For example, offering tuition scholarships to foster children could address common problems such as instability and persistent low expectations. Expanding school choice options for foster children would also encourage schools to tailor educational services to meet foster children's unique needs (Lips, 2007).

Understanding the need to improve educational opportunities for children in foster care begins by understanding the foster care system. The Code of Federal Regulations defines foster care as "24-hour substitute care for children placed away from
their parents or guardians” (Lips, 2007, p. 90). For a variety of reasons, children in foster care have been removed from the homes of their birth families and placed under state care. Some children ultimately are returned to their birth families or placed for adoption. Others end up in long-term foster care. Nationally, roughly half of all foster children will spend at least one year in foster care, with 20 percent staying longer than three years and 9 percent staying for more than five years. Unlike their peers in traditional families, many foster children do not have an adequate safety net or social network and cannot rely on parents or other relatives to facilitate a smooth transition out of the home and into adulthood (Lips, 2007).

A large body of research suggests that children in foster care are among the most at risk for poor life outcomes in American society. Adults who were formerly in foster care are more likely than the general population to be homeless, unprepared for employment and limited to low-skill jobs, and dependent on welfare or Medicaid. They are also more likely to be convicted of crimes and incarcerated, to succumb to drug and alcohol abuse, or to have poor physical or mental health. Women who have been in foster care experience higher rates of early pregnancy and may be more likely to see their own children placed in foster care (Lips, 2007).

Lips (2007) further states research shows that problems begin early for many foster children. For example, a study of 4,500 foster children in Washington state public schools found that children placed in foster care scored 16 percent to 20 percent below non-foster children on state standardized tests. These results are consistent with national trends. The National Conference of State Legislatures reported that foster children had “high rates of grade retention; lower scores on standardized tests; and higher
absenteeism, tardiness, truancy and dropout rates” (p. 90) when compared to the general population.

The American School Board Journal found that “foster children often repeat a grade and are twice as likely as the rest of the population to drop out before graduation” (Lips, 2007, p. 90). Overall, a synthesis of available research evidence reached the conclusion that “almost all of the reviewed studies of those who were in out-of-home care reveal that the subject’s average level of educational attainment is below that of other citizens of comparable age” (p. 90). Researchers have identified a number of problems that foster children commonly experience in the education and child welfare systems. These problems include instability, persistent low expectations, and poor adult advocacy on their behalf, inadequate life-skills training, special education needs, and cultural sensitivities. Understanding these common problems and unique needs will help policymakers to design reforms to improve educational opportunities for children in foster care (Lips, 2007).

Frequent out-of-home placements can lead to school transfers because children can be required to change schools when they change addresses. For example, the Vera Institute of Justice reports that in New York City between 1995 and 1999, 42 percent of children changed schools within 30 days of entering foster care, based on statistics provided by the city's child welfare agency. Research evidence suggests that frequent school transfers and disruptions in the learning process can take a toll on a student's learning development. For example, a 1994 study by the General Accounting Office reported that third-grade students who had experienced frequent school changes were more likely to perform below grade level in reading and math or to repeat a grade than
were students who had never changed schools. It is not surprising, therefore, that
frequent school transfers would negatively affect foster children (McDonald, Allen,
Westerfelt, & Piliavin, 1996).

A research synthesis reported that former foster children who experienced fewer
out-of-home placements performed better in school and completed more years of
education than did others in foster care. A survey of former foster children found that
they “strongly believed that they had been shifted around too much while in foster care,
and as a result, they suffered, especially in terms of education” (McDonald, Allen,
Westerfelt, & Piliavin, 1996, p. 22). School transfers can create gaps in the learning
cycle. They force children to adjust to new classroom settings, teachers, and classmates
and cause children to lose social networks, peer groups, and relationships with adults.
These changes can exacerbate the emotional instability and unrest caused by home
transfers. Reducing instability for foster children is identified by researchers and
advocates as a way to improve the foster care system (McDonald, et al., 1996).

One way to improve educational options for children in foster care would be to
allow them to attend a public or private school of choice using a tuition scholarship.
Foster children could be offered education vouchers on a voluntary basis to enroll and
remain in a public or private school of their or their guardians' choice. Such a program
could be geared to address common problems such as instability, persistent low
expectations, poor adult advocacy, life-skills training needs, special education needs, and
cultural sensitivities. Giving foster children the opportunity to attend a school of choice
could help to address the common problem of educational instability. A scholarship or
choice option would allow them to remain in the same school (whenever geographically
possible) even when placed in a new home setting (McDonald, Allen, Westerfelt, & Piliavin, 1996).

The Vera Institute of Justice, an advocacy organization for foster children, observed that "keeping school as a point of stability can help foster children succeed educationally and give them peers and caring adults to help them weather the changes at home" (McDonald, et al., 1996, p. 22). Allowing for greater choice in education could accomplish this goal in many cases and address a common problem for many foster children who experience frequent transfers. Enabling greater stability could also yield social benefits. Surveys of foster children have identified building a sense of community and maintaining peer groups as important factors in their development. It stands to reason that allowing a child to stay in the same school could positively influence some foster children by allowing them to maintain long-term friendships and peer groups. This could help to provide a sense of belonging and community for foster children, who often lack strong social networks at home (McDonald, et al., 1996).

For other children, a school transfer may be the key to better educational opportunities. Many foster children could benefit from the opportunity to attend a higher-quality school of choice. Research studies of existing school choice programs have reported that students receiving vouchers to attend a school of choice improve academically when compared with their peers who remain in public schools. Other research evidence suggests that school choice programs improve participating families' satisfaction with their children's schools. Therefore, having the option of attending a school of choice would likely improve the learning opportunities of many foster children (McNeil, 2007).
Foster children face challenges in life that are different from those faced by the general population. For example, former foster children have identified the need for more life-skills instruction to help to prepare them for the transition to independence in adulthood. Allowing foster children to attend a school of choice could create an environment in which schools would have new incentives to deliver services that meet these specific needs. For example, a group in Baltimore City has proposed creating a public charter school that focuses on providing a quality education to foster children. A specialized school like this could employ teachers and counselors who are trained and prepared to meet foster children's unique needs (Lips, 2007).

For some foster children, attending such a school could be an improvement over the traditional school setting. Improving educational opportunities for children in foster care could have additional benefits beyond the classroom. One common challenge in the foster care system is recruiting and retaining foster parents. The National Conference of State Legislatures has reported that "turnover among foster parents is extremely high; some agencies lose from 30 to 50 percent of their caregivers every year. In many communities, attracting quality foster parents is an ongoing problem. Policymakers have sought to address this problem through promotional efforts or by increasing stipend amounts. However, other factors may affect a foster parent's decision to continue as a caregiver. For example, in a government survey of foster parents who were leaving the foster care system, 46 percent cited having "no say in the child's future" as a top reason for leaving. Reforms that improve the educational experience of foster children and give families the opportunity to choose a quality school for their child would likely improve
the overall foster care experience and thus help to alleviate the shortage of foster parents (Lips, 2007).

Federal, state, and local policymakers should amend existing programs to improve education options for foster children. As policymakers design these reforms, they should consider four important principles. Specifically, if a scholarship program allows foster families to choose a religious school for the child, policymakers may face state-level constitutional challenges and the practical question of who should be authorized to make the decision on behalf of the child. Policymakers should work to address these questions in a manner that allows for the greatest flexibility for foster families to find the best educational opportunities for the child while maintaining proper oversight and checks and balances. Legislation to create scholarship programs for children in foster care should place the authority to choose in the hands of a guardian or the person deemed by the state to have the authority to act on behalf of the child. For example, it would be problematic if adoption is the goal of many foster children was seen as a detriment to a child’s schooling (Lips, 2007).

One option would be to continue the scholarship to the child after adoption. Similarly, while families would be unlikely to place their child in foster care to take advantage of a scholarship program, policymakers could eliminate any such incentive by offering similar education options to all parents or to specific populations, such as students from low-income families. When asked whether or not a school voucher program would benefit their foster children, a focus group of former foster parents responded that a voucher would be beneficial if it factored in non-tuition costs such as transportation and school uniforms. To address this issue, scholarships could be designed
to spend a percentage of funds on transportation and other costs. Policymakers should consult with people and organizations in the foster care community when designing their initiatives to ensure that policies best meet foster children's needs (Lips, 2007).

One way to improve educational opportunities for children in foster care would be to reform the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program to give states greater flexibility in deciding how to distribute scholarships to foster children. On June 25, 1999, the U.S. House of Representatives voted 380 to 6 in favor of the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Act, a proposal designed to support the transition of foster children into independence in adulthood. The act doubled the amount of federal funding to support services for youth aging out of foster care to $140 million annually.

According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), the funding increase was coupled with a measure to provide states with "more flexibility to design programs to improve the transition of older foster children from state custody to independent living." The law also offered states "an additional $60 million in discretionary funds for education and training vouchers for former foster care youth."

According to the CRS: [The law's general purpose was to] help eligible children who are under the age of 18 obtain a high school diploma, prepare for additional vocational training or post-secondary education, explore careers, learn other life skills (including job retention, budgeting and financial management), avoid substance abuse, and make other healthy life decisions. Specifically, the $60 million could be used as education and training vouchers for higher education and other post-secondary institutions, such as for-profit technical training programs. However, the education aid offered by the Chafee
Foster Care Independence Act may come too late in many cases because it targets foster children 16 years old and older.

Foster children in the K–12 education system have a number of unique needs. Providing education choice and flexibility in K–12 could provide them with a more solid educational foundation, helping them to achieve academic success, social stability, and adult self-sufficiency. Congress should give states the flexibility to use funds allocated through the Chaffee Foster Care Independence Program to promote K–12 education options for younger children in foster care if state leaders believe that this would be the best use of funds (Lips, 2007).

In 2004, President George W. Bush signed legislation to create a school voucher program for low-income students in Washington, D.C., where the federal government has direct authority over the local government and school system. Through this program, more than 1,800 disadvantaged students are attending private schools using tuition scholarships. The program's popularity is evident, given that 6,500 students have applied for scholarships over the past three years approximately 11 percent of the eligible students in the city. Since the federal government has oversight over the District of Columbia, Congress should create a new scholarship program that is geared specifically to serving foster children living in Washington, D.C. As of July 2006, 2,546 children were in foster care in the District. Approximately 1,800 of them were of school age. As of January 31, 2006, 40 percent of the children in the District's foster care system had experienced four or more placements while in care, and 17 percent had experienced more than three placements during the previous 12 months. Many of these children are likely
facing the educational challenges outlined in this report and could benefit from a new opportunity scholarship targeted toward foster children living in the District.

In 2006, Arizona created the nation's first opportunity scholarship program for children in foster care. Under this program, approximately 500 children in foster care will be awarded $5,000 tuition scholarships starting in fall 2007. To date, similar legislation has been introduced in Florida, Maryland, Tennessee, and Texas. The American Legislative Exchange Council has created model legislation to provide opportunity scholarships to children in foster care (Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America, 1996).

States and local governments should implement reforms, such as widespread public school choice, to ensure that, whenever geographically possible, foster children are not forced to transfer schools when they experience home transfers. Another way to improve education options for children in foster care would be to create new charter schools that focus on serving foster children. Across the country, approximately 4,000 charter schools are operating in 40 states and the District of Columbia. Charter schools are publicly funded schools that agree to meet certain performance standards set by the state but are otherwise free from the bureaucratic rules and regulations that encumber traditional school systems. For this reason, charter schools can be created to serve specific purposes or populations of students. A successful charter school model could be created to serve children in foster care by addressing their unique needs. Such a charter school could offer a positive educational experience for children in foster care. Foster children would then have the voluntary option of enrolling in charter schools if they
believed that such schools would provide a better educational opportunity (Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America, 1996).

Consider the plight of foster youth-entering the child welfare system following neglect, abuse, and separation from family; experiencing hardships during care; and lacking a constant adult to aggressively pursue their educational needs-and you start to see why these students need special education services at a high rate and have bleak educational outcomes. Foster youth are often relocated to different homes several times a year, each time needing a new and appropriate school placement. Their school records are often lost and credits are not always transferred. Youth must begin yet again the arduous task of meeting new friends and teachers. They may even sit out of school for months on end. Such constant change compounds existing mental health issues or educational disabilities. The lack of an involved "parent" to aggressively pursue their educational needs further stymies progress. Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), procedural rights to obtaining special education services for students belong to their parents. Without strong parental advocates, delivery of special education services to foster youth is often delayed, inadequate, or overly restrictive (Levine, 2005).

Levine (2005) further states through innovative laws and practices, those involved in the care and education of foster youth can begin to remove the barriers to their educational success. Legislators have begun to recognize the importance of parental education rights to success in school. The current IDEA regulations allow foster parents to hold educational rights for a child. However, they can do so only if the birth parents' educational rights have been limited by juvenile court, the youth is placed in long-term
foster care and has an ongoing relationship with the foster parent, and the foster parent is willing to make educational decisions for that youth.

The newly reauthorized IDEA includes foster parents in the definition of "parent." This expands the pool of people who can hold educational rights for foster youth. If a new foster parent gains educational rights each time a youth moves, however, schools can be easily confused as to who holds those rights at any given time. Furthermore, short-term foster parents may lack the necessary knowledge about the youth in their care to make informed decisions. To avoid possible negative consequences, the U.S. Department of Education should maintain the existing regulatory language, i.e., foster parents hold educational rights in limited circumstances. The department has published proposed regulations, but, as of this writing, they have not been finalized (Levine, 2005).

Another provision under the amended act gives both juvenile courts and school districts the right to appoint educational surrogates. This dual responsibility ensures that if one agency cannot find a surrogate, the other must. However, unless the regulations designate one entity as having first opportunity to appoint an educational surrogate, confusion may cause inaction. Hopefully, the drafters of the new regulations will give first appointing priority to juvenile courts, as they are able to simultaneously limit parental rights and appoint a surrogate. When the courts are unable to find a surrogate, districts should do so (Levine, 2005).

Other state laws have begun to address unique educational challenges of foster youth. California recently enacted a law, referred to as AB490, that strives to ensure that educational and placement decisions are based on the best interests of the youth and that all people involved in their care and education work together to maintain stable school
placements. It also recognizes the importance of educational rights. If the educational surrogate believes that remaining at the "school of origin"--the school at which the youth started the school year--is in the best interests of the youth, then he or she can remain there throughout that academic year, even if moved to a new residence. Foster youth have poor educational outcomes. While it is important to determine their causes, it is equally essential to implement new laws and practices that begin to allow these youth to access and obtain a quality education (Levine, 2005).

Children in foster care face many educational obstacles because of frequent moves. Thus, this already vulnerable population becomes more vulnerable educationally (Zetlin & Weinberg, 2004). They will miss many school days while in transition from home to home in addition to facing the challenges of new schools; this will affect their attendance and comfort level, which in turn can impact their school experience as well as long-term performance outcomes (Jones, et al., 2004; Kools & Kennedy, 2003; Leslie et al., 2003; Racusin, et al., 2005; Zetlin, Weinberg, & Kimm, 2005). School credits may not always transfer between schools and school records may be lost as a result of frequent school changes.

Zetlin and Weinberg (2004), in their study of foster care children in Los Angeles, discuss the many obstacles previously mentioned that become barriers to successful education. Less than 20% of student records were available and 75% of student records had incorrect data inputted. Children who moved more frequently had no records; they could not be located. A study done by Courtney, Piliavin, Grogan, and Nesmith (2001) revealed that 92% of the adolescents in their study were very hopeful about their future, but less than half of the 90% still attending high school would graduate.
In the final report of the Washington State's Office of Children's Administration Research (2004), results also revealed poor educational outcomes for alumni of foster care. The report found that only 50% of foster children in the study graduated from high school or earned a general educational development (GED) credential. Results showed that 89% of foster children in this study obtained a GED rather than completing high school; the rates of GEDs of children in foster care versus that of the general population were about six times greater (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). For those seeking bachelor's degree or higher, only 1.8% of alumni would continue to postsecondary education compared to 24% of the general population (Casey Family Programs, 2001; Children's Administration Research, 2004; U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). Poor educational outcomes of children in foster care increase their vulnerability and can impact their future. A common belief, with growing support, is that early interventions, such as education, affect adult health outcomes and the quality of adulthood (Daniels, Kennedy, & Kawachi, 2000).

Educators who work at the school and classroom levels blame policy makers for their lack of understanding of the real life of schools. Many of the parties involved blame the victims, or, more accurately, they would blame the victims if they had not been told that it is inappropriate to do so. (By "victims" we mean both students who are unprepared to cope with conventional school regulations, procedures, and requirements and their parents.) Everyone wants to blame the delivery systems that fragment the social, medical, psychological, nutritional, and educational resources and services provided for children.

Whoever or whatever is to blame for the failure of reform, many of the reform initiatives that are currently most popular could be dismissed as ridiculous on their face if
they were not devised and supported by powerful and apparently credible advocates and if the consequences of their failure were not so devastating for a generation of American youth. Education reform in the U. S. must not fail. City school systems cannot be dismissed as unworkable. Youngsters from low-income households cannot be consigned to poverty-ridden schools and bleak futures. Despair over the state of American schools is unthinkable (Clark & Astuto, 1994).

Clark and Astuto (1994) further state the root cause of the failure of reform is the limited imagination that has informed the reform proposals. For example, the establishment of state-level testing with sanctions for districts that do not meet the minimum standards is essentially a paper transaction that threatens a handful of under-producing districts. Not surprisingly, these are almost always districts with high concentrations of children living in poverty. For such districts, a proposal to convert their schools into youth service centers that would be open 5-4 hours a day, 365 days a year, serving three healthy meals to students and providing social, psychological, and medical services would be an authentic proposal for reform. Instead, school districts are counseled to adopt outcome-based programs that are in alignment with the standardized tests being used to assess the effectiveness of schools.

Why do we focus on implementing site-based management systems for high schools while we retain the daily schedule of six to eight 50-minute class periods, which ensures that most high school teachers will never get to know about the lives of the 150 to 200 students whom they see each day? Does anyone believe that such an organizational structure provides the time for English teachers to tutor their students in writing? Or, that it provides responsible adult role models for youngsters who have few
such models in their homes or communities? Or, that it provides an opportunity for individualized instruction and counseling? Do we really believe that schools are so different from other organizations that testing to weed out rejects is an effective system for improving the quality of the school’s core processes? (Clark & Astuto, 1994).

What sort of reform is this, anyway? Why are we overlooking commonsense options that are supported by the experience of research and practice? We believe that the current reform movement is rooted in a set of nested assumptions that constrain the range of changes proposed for -- or implemented in -- our schools. For the past two years we have been attempting to identify the assumptions of policy makers, educational researchers, administrators, and teachers that govern the reform proposals they consider feasible. Our hunch was that many of these assumptions should be challenged; we believed that the axiomatic standing they had been granted in the reform movement was unwarranted (Clark & Astuto, 1994).

Theoretical Framework

**System Theory**

System theory is the interdisciplinary theory about the nature of complex systems in nature, society, and science. More specifically, it is a framework by which one can investigate and/or describe any group of objects that work in concert to produce some result. This could be a single organism, any organization or society, or any electro-mechanical or informational artifact. System theory first originated in biology in the 1920’s out of the need to explain the interrelatedness of organisms in ecosystems. As a technical and general academic area of study it predominately refers to the science of
systems that resulted from Bertalanffy’s General System Theory (GST), among others, in initiating what became a project of systems research and practice (Bale, 1995).

Contemporary ideas from systems theory have grown with diversified areas, exemplified by the work of Bela H. Banathy, ecological systems with Howard T. Odum, Eugene Odum, and Fritjof Capara, organizational theory and management with individuals such as Peter Senge, interdisciplinary study with areas like Human Resource Development from the work of Richard A. Swanson, and insights from educators such as Debora Hammond. As a transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and multiperspectival domain, the area brings together principles and concepts from ontology, philosophy of science, physics, computer science, biology, and engineering as well as geography, sociology, political science, psychotherapy (within family systems) and economics among others. Systems theory thus serves as a bridge for interdisciplinary dialogue between autonomous areas of study as well as within the area of systems science itself (Bale, 1995).

Bale (1995) further states that system theory as an area of study specifically developed following the World Wars from the work of Ludwig Von Bertalanffy, Anatol Rapport, Kenneth E. Boulding, William Ross Ashby, Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, C. West Churchman and others in the 1950’s, especially catalyzed by the cooperation in the Society for General Systems Research. Cognizant of advances in science that questioned classical assumptions in the organizational sciences, Bertalanffy’s idea to develop a theory of systems began as early as the interwar period. Subjects like complexity, self-organization, connectionism and adaptive systems had already been studied in the 1940’s and 1950’s.
The systems view was based on several fundamental ideas. First, phenomena can be viewed as a web of relationships among elements, or a system. Second, all systems, whether electrical, biological, or social have common patterns, behaviors, and properties that can be understood and used to develop greater insight into the behavior of complex phenomena and to move closer toward a unity of science. System philosophy, methodology and application are complementary to this science. By 1956, the Society for General Systems Research was established, renamed the International Society for Systems Science in 1988 (Bale, 1995).

The Cold War had its effects upon the research project for systems theory in ways that sorely disappointed many of the seminal theorists. Some began to recognize theories defined in association with systems theory deviated from the initial General System Theory (GST). The economist Kenneth Boulding, an early researcher in system theory, had concerns over the manipulation of systems concepts. Boulding concluded from the effects of the Cold War that abuses of power always prove consequential and that systems theory might address such issues. Since the end of the Cold War, there has been renewed interest in systems theory with efforts to strengthen an ethical view (Bale, 1995).

Systems theory offers a way of conceptualizing the relationship between people and environments and encourages a balanced approach to both domains of practice. Emphasis is on the "goodness of fit" between the client and the environment. Workers can focus on how family, community, social, economic and political factors affect the client’s situation. The five principles of systems are; all systems seek goal attainment and balance, all systems have boundaries, all systems are made up of subsystems, the
whole is greater than the sum of its parts, and all systems create feedback. The key assumptions about systems theories are that individuals function as a part of many systems, they are affected by these systems and they affect the systems, because systems are in dynamic interchange, a change in one part of the system will have consequences for other systems, problems arise because of a misfit between individuals and the systems of which they are a part, and the role of the social worker is to enhance the fit between the individual and the systems affecting them (Hoffman & Sallee, 1994).

Systems theory suggests that schools be managed more like organizations, where teachers and social workers are accountable for their students’ results, curriculum stresses, critical thinking skills, and learning is learner directed instead of just lecture format. The goal of applying systems theory is to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the total system (school) via the development of manageable subsystems (teams or groups within the school system-social workers) with common focuses or purposes (Katz & Kahn, 1996).

Applying systems theory gives the students cohesion to disparate facts giving better problem solving skills. It also increases the understanding of relationships between systems. For example, giving a group of students the task of developing an amusement park requires them to look at economics, social environmental, educational, and construction factors. It requires them to use traditional material (math, reading, spelling, grammar, biology, etc.) as well as give students additional understanding about how these pieces mesh together to make a whole. It demonstrates to them first hand how the most basic concepts contribute to the larger figure. It encourages students to change
from being passive absorbers of information to active learners seeking knowledge. At best, it creates a continually improving education system (Katz & Kahn, 1996).

Social Learning Theory

Learning theories are so central to the discipline of psychology that it is impossible to separate the history of learning theories from the history of psychology. Learning is a basic psychological process, and investigations of the principles and mechanisms of learning have been the subject of research and debate since establishment of the first psychological laboratory by Wilhem Wundt in Leipzeig, Germany in 1879. Learning is defined as a lasting change in behaviors or beliefs that result from experience. The ability to learn provides every living organism with the ability to adapt to a changing environment (Bandura, 1977).

Learning is an inevitable consequence of living if we could not learn, we would die. The evolution of learning theories may be thought of as a progression from broad theories developed to explain the many ways that learning occurs to more specific theories that are limited in the types of learning they are designed to explain. Social learning theory focuses on the sort of learning that occurs in a social context where modeling, or observational learning, constitutes a large part of the way organism learning. Social learning theorists are concerned with how expectations, memory, and awareness influence the learning process. Both humans and non-humans can learn through observation and modeling. Consider, for example, the acquisition of sign language by the offspring of language trained apes who learn to sign by watching their trained parents. Children learn many behaviors through modeling.
A classic experiment by Albert Bandura allowed one group of children to observe an adult who aggressively pounded on a doll, while another group watched a nonaggressive model and a third group had no model at all. The children who saw the aggressive adult often modeled this behavior when given an opportunity to play with the same doll. The children who saw the nonaggressive model showed the least amount of aggressive play when compared to the other two groups. Social learning theorists retain the behaviorist principles of reinforcement and response contingencies, but they also extend the area of inquiry for learning to include components of cognitive processing such as attention, remembering, the processing of information about the environment, and the consequences of behavior (Bandura, 1977).

Bandura (1977) states that learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling. From observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action. Social learning theory explains human behavior in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioral, and environmental influences. The component processes underlying observational learning are: attention, including modeled events (distinctiveness, affective valence, complexity, prevalence, and functional value); observer characteristics (sensory capacities, arousal level, perceptual set, past reinforcement); retention, including symbolic coding, cognitive organization, symbolic rehearsal, motor rehearsal); motor reproduction, including, physical capabilities, self observation of reproduction, accuracy of feedback; and motivation, including external,
vicarious and self reinforcement. Because it encompasses attention, memory, and
motivation, social learning theory spans both cognitive and behavioral frameworks.

There are four general principles of social learning theory: (1) People can learn by
observing the behavior is of others and the outcomes of those behaviors; (2) Learning can
occur without a change in behavior. Behaviors say that learning has to be represented by
a permanent change in behavior; in contrast social learning theorists say that because
people can learn through observation alone, their learning may not necessarily be shown
in their performance. Learning may or may not result in a behavior change; (3)
Cognition plays a role in learning. Over the last 30 years, social learning theory has
become increasingly cognitive in its interpretation of human learning. Awareness and
expectations of future reinforcements or punishments can have a major effect on the
behaviors that people exhibit; and (4) Social learning theory can be considered a bridge
or a transition between behaviorist and learning theories and cognitive learning theories.
Many behaviors can be learned at least partly through modeling. Examples that can be
cited are students can watch parents read, students can watch the demonstrations of
mathematics problems, or see someone acting bravely in a fearful situation (Ormond,
1999).

There are four conditions that are necessary before an individual can successfully
model the behavior of someone else: (1) Attention - the person must first pay attention to
the model; (2) Retention - the observer must be able to remember the behavior that has
been observed. One way of increasing this is using the technique of rehearsal; (3) Motor
reproduction - the third condition is the ability to replicate the behavior that the model
has just demonstrated. This means that the observer has to be able to replicate the action,
which could be a problem with a learner who is ready developmentally to replicate the action; and (4) Motivation is the final necessary ingredient for modeling to occur. Learners must want to demonstrate what they have learned. Remember that since these four conditions vary among individuals, different people will reproduce the same behavior differently (Ormond, 1999).

There are several effects that modeling has on behavior. Modeling teaches new behaviors, modeling influences the frequency of previously learned behaviors, modeling may encourage previously forbidden behaviors, and modeling increases the frequency of similar behaviors. For example, a student might see a friend excel in basketball and he tries to excel in football because he is not tall enough for basketball (Ormond, 1999).

Social learning theory has numerous implications for classroom use. Students often learn a great deal simply by observing other people; describing the consequences of behavior effectively increases the appropriate behaviors and decreases the inappropriate ones. This can involve discussing with learners about the rewards and consequences of various behaviors; modeling provides an alternative to shaping for teaching new behavior instead of using shaping, which is operant conditioning; modeling can provide a faster and more efficient means for teaching new behavior (Ormond, 1999).

To promote effective modeling a teacher must make sure that the four essential conditions exit, teachers and parents must model appropriate behaviors and take care that they do not model inappropriate behaviors; teachers should expose students to a variety of other models. This technique is especially important to break down traditional stereotypes; students must believe that they are capable of accomplishing school tasks. Thus, it is very important to develop a sense of self-efficacy for students. Teachers can
promote such self-efficacy by having students receive confidence building messages, watch others be successful and experience success of their own, teachers should help students set realistic expectations for their academic accomplishments and finally self-regulation techniques provide an effective method for improving student behavior (Ormond, 1999).

Learning theories have often been used to provide a guide for education. Earlier applications were concerned with the use of appropriate rewards and punishment, concerns that mirrored the major tenets of behaviorist theories. More recently, cognitive perspectives have shaped the field of education, and there has been more concern with learning methods that enhance long-term retention and the transfer of information and skills that are learned in schools to novel problems in out of school settings. For example, variability in encoding (learning material in different ways, e.g., video and text) produces more durable long-term retention, even though it is more effortful (and generally less enjoyable) way to learn. In addition, students become better thinkers when they receive specific instruction in thinking skills and when the instruction is designed to enhance transfer (Winstanley & Bjork, 2002).

Teaching strategies that enhance transfer include spaced practice (viewing material over time versus cramming), using a variety of examples so learners can recognize where a concept is applicable, and practice at retrieval (repeatedly remembering material over time) with informative feedback. Learning theories are facing new challenges as people grapple with increases in the amount of available information that needs to be learned, rapidly changing technologies that require new types of responses to new problems, and the need to continue learning throughout one’s
life, even into old age. Contemporary learning theories supported by empirical research offer the promise of enhanced learning and improved thinking, both of which are critical in a rapidly changing and complex world (Winstanley & Bjork, 2002).

**Afrocentric Perspective**

Eurocentric theories of human behavior reflect concepts of human behavior developed in European and Anglo-American culture. The practice of using Eurocentric theories to explain the behavior and ethos of African Americans can be in appropriate because a major assumption of the Afrocentric paradigm is that social science theories are derived from specific experiences and cultural perspectives of the theorist. Unlike the predominant Eurocentric ideal, the theorist, from an Afrocentric standpoint, is not viewed as an objective, detached observer but as an observer shaped by a particular cultural, autobiographical, and political standpoint. Therefore, Afrocentrists do not believe in social science universalism that one theory or paradigm can be used to explain social phenomena among all people and in all cultures (Schiele, 1996).

Afrocentrists also contend that the application and imposition of Eurocentric theories of human behavior, especially to explain the behavior and ethos of African Americans, are implicitly oppressive. Most of the theories of human behavior which social workers and social scientist in the United States are exposed have sprung from a Eurocentric perspective because of the political and economic hegemony that European Americans exercise over U.S. social institutions. European political and economic hegemony, Afrocentrists say, has led to hegemony of knowledge production and
knowledge validation (especially apparent in academia) that omits or marginalizes the indigenous worldview of people of color (Schiele, 1996).

Schiele (1996) further states that Afrocentricity has three objectives: (1) It seeks to promote an alternative social science paradigm more reflective of the cultural and political reality of African Americans; (2) It seeks to dispel the negative distortions about people of African ancestry by legitimizing and disseminating a worldview that goes back thousands of years and that exists in the hearts and minds of many people of African descent today; and (3) It seeks to promote a worldview that will facilitate human and social transformation toward spiritual, moral, and humanistic ends that will persuade people of different cultural and ethnic groups that they share a mutual interest in this regard.

It is important for social workers to understand the theory of Afrocentricity. Asante defines Afrocentricity as a mode of thought and action in which the centrality of African interests, values and perspectives predominate. In regards to theory, it is the placing of African people in the center of any analysis of African phenomena. Thus, it is possible for anyone to master the discipline of seeking the location of Africans in a given phenomenon. In terms of action and behavior, it is a devotion to the idea that what is in the best interest of African consciousness is at the heart of ethical behavior. Finally, Afrocentricity seeks to enshrine the idea that blackness itself is a trope of ethics. Thus, to be black is to be against all forms of oppression, racism, classism, homophobia, patriarchy, child abuse, pedophilia, and white racial domination (Pellbon, 2007).

Despite Afrocentricity's unique epistemology, accepted definitions of theory must provide analytical framework. The Council on Social Work Education's Educational
Policy Accreditation and Accreditation Standards guides social work programs on foundation content essential for social work practice. One stated objective is that graduates are able to use “theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence” (Pellbon, 2007, p. 169). Though knowledge is not limited to theoretical frameworks, accepting a premise of empirical support for theory is a logical method to prepare social workers to competently develop and use social work knowledge. Knowledge challenged by critical thinking skills and science provides systematic methods for social workers to develop interventions, convey their methods to clients, and measure practice outcomes (Pellbon, 2007).

Afrocentricity has defined concepts, propositions, and statements that explain phenomena. However, it is important to realize that rational organization of concepts into explanatory statements is insufficient to conclude their ideas are theory (Pellbon, 2007).

According to Tillman (2002), educational research and practices that reflect a cultural paradigm emphasize cultural solidarity, education for self reliance in the African American community, and specific ways in which cultural knowledge, practices and values that characterize the historic and contemporary African American experience can be drawn upon to improve the education of African Americans. Culturally sensitive research approaches both recognize ethnicity and position of culture as central to the research process. When research about African Americans is approached from a culturally sensitive perspective, the varied aspects of their culture and their varied historical and contemporary experiences are acknowledged.
Many African American social workers, and others, need to examine honestly the extent to which they (we) are incarcerated with Eurocentric social work and social science models. Because the Eurocentric worldview receives greater attention in the knowledge production and information dissemination process, many of us are duped into believing that the Eurocentric way is the only way. Moreover, many people believe that the variance in perspectives within the Eurocentric paradigm is sufficient to explain the behavior and to solve the problems of people. We must begin to understand that in spite of its variability, the Eurocentric paradigm is just one of several lenses through which human behavior and social problems can be understood (Schiele, 1997).

Furthermore, several ideas found in some Eurocentric theories and conceptual models have their origins in cultures that predate European societies. For example, there is evidence to suggest that much of Carl Jung’s psychological theory is predicated on ideas held in many traditional and ancient African societies, such as ancient Kemet. This conceptual incarceration, as Noble refers to it, must be addressed by African Americans. Afrocentricity is based on traditional ideas that emanate from our ancestors and have great potential to advance people of African descent. For African Americans to deny the legitimacy of Afrocentricity is to participate in self-devaluation and rejection. We must understand that the Eurocentric worldview, especially its claim of universality, was to not only physically enslave people of African descent but also to mentally enslave them (us) into that everything European was good and everything African was bad. Afrocentricity provides the avenue through which African American social workers and African Americans generally can recapture their cultural sanity and collective self-respect, which
have been debilitated by almost 400 years of persistent racial and cultural oppression (Schiele, 1997).

In summary, the literature review discussed motivation, behaviors, academic performance, and educational challenges of foster care and non-foster care students. An historical overview of foster care was provided.

The three frameworks used to guide this study are Systems Theory, Social Learning Theory, and the Afrocentric Perspective. Systems theory was chosen because Systems Theory suggests that schools be managed more like organizations, where teachers and social workers are accountable for their students' results, curriculum stresses, critical thinking skills, and learning is learner directed instead of just lecture nature (Katz & Kahn, 1996). Social Learning Theory was chosen because it focuses on the sort of learning that occurs in a social context where modeling, or observational learning, constitutes a large part of the way organism learning. Social learning theorists are concerned with how expectations, memory, and awareness influence the learning process (Bandura, 1977).

Finally, the Afrocentric Perspective was chosen because it does not believe in social science universalism that one theory or paradigm can be used to explain social phenomena among all people and in all cultures (Schiele, 1996).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Chapter III describes the method employed to address the research question regarding teachers' perceptions of motivation, behaviors, and academic performance of foster care and non-foster care students. The researcher discusses why the design is appropriate for this study. In addition, chapter III describes the study population, the sample and data collection procedures, instrumentation, and limitations of the study.

Research Design

This study used a descriptive and explanatory research design. In this study, explanatory research is defined as a method or style of research in which the principal objective is to know and understand the trait and mechanisms of the relationship and association between the independent and dependent variable (Key, 1997).

According to Key (1997), the focal point in this type of research is to provide an explanation between two or more phenomena. Explanatory research characteristically seeks to recognize and clarify a causal association which is substantively significant and meaningful. In this sort of study, people normally develop or build a hypothesis, which is to be tested and experienced in the light of the existing literature.

The descriptive and explanatory research design will allow for the descriptive analysis of the demographic characteristics of the participants. Descriptive research is the
most commonly used and the basic reason for carrying out descriptive research is to identify the cause of something that is happening (Key, 1997). This method will be utilized because it will allow for an appropriate examination of teacher’s perceptions of motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students.

Description of Site

The research study was conducted in the Atlanta metropolitan area. Fifty percent of the surveys were distributed at the Office of New Beginnings Life Changing Network, Inc., which is a private foster care agency that specializes in placing teen mothers in foster care placements and 50 percent was distributed via email. New Beginnings Life Changing Network, Inc. was a neutral location for the respondents. The survey was also distributed via email; this allowed the researcher to drive respondents to the survey multiple times to ensure a greater response rate.

Sample and Population

The target population was comprised of public school teachers in the Atlanta metropolitan area who teach foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle school. Eighty-five (85) respondents were selected to participate in the study. A twenty-one (21) item survey was utilized. Section I consisted of the demographic data and section II consisted of the discussion of the respondents from the survey entitled Teachers’ Perceptions of Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students.
Instrumentation

The instrument utilized for the research study is a survey questionnaire entitled Teacher’s Perceptions of Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students. The survey consisted of two sections with a total of twenty-one (21) questions. Section I required demographic information about the characteristics of the participants. Section II asked questions about teacher’s perceptions of the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

Section I of the survey consisted of nine questions (1-9). The questions in section I are concerned with gender, ethnicity, age, marital status, employment status, education, income, and teaching experience.

Section II of the survey consisted of teachers’ perceptions questions (10-21). This section examined teachers’ perceptions of the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools on a Likert scale of 1-4; 1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree.

Treatment of Data

The treatment of the data utilized for this study was descriptive statistics; which included measures of central tendency, frequency distribution, and cross tabulation. The statistical test that was utilized for this study was chi square. Cross tabulation expresses a joint distribution of two variables. Typically, cross tabulation tables are used to represent a nominal level of data. Cross tabulations were conducted between motivation
and behaviors, motivation and academic performance, and behaviors and academic performance. Chi square was used to test whether there was a meaningful statistical significance at the .05 level of probability among the variables in the study.

Limitations of the Study

The literature that was most useful for this study focused on successful collaborative practices between child welfare agencies and the public school system. Although some researchers focused on the importance of education for children in foster care, they failed to identify the collaborative barriers and successful practices that professionals in public education and child welfare agencies have experienced. Another gap in the literature may be attributed to the misconceptions that children placed in foster care are perceived as weak and powerless.

The literature provided a wide array of ideas; most of them were in agreement that public schools and child welfare agencies must begin to work together to support foster care and non-foster care children's educational functioning. The school is seen as a potential anchor for a child whose life has been uprooted. The stability and security of a familiar school system can help these children weather the storm, but only if the key participants involved make an active commitment to collaborate with each other (Altshuler, 2003).

In summary, chapter III includes a discussion of the methods used to conduct the research study. Included are the sections to the research design and its appropriateness, the description site, sample and population, instrumentation, treatment of data, and limitations.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to explain teachers' perceptions of the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools. The research question was as follows:

Research Question: Do teachers perceive any difference between the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools?

Explanatory research design was utilized because it allows for an appropriate examination of teachers' perceptions of motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students.

Chapter IV addressed the findings of the study in two sections. Section one consisted of the demographic data and section two consisted of discussion of the respondents' responses from the survey entitled Teachers' Perceptions of Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students (research question and hypothesis).

Demographic Data

This section provided a profile of the study respondents. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the following: gender, ethnicity, age, martial, employment, education, income, teaching experience, and students.
The target population was composed of teachers in the Atlanta metropolitan area who teach foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle school.

Eighty-five teachers from the Atlanta metropolitan area were selected to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Profile of Study Respondents (N=85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29 yrs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 yrs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 yrs &amp; over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

Demographic Profile of Study Respondents (N=85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Training</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-44,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000-54,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000-64,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,000-74,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 &amp; over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years &amp; more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Describes Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Foster Care</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 1, the respondents were African American females between the ages of 30-39 who were never married and employed full-time as a teacher who taught foster care and non-foster care students and earned wages between 35,000-44,999.
Research Question and Hypotheses

There were one research question and three null hypotheses in the study. This section provides an analysis of the research question and a testing of the null hypotheses.

Research Question: Do teachers perceive any difference between motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools?

Hypothesis 1: There is no statistically significant difference between teachers' perception of the motivation and behaviors of foster care students and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

Teachers' Perception of Motivation among Foster Care and Non-foster Care Students

The following definitions of motivation were gleaned from a variety of psychology textbooks and reflect the general consensus that motivation is an internal state or condition that serves to activate or energize behavior and give it direction. Motivation can also be defined as a willingness to actively participate in planning and implementing actions. The latter of the definitions will be utilized for throughout the paper.

Table 2 is a frequency distribution of teachers' perceptions of motivation among foster care and non-foster care students. Table 2 indicates whether or not respondents agreed or disagreed with the motivation among foster care and non-foster care students.
Table 2

Teachers’ Perceptions of Motivation among Foster Care and Non-foster Care Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Disagree #</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Agree #</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 1:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 2:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 3:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 4:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 2, teachers’ perceptions of motivation of foster care and non-foster care students. Teachers disagreed (91.6%) that foster care students do not participate in enrichment activities, teachers disagreed (89.2%) that foster care students are not motivated in the classroom setting, teachers disagreed (54.1%) that non-foster care students do participate in enrichment activities, and teachers disagreed (51.81%) that non-foster care students are motivated in the classroom setting.

Hypothesis 2: There is no statistically significant difference between teachers’ perception of the motivation and academic performance of foster care students and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

Teachers’ Perceptions of Behavior among Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students

The well-being of children in care presents a challenge to child welfare systems internationally. Increasing attention is being paid to their education, emotional
health and behavioral development. Several studies have suggested they are significantly more likely to exhibit psychological problems than children in the general population.

Indications of emotional and behavioral concerns that are in the clinical range also come from studies on mental health service utilization by children and young people in care (Stahmer, et al., 2005). The following definition of behavior will be utilized throughout the paper; to conduct oneself in the proper manner, do what is expected or required.

Table 3 is a frequency distribution of teachers’ perceptions of behavior among foster care and non-foster care students. Table 3 indicated whether or not respondents agreed or disagreed with the behavior among foster care and non-foster care students.

Table 3

Teachers’ Perceptions of Behavior among Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Disagree #</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Agree #</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 1:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 2:</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 3:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 4:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 3, teachers’ perceptions of behavior among foster care and non-foster care students. Teachers disagreed (94.0%) that foster care students do not encounter conflicts on school premises, teachers disagreed (89.2%) that foster care
students do not follow school policies, teachers agree (64.7%) that non-foster care
students encounter conflicts on school premises, and teachers agree (52.9%) that
non-foster care students follow school policies.

Hypothesis 3: There is no statistically significant difference between teachers' perception of the behaviors and academic performance of foster care students and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

Teachers’ Perceptions of Academic Performance among Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students

Jacobson, 2008, discusses the education of the 700,000 U.S. children in foster care and what the government may do for them. William O’Hare of Kids Count comments on the ability of foster families to provide educational opportunities to foster children, which is likely due to a smaller income, lack of higher education, and unemployment among foster parents. Research has shown that foster children are more likely to dropout of school, be placed in special education, or repeat grades.

Table 4 is a frequency distribution of teachers’ perceptions of the academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students. Table 4 indicates whether or not respondents agreed or disagreed with the academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students.
Table 4

Teachers' Perceptions of Academic Performance among Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Disagree #</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Agree #</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance 1:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance 2:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance 3:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance 4:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4, teachers' perceptions of behavior among foster care and non-foster care students. Teachers disagreed (87.6%) that foster care students do not work diligently toward completion of their classroom assignments, teachers disagreed (90.4%) that foster care students do not need assistance with academics, teachers agreed (57.6%) that non-foster care students work diligently towards completion of their classroom assignment, and teachers agreed (67.1%) that non-foster care students need assistance with academics.

Table 5 is a crosstabulation of teachers' perceptions of the motivation and behaviors of foster care and non-foster care students and indicates whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the variables.
Table 5

Crosstabulation of Teachers’ Perceptions of the Motivation and Behaviors of Foster Care and Non-foster Care Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = .05 df = 1 p = .000

As indicated in Table 5, 95.2 percent (95.2%) of teachers disagreed that there is a relationship between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students and 3.62 percent (3.62%) indicated they agreed that there is a relationship between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students.

As shown in Table 5, the statistical measurement Chi square (X²) was employed to test for the strength of the relationship between motivation and behaviors of foster care and non-foster care students. The null hypothesis was not rejected (P=0.00) indicating there was a statistical significant difference between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students at the .05 level of probability.
Table 6 is a crosstabulation of teachers’ perceptions of the academic performance and motivation of foster care and non-foster care students and indicated whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the variables and indicated whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the variables.

Table 6

Crosstabulation of Teachers’ Perceptions of the Academic Performance and Motivation of Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .05 \]
\[ df = 1 \]
\[ p = .821 \]

As indicated in Table 6, 94 percent (94.0%) of teachers disagreed that there is a relationship between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students and 4.8 percent (4.8%) indicated they agreed that there is a relationship between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students.

As shown in Table 6, the statistical measurement Chi square \( (X^2) \) was employed to test for the strength of the relationship between academic performance and motivation of foster care and non-foster care students. The null hypothesis was rejected \( (P=.821) \).
indicating there was not a statistical significant difference between academic performance and motivation among foster care and non-foster care students at the .05 level of probability.

Table 7 is a crosstabulation of teachers’ perceptions of the academic performance and behaviors of foster care and non-foster care students and indicated whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the variables and indicated whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the variables.

Table 7
Crosstabulation of Teachers’ Perceptions of the Academic Performance and Behaviors of Foster Care and Non-Foster Care Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 0.05\]  \[df = 1\]  \[p = 0.912\]

As indicated in Table 7, 97.6 percent (97.6%) of teachers disagreed that there is a relationship between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students and 1.2 percent (1.2%) indicated they agreed that there is a relationship between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students.
As shown in Table 7, the statistical measurement Chi square ($X^2$) was employed to test for the strength of the relationship between academic performance and motivation of foster care and non-foster care students. The null hypothesis was rejected ($P=.912$) indicating there was not a statistical significant difference between academic performance and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students at the .05 level of probability.

In summary, teachers responded to the survey by indicating that there was a relationship between motivation and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students. However, they agreed that there was no relationship between academic performance and motivation and academic performance and behaviors among foster care and non-foster care students.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was designed to answer three questions concerning teachers’ perceptions of the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in middle and elementary schools. This chapter presents the conclusions of the research findings and recommendations.

Hypothesis 1: There is no statistically significant difference between the teachers’ perceptions of the motivation and behaviors of foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

In order to determine if there was a difference between the teachers’ perceptions of the motivation and behaviors of foster care and non-foster care students, the two variables were analyzed. Of the 85 teachers surveyed, they disagreed (91.6%) that foster care students do not participate in enrichment activities, teachers disagreed (89.2%) that foster care students are not motivated in the classroom setting, teachers disagreed (54.1%) that non-foster care students do participate in enrichment activities, and teachers disagreed (51.81%) that non-foster care students are motivated in the classroom setting (See Table 2).
The statistical test Chi square was applied for significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected (P=.000) indicating that there was a statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability (See Table 5).

Hypothesis 2: There is no statistically significant difference between the teachers’ perceptions of the motivation and academic performance of foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

Teachers disagreed (94.0%) that foster care students do not encounter conflicts on school premises, teachers disagreed (89.2%) that foster care students do not follow school policies, teachers agree (64.7%) that non-foster care students encounter conflicts on school premises, and teachers agree (52.9%) that non-foster care students follow school policies (See Table 3).

The statistical test Chi square was applied for significance, the null hypothesis was rejected (P=.821) indicating that there was a statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability (See Table 6).

Hypothesis 3: There is no statistically significant difference between the teachers’ perceptions of the behaviors and academic performance of foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools.

Teachers disagreed (87.6%) that foster care students do not work diligently toward completion of their classroom assignments, teachers disagreed (90.4%) that foster care students do not need assistance with academics, teachers agreed (57.6%) that non-foster care students work diligently towards completion of their classroom
assignment, and teachers agreed (67.1%) that non-foster care students need assistance with academics (See Table 4).

The statistical test Chi square was applied for significance, the null hypothesis was rejected (P=.912) indicating that there was a statistically significant relationship between the two variables at the .05 level of probability (See Table 7).

Conclusion

As a result of the findings of this study, teachers must find alternative methods in order to meet the educational needs of children in foster care and non-foster care students. It is crucial for teachers to identify strengths and functional adaptations of foster care and non-foster care children in order for them to receive and achieve educational freedom.

This study not only expands the body of literature related to foster care and education, the results could be of value to teachers and other professionals interested in helping foster care students began to connect to their educational processes in a way that motivates them to achieve academic success.

In conclusion, based on the literature, it is important that teachers find, as previously stated, alternative methods in order to meet the educational needs of foster care and non-foster care students. The process must improve for foster care children who are in need of educational services, such as tutoring, and teachers must be at the forefront of the movement. However, for many foster care and non-foster care students that are academically deficient, other methods and techniques must be implemented in order for them to receive and achieve educational freedom.
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SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF FOSTER CARE AND NON-FOSTER CARE STUDENTS

SECTION I  Demographic Information
Place a mark [x] next to the appropriate item. Choose only one answer for each question.

1. What is your Gender?
   ___ 1. Male
   ___ 2. Female

2. Which of the following best describes your Ethnicity?
   ___ 1. Caucasian
   ___ 2. African American
   ___ 3. Asian American
   ___ 4. Hispanic
   ___ 5. Native American
   ___ 6. Other

3. Which of the following best describes your Age group?
   ___ 1. 21-29
   ___ 2. 30-39
   ___ 3. 40-49
   ___ 4. 50-59
   ___ 5. 60-over
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4. Which of the following best describes your **Martial Status**?
   ___ 1. Never married
   ___ 2. Married
   ___ 3. Divorced
   ___ 4. Widowed

5. Which of the following best describes your current **Employment Status**?
   ___ 1. Full-time
   ___ 2. Part-time
   ___ 3. Volunteer

6. What is the highest level of **Education** you completed?
   ___ 1. College graduate
   ___ 2. Some graduate training
   ___ 3. Masters Degree
   ___ 4. Specialist training
   ___ 5. Doctorate Degree

7. What is your yearly household **Income**?
   ___ 1. $35,000 to $44,999
   ___ 2. $45,000 to $54,999
   ___ 3. $55,000 to $64,999
   ___ 4. $65,000 to $74,999
   ___ 5. $75,000 and over
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8. Which of the following best describes your Teaching Experience?
   ___ 1. Less than 1 year
   ___ 2. 1-4 years
   ___ 3. 5-9 years
   ___ 4. 10-14 years
   ___ 5. 15 or more

9. Which of the following best describes your Students?
   ___ 1. Both
   ___ 2. Foster Care
   ___ 3. Non-Foster Care

SECTION II: This section asks questions about teacher’s perceptions of the motivation, behaviors and academic performance among foster care and non-foster care students in elementary and middle schools. Write the appropriate response number in the blank beside each statement using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motivation:
   ___ 10. Foster care students do not participate in enrichment activities.
   ___ 11. Foster care students are not motivated in the classroom setting.
   ___ 12. Non-foster care students do participate in enrichment activities.
   ___ 13. Non-foster care students are motivated in the classroom setting.
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Behaviors:
____ 14. Foster care students do not encounter conflicts on school premises.
____ 15. Foster care students do not follow school policies.
____ 16. Non-foster care students encounter conflicts on school premises.
____ 17. Non-foster care students follow school policies.

Academic Performance:
____ 18. Foster care students do not work diligently towards completion of their classroom assignments.
____ 19. Foster care students do not need assistance with academics.
____ 20. Non-foster care students work diligently towards completion of their classroom assignment.
____ 21. Non-foster care students need assistance with academics.
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CONSENT FORM

A Study of Teachers’ Perceptions of the Motivation, Behaviors and Academic Performance Among Foster care and Non-foster care Students in Elementary and Middle Schools.

You are invited to participate in a brief survey. The survey entitled: Teachers’ Perceptions, will take approximately five to ten minutes to complete. The purpose of the survey is to obtain information about your perceptions about the motivation, behaviors, and academic performance of foster care and non-foster care students.

There are no known risks to participants who agree to take part in this research. There are no known personal benefits to participants who agree to take part in this research. However, it is hoped that all who participate in this study will advance research in the field of social work.

All responses to the questionnaires will remain private, confidential, and physically secured. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you have questions about this study, you may contact the principal investigator Pamela Todd by email at rja916@hotmail.com or the Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work at (404) 880-8006.

My signature below verifies that I have read the statement above and agree to participate in this project.

Print Name ____________________________ Signature ____________________________ Date ____________________________
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CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

Institutional Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs

October 23, 2009

Ms. Pamela Todd <Pja916@yahoo.com>
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Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, GA 30314

RE: A Study of Teacher's Perceptions of the Motivation, Behaviors and Academic Performance Among Foster Care and Non-foster Care Students in Elementary and Middle Schools.
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Human Subjects Code Number: HR2009-10-341-1

Dear Ms. Todd:

The Human Subjects Committee of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your protocol and approved of it as exempt in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Your Protocol Approval Code is HR2009-10-341-1/A

This permit will expire on October 25, 2010. Thereafter, continued approval is contingent upon the annual submission of a renewal form to this office.

The CAU IRB acknowledges your timely completion of the CITI IRB Training in Protection of Human Subjects – “Social and Behavioral Sciences Track”. Your certification is valid for two years.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Georgianna Bolden at the Office of Sponsored Programs (404) 880-6979 or Dr. Paul I. Musey, (404) 880-6829.
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Chair
IRB: Human Subjects Committee

cc. Office of Sponsored Programs, “Dr. Georgianna Bolden” <gbolden@cau.edu>
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SPSS PROGRAM ANALYSIS

TITLE 'TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF FOSTER AND NON-FOSTER CARE STUDENTS'.
SUBTITLE 'PAMELA TODD - CAU PhD Program School of Social Work'.

DATA LIST FIXED/
ID 1-3
GENDER 4
ETHNIC 5
AGEGRP 6
MARITAL 7
EMPLOY 8
EDUC 9
INCOME 10
TEACH 11
STUDENT 12
MOTIV10 13
MOTIV11 14
MOTIV12 15
MOTIV13 16
BEHAV14 17
BEHAV15 18
BEHAV16 19
BEHAV17 20
ACADE18 21
ACADE19 22
ACADE20 23
ACADE21 24.

COMPUTE MOTIVATE = (MOTIV10+MOTIV11+MOTIV12+MOTIV13)/4.
COMPUTE BEHAVIOR = (BEHAV14+BEHAV15+BEHAV16+BEHAV17)/4.
COMPUTE ACADEMIC = (ACADE18+ACADE19+ACADE20+ACADE21)/4.

VARIABLE LABELS
ID 'Case Number'
GENDER 'Q1 Gender'
ETHNIC 'Q2 Ethnicity'
AGEGRP 'Q3 Age Group'
MARITAL 'Q4 Marital Status'
EMPLOY 'Q5 Employment Status'
EDUC 'Q6 Education'
INCOME 'Q7 Yearly household Income'
TEACH 'Q8 Teaching Experience'
STUDENT 'Q9 Best describe Students'
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MOTIV10 'Q10 Foster care students do not participate in enrichment activities'
MOTIV11 'Q11 Foster care students are not motivated in the classroom setting'
MOTIV12 'Q12 Non-foster care students do participate in enrichment activities'
MOTIV13 'Q13 Non-foster care students are motivated in the classroom setting'
BEHAV14 'Q14 Foster care students do not encounter conflicts on school premises'
BEHAV15 'Q15 Foster care students do not follow school policies'
BEHAV16 'Q16 Non-foster care students encounter conflicts on school premises'
BEHAV17 'Q17 Non-foster care students follow policies'
ACADE18 'Q18 Foster care students do not work diligently toward completion of their classroom assignments'
ACADE19 'Q19 Foster care students do not need assistance with academics'
ACADE20 'Q20 Non-foster care students work diligently towards completion of their classroom assignment'
ACADE21 'Q21 Non-foster care students need assistance with academics'.

VALUE LABELS
GENDER
1 'Male'
2 'Female'/
ETHNIC
1 'Caucasian'
2 'African American'
3 'Asian American'
4 'Hispanic'
5 'Native American'
6 'Other'/
AGEGRP
1 '21-29'
2 '30-39'
3 '40-49'
4 '50-59'
5 '60 & Over'/
MARITAL
1 'Never Married'
2 'Married'
3 'Divorced'
4 'Widowed'/
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| EMPLOY | 1 'Full-time' |
|        | 2 'Part-time' |
|        | 3 'Volunteer'/ |

| EDUC | 1 'College Graduate' |
|      | 2 'Some Graduate Training' |
|      | 3 'Masters Degree' |
|      | 4 'Specialist Training' |
|      | 5 'Doctorate Degree'/ |

| INCOME | 1 '$35,000—44,999' |
|        | 2 '$45,000—54,999' |
|        | 3 '$55,000—64,999' |
|        | 4 '$65,000—74,999' |
|        | 5 '$75,000 & over'/ |

| TEACH | 1 'Less than 1yr' |
|       | 2 '1-4 years' |
|       | 3 '5-9 years' |
|       | 4 '10-14 years' |
|       | 5 '15yrs & more'/ |

| STUDENT | 1 'Both' |
|         | 2 'Foster Care' |
|         | 3 'Non-Foster Care'/ |

| MOTIV10 | 1 'Strongly Disagree' |
|         | 2 'Disagree' |
|         | 3 'Agree' |
|         | 4 'Strongly Agree'/ |

| MOTIV11 | 1 'Strongly Disagree' |
|         | 2 'Disagree' |
|         | 3 'Agree' |
|         | 4 'Strongly Agree'/ |

| MOTIV12 | 1 'Strongly Disagree' |
|         | 2 'Disagree' |
|         | 3 'Agree' |
|         | 4 'Strongly Agree'/ |

| MOTIV13 | 1 'Strongly Disagree' |
|         | 2 'Disagree' |
|         | 3 'Agree' |
|         | 4 'Strongly Agree'/ |
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BEHAV14
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

BEHAV15
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

BEHAV16
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

BEHAV17
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

ACADE18
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

ACADE19
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

ACADE20
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

ACADE21
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

MOTIVATE
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'

BEHAVIOR
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'
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ACADEMIC
  1 'Strongly Disagree'
  2 'Disagree'
  3 'Agree'
  4 'Strongly Agree'./.

RECODE MOTIV10 MOTIV11 MOTIV12 MOTIV13 (1 thru 2.99=2)(3 thru 4.99=3).
RECODE BEHAV14 BEHAV15 BEHAV16 BEHAV17 (1 thru 2.99=2)(3 thru 4.99=3).
RECODE ACADE18 ACADE19 ACADE20 ACADE21 (1 thru 2.99=2)(3 thru 4.99=3).
RECODE MOTIVATE BEHAVIOR ACADEMIC(1 thru 2.99=2)(3 thru 4.99=3).

MISSING VALUES
  GENDER ETHNIC AGE GRP MARITAL EMPLOY EDUC INCOME TEACH
  STUDENT MOTIV10 MOTIV11 MOTIV12 MOTIV13
  BEHAV14 BEHAV15 BEHAV16 BEHAV17
  ACADE18 ACADE19 ACADE20 ACADE21 (0).

BEGIN DATA
  001223112132234324243223
  0022253134251441232123
  0032252145311341143114
  004222133312212432122
  0052221113222332233232
  0061231222322222322222
  0072231322232323232323
  0082221355322323232323
  0091231322233323232323
  0102221435323332333233
  0112221542222222222222
  0122221112323233233233
  0132221123323233232323
  0142221132323232323232
  0152231112332223232323
  0162321232232223222222
  0172221112222132132222
  0181221123222222322222
  01922312212211321323
  02022211123222222232323
  0212221123212121323243
  0222231313332121323233
  0231231133333323232323
  0241231333232323232323
  0252221112222222323233
  0262221112322332323233
  0272111123222322312133
  028123123122223421233
  0292231133321222332233
  0302221123222223321333
  0312221133322112142143
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03222213333212221342143
03322214542313223232233
0342221323322323232323
035222145322132231321233
036222113443333134322322
037222111222212222322323
038222111232224113332223
03922211142222223231233
040222321435322323232323
041222144432232323232323
042222143222322323232323
043222131432222222222223
0442221434232323222231234
045223315553223223232323
046222133231413213222323
047222111232324113332232
048231111123232323232323
04921111122004400330033
050211111222222222222222
051212211122222222222222
052212313122222222222222
0532231311332313422134
05422211113223312432132
055221111222222222222222
056231111122003300330033
057222111232223223232323
058222111232223223232323
059222132322113311331133
060213313432232323232323
06122111123112211221122
062212111232222222222222
063211114123112222222222
064222211133113311222222
065224313443222222222222
066222111232222222222222
067223213232222222222222
068243134432222222222222
069222111123112211221122
070222111232222222222222
071122111123223222222222
072222111123222222222222
073223214231112211221122
074122111123222222222222
075223214232222222222222
07612211423112211221122
077122113232222222222222
078222111123222222222222
079222111123222222222222
080223313232222222222222
0812122132232223332323233
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FREQUENCIES
/VARIABLES GENDER ETHNIC AGERG MARITAL EMPLOY EDUC INCOME TEACH
STUDENT MOTIV10 MOTIV11 MOTIV12 MOTIV13 BEHAV14 BEHAV15 BEHAV16 BEHAV17
ACADE18 ACADE19 ACADE20 ACADE21 MOTIVATE BEHAVIOR ACADEMIC
/STATISTICS = DEFAULT.
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