DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 275 TM 830 143

AUTHOR Dorr-Bremme, Donald
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO CSE-R-189
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 96p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *Busing; Case Studies; Decision Making; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnography; Intergroup Relations; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; School Buses; *Student Transportation; *Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS *Los Angeles Unified School District CA

TITLE Ethnographic Study of Los Angeles Unified School District's Permits with Transportation (PWT) Program.

ABSTRACT

The Los Angeles Unified School District's Permit with Transportation (PWT) Program allows volunteering students to be bused to attend schools other than those to which they would normally be assigned on the basis of residential location. Described are aspects of student participants' experiences, and of PWT Program activities at four receiving schools to answer the following questions: (1) To what extent are the students participating in PWT integrated into social life at the receiving schools? (2) What policies, programs, and activities specifically related to the PWT Program are carried out in the receiving schools? (3) In general, what are staff members' views on the PWT Program? Over a period of 4 weeks, two trained field researchers spent about 50 hours at each of two elementary and two secondary schools observing students and staff. Debriefing tapes, and all interview and observation notes were reviewed to synthesize the data. The findings of the study are presented in two forms. A narrative description of four vignettes depicts the social life of PWT students at each school. The findings are also presented--separately for elementary and high schools--as answers to questions policy makers and program managers might ask. (PN)

ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT'S PERMITS WITH TRANSPORTATION (PWT) PROGRAM

Donald Dorr-Bremme

CSE Report No. 189
1982

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF EVALUATION
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

The research reported herein was supported in part by a grant to the Center for the Study of Evaluation from the National Institute of Education. U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions and findings expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of NIE and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Table of Contents

PREFACE: HOW THIS REPORT CAME TO BE

During the summer of 1980, the Los Angeles Unified School District was directed by the Court to monitor periodically its desegregation process. Responding to this directive, the District assembled an Integration Evaluation Planning Team (EPT) of five experts in education, evaluation, and desegregation. When termination of the District's Manadatory Desegregation busing phase was imminent (in April, 1981), the District's Integration Planning and Management Division, in conjunction with the Research and Evaluation Branch, asked the team of experts to redirect planned research toward three other programs in the Los Angeles desegregation plan: Year-Round Schools, Magnet Schools, and Permits with Transportation (PWT). The objective of this research was to gather information for program planning and policy making. A program of research thus evolved. That research was carried out in Los Angeles schools through May and early June of 1981.

Thus, this "ethnographic study" was initiated by members of the Integration Evaluation Planning Team in consultation with both District Research and Evaluation Branch staff members and those involved in planning and managing school integration in Los Angeles. The work, however, was designed and carried out by personnel at the Center for the Study of Evaluation in the Graduate School of Education at UCLA.

Although the work was nested within a broader study of PWT and, in turn, research on several other desegregation programs, it was in most

respects an entirely discrete endeavor. However, (1) the Integration Evaluation Planning Team directed that the four schools chosen for this sub-study be selected from a set of twenty sampled for questionnaire research in the larger study of PWT; (2) Los Angeles Unified School District personnel required that this study focus on the social experiences of students participating in PWT; and (3) District personnel also required that students not be interviewed. With these exceptions, the UCLA group had no contact with others involved in the desegregation research.

INTRODUCTION

Focus of the Study

The Los Angeles Unified School District's Permits with Transportation (PWT) Program allows students voluntarily to attend schools other than those to which they would normally be assigned on the basis of residential location. Buses are provided for those who participate in the Program. PWT began in 1968 with 550 student participants. Today, PWT continues as part of the District's Voluntary Integration Program. In 1980-81, 14,743 pupils from 146 "sending schools" attended 74 "receiving schools" as part of the PWT Program.

Aspects of student participants' experiences, and of PWT Program activities at four receiving schools, are described in this report. The general purpose of the description is to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent are the students participating in PWT integrated into social life at the receiving schools?
2. What policies, programs, and activities specifically related to the PWT Program (especially those in support of PWT students' integration into school social life) are carried out in the receiving schools?
3. In general, what are staff members' views on the PWT Program?

How Information was Gathered

Information to address these three questions was gathered during extended visits to four schools: Goodwin Avenue and Bresson Place Elementary Schools; and Hardwick and Dewey High Schools.* (The names used here and throughout this report are pseudonyms.) Over a period of four weeks, a pair of trained field researchers spent about 50 hours each (or about 100 person-hours) at the two elementary schools. They conducted formal, semi-structured interviews with 14 staff members--administrators, classroom teachers, instructional specialists, and aides. Informal conversations with 11 others were also held. In addition, the field team observed students' and staff members' actions and interactions during the arrival and departure of the buses; at recess, lunch, and physical education; in halls and offices; on the grounds before and after school; and, of course, in classrooms. (In the two elementary schools together, 12 classrooms were observed at a variety of times during the day, for a total duration of a little over 16 hours.)

Two other field researchers concentrated their efforts on the high schools. They spent over 50 hours in tandem at each site (or, about 110 person-hours in the field). Formal, semi-structured interviews were conducted by the pair with a total of 28 faculty members, counselors, administrators, and aides. The field researchers also conducted 40 informal conversations with professional personnel at the high schools.

They observed the behavior of students and staff during bus arrival and departure; at lunch time, nutrition periods, and between classes in

* See Appendix for a description of the process and criteria for school selection.

various settings around the two campuses. They also watched band rehearsal, athletic practices, and administrative office operations. In addition, the pair visited a school art show and a talent show. And, of course, they observed classroom activities. (The high school research team, however, spent little time in any one classroom. Because the number of high school classrooms is large and the scope of campus activities is wide, the study emphasized breadth rather than depth of observational coverage. Thus some 50 or so classes were observed for periods of several minutes, often from the doorways of classrooms. A few class groups were visited for longer periods.)

Both research teams also had brief informal conversations with students. Researchers recorded interview responses and made records of observations and informal conversations in field notes. (No formal observation forms were used.)

Between periods on site, each field research team was "debriefed" by the project coordinator. During these debriefing sessions: (a) the researchers synthesized information and reported their evolving impressions and evidence which confirmed or disconfirmed them; (b) gaps in the data collected to date were identified; (c) progressively more specific questions were identified; and (d) priority tasks for the next period in the field were set forth. The project coordinator also noted the implicit assumptions, biases, etc., evident in the researchers' reports; gave the researchers' feedback on these; and directed the researchers to specific data-gathering activities that would challenge the biases and test the assumptions they

held. Thus, "debriefing" conferences were a means of successively analyzing the data, of fine-tuning the research, and of maintaining quality control.

Final analysis of the information included reviewing all debriefing tapes (by the project coordinator) and all interview and observation notes (by the field teams) in order to synthesize the data and check confirming and disconfirming evidence for generalizations.

What This Report Is and Is Not

Usually, field researchers who proceed ethnographically* devote two-to-three times the length of time they spend in the field to data analysis activity. The researchers on this project knew it would not be possible to spend that kind of time on analysis. (The entire project had to be accomplished within five weeks of the day the project coordinator was asked to do the work.) However, the research team purposely chose to spend as much time on site as possible--to gather more data than they could describe in detail in a final report. As a consequence, specific counts, for example, of the number of interviewees who said this or that; of the proportion of PWT students who were observed with local students here or there, etc.; as well as extended quotations of respondents, and other forms of precise documentation, are limited in the text that follows.

*The ethnographic approach is that employed by anthropologists, who usually spend extended periods in the field, live among the social group they are studying and, based on field note records, examine social life "holistically" across many levels of social organization. As ethnographers do, the researchers on this project kept their eyes and ears open, attended to themes and patterns of talk and behavior as they occurred in context, took field notes, and progressively refined and focused what they attended to. In these ways, the work was "ethnographically oriented."

(Time for cross-checking counts, selecting large numbers of quotations, etc., was simply too limited.) But, of course, each generalization is grounded in the data--and that data is stronger for having been gathered (given total research time) over a maximum time period in a maximum number of settings.

A second caveat is critical: fifty or sixty hours (the time spent at each school) is an extremely limited amount of time in which to understand issues as complex as those this study entails. Literature on the Permits With Transportation Program emphasizes that participating students will have opportunities to "learn to get along with all people" and meet "new friends."* The Court-defined harms of racial isolation PWT is intended to address, include negative attitudes toward school and tension in intergroup relations. In four school days (the equivalent of the 50 hours spent per school), it is possible to observe the surface of social life. But it is not possible in that time (especially given constraints on speaking with students) to get in touch with participants' feelings and experiences of that social life. Nor can one sufficiently comprehend the beliefs and assumptions which govern the ways in which participants act with one another. In short, the world-as-experienced by students and staff members in the four schools--given the scope of this study--remains virtually undescribed in the pages below.

Do PWT participants feel that they have full access to all school

*See, for instance, the April, 1981 "Dear Parent or Guardian" letter distributed by the School District to parents with children in the Mandatory Busing Program, and the PWT Permit Application brochure ("New Schools, New Friends") distributed to all students in May, 1981.

programs and activities? Do they believe that they are accepted as "regular members" of the student body? What are local students' attitudes toward those from other parts of town? What systems of belief among staff members may account for the actions they were observed to take--and not to take--with PWT students? Such questions as these remain unanswered here.

In short, then, this report provides a solid picture of what appears on the surface to be the social experience of PWT students in four schools. This picture (in conjunction with other parts of the PWT study conducted in the late spring of 1981) is a sufficient basis for District policy-makers and program managers to take some initial steps toward strengthening the program. It is a picture which implies clear directions for further research. But it is not a picture which captures the life experiences of those who spend their days in the schools. Many questions remain unasked.

How This Report is Organized

The findings of the study described above are presented in two forms. The first form is that of narrative description. Four vignettes--one on each school--are provided to give the reader a "feel" for the social life of PWT students at each school. These vignettes follow a "day in the life" format. (In fact, however, each is a composite drawn from data gathered on several days, and the classes portrayed are not necessarily scheduled in the order described.)

Next, the findings are presented--separately for elementary and high schools--as answers to six specific questions. These are questions that,

within the defined scope of this study, policy-makers and program managers might ask:

1. Do PWT students seem to have equitable access to and within all school facilities, school-sponsored programs, and activities?

2. Do students participating in PWT interact with other students in the receiving schools? (Attention is given to when, where, and how).

3. What are the qualities of staff-student interaction in the school settings?

4. What policies, programs, and activities for PWT students are designed and implemented at the schools?

5. According to the staff members at the receiving schools visited, what are the advantages and disadvantages of the PWT Program?

6. What are the recommendations of the staff members at the schools visited, regarding the PWT Program?

Summary answers to each question are presented as "bullets" just after the questions themselves. (The reader who wishes a brief overview of the findings can simply skip over the description and documentation which, in each case, follow.)

Finally, a summary of findings from elementary and secondary schools together is offered.

PWT AT GOODWIN AVENUE: A VIGNETTE

As the six buses with the PWT students approach Goodwin Avenue Elementary School, they pass through a quiet neighborhood with moderately-sized homes. Homes border the school on all sides and children can be seen arriving at the private school in the next block. Once the buses arrive at the school most of the students can be seen gathering their belongings and getting off the bus in a somewhat orderly fashion. One of the three PWT aides reminds a few of the students to calm down and not to push as they get off the bus. Once the PWT students have unloaded, some wait for friends on other buses to catch up to them and they enter the school premises either in pairs or in small groups.

It is about 8:00 a.m., and neighborhood students begin arriving also. Some of them walk toward the patio area to stand in line with the PWT students to wait for breakfast. A few of the students call out greetings to the principal who is there to help supervise. He returns their hellos and talks with a few of the students as they enter the school grounds.

The lining up for breakfast is an animated event--evidenced by minor horseplay and laughter. Most of the students appear to stay in the groups they arrived with while standing in line. When they get their food some of the PWT students sit among the local students to eat their breakfast.

When the students finish their breakfast they are dismissed by one of the PWT aides who makes sure the area around them is clean before students can leave for the playground activities. This results in a fairly clean area when the students leave and head for the playground.

The playground and appropriate equipment are available for the students to use before school starts. Most students participate in some type of game but some can be seen standing in groups talking or walking around the play area or between the classrooms. The playground area is quite large so numerous opportunities are available for the students to mix with one another. Some of the activities that the students seem to enjoy are kickball, basketball, volleyball, foursquare, hopscotch, jumprope, handball, and playing on the jungle gym and bar equipment.

The PWT students and the others seem to mix and play together on the playground during this time. Some separation here is noted in that many of the boys and girls play separately--the girls mainly choosing to play foursquare, jumprope and hopscotch while the boys usually play kickball, handball, and basketball. But within these games some separation between PWT students and the other students is also evident. There are pockets on the playground where groups, made up of only PWT students, are playing together, and in other places groups of local neighborhood students are playing by themselves. When speaking to a teacher about this matter, he comments that he feels there is some separation among the ethnic groups but also feels that the PWT boys mix much better than the girls. The principal feels that "mixing has been a slow process" because some of the PWT students are physically much bigger than most of the local students; the principal feels this may cause some intimidation.

The morning playground activities are brought to an end by the ringing of the bell at 8:25. Upon hearing the bell the students gradually stop

their play, return the equipment to the resource monitor, and line up at their designated locations to wait for their teachers. The PWT aides can be seen urging the stragglers on the playground to hurry and get in line. As the teachers come to greet their classes most of the students can be seen standing in two straight lines, often with boys and girls in the same line. No distinct separations between PWT students and the others are noted at this time.

At Goodwin Avenue, PWT students can be seen in most of the first through sixth-grade classrooms. In the upper grade classes it is often the case that at least half of the students in the class are part of the PWT program. Within each classroom the PWT and the local students appear to be randomly seated among each other, so that the seating arrangements do not seem to cause any undue physical separation between the students.

Looking in on one of the classrooms the students are quietly working on their reading assignments. Most of the upper grade students are involved in a homogeneous-group reading plan so not all of the students have their regular teacher at this time. The students in this room are sitting at three long groups of tables. The teacher is working with some students at the middle table while the others in the room are quietly working on assignments. The students with the teacher are discussing a novel which they have been reading. This group consists of White, Black, and Hispanic students, all of whom seem to be paying attention and participating.

The teacher questions the students about the book and gives them all equal opportunities to respond. The tone in the room is subdued and the

students are not given much opportunity to interact while working during this time. When the students do interact it is usually about a question they have about their assignment.

In another classroom during this same time the tone is much livelier as the students are interacting much more. The students are working on a math lesson which deals with the division of fractions. After the teacher has reviewed the steps the students are to follow, they begin their assignment. Both the aide and the teacher walk around the room helping students individually as they need it.

The students talk as they work. At a few points during their work the teacher asks them to "hold down the noise" but some continue talking. A PWT girl and a White boy laugh about something together as another PWT girl moves over to talk with an ethnically mixed group of girls sitting in another part of the room. The teacher reminds the students that their assignment is due before recess and this seems to make the students quieter. He asks one of the PWT girls who has finished to go over and help one of the local neighborhood students.

The teacher comments that he is very upset about the student-to-teacher ratio. He says he has had 35 or 36 students all year and feels the "students have been cheated" because of this.

As it nears recess time, the principal interrupts the lessons in each room to make some announcements over the school's intercom. He explains the new schedule for the marble area to the students, asks that certain classes pick up the papers that are outside their rooms, and reminds the students who are "benched" that they are to go to the meditation

room. This is a room the school has set up for students to go to think about their behavior.

When the principal finishes his announcement the teacher dismisses the students for recess. They walk slowly outside in pairs and in small groups of PWT and other students. As they reach the playground some split up to begin playing the respective games of their choice.

At recess the patterns of interaction are similar to those that occur during the before-school playground games. The whole school has recess at the same time and students are able to play where they wish. However, once the students have chosen a game they must stay there for the whole period.

A popular pastime during recess and lunch at Goodwin Avenue school is the game of marbles. Because marbles has become so popular, a special area has been designated specifically for the students to play the game. Very few, if any, girls play in this area but the PWT and local neighborhood students who play here mix and interact quite freely. One of the students from the receiving school area reports that if it weren't for the PWT students, marbles would not have become popular. He also comments that the Hispanic students are the best at the game and are respected for that talent. Some of the teachers report that the marbles are quite a problem in the classroom but the game is so popular it is difficult to forbid the students to play.

No name-calling or teasing between PWT students and other students is heard during the recess period. Some of the personnel at Goodwin Avenue relate that there was some fighting and name-calling on the playground pre-

viously in the year, but with discussions and disciplinary techniques the problems have subsided. They feel the atmosphere of the school is much improved.

The three PWT aides are present on the playground along with the principal to supervise the play time. The principal seems to make a point to speak to both PWT pupils and the neighborhood students and greets as many by their names as possible. The students appear to feel free to speak with the principal on an informal basis when he is out on the school grounds.

Upon visiting another classroom, after recess, most of the students are seen sitting in long rows which face the teacher's desk at the front of the room. There are two aides, one on either side of the room, working with small groups of Hispanic students. The rest of the students are working on a variety of reading assignments. As the students work, the PWT students and the others often speak with those near them either about their assignments or just socially. A Black PWT student and another student who is from the receiving school are completing an assignment together and seem to work well together. The teacher is available for questions at this time and sits at her desk so that the students may come to her if they have problems.

During the hour the class is working on their reading assignments, a variety of students approach the teacher with questions or problems. She responds in English and Spanish as appropriate for each student. She seems to raise her voice quite often while dealing with the students and seems particularly harsh with the PWT students. This teacher comments that she has high standards for the students in her class and feels that, in partic-

ular, the PWT students in her class need to be pushed to achieve at the level she feels they should be working at.

This class goes to lunch at 11:30 a.m. with half of the school while the other half goes at 12:00 p.m. With the growth in the size of the school the principal maintains that it is logistically necessary to have separate lunch periods. He comments that he is not happy with the situation because the students cannot mix well, but he does split the grades so that the first, third, and fifth graders go at one time and the second, fourth, and sixth-grade students go at another.

At each lunch period the students must stand in a long line to get their lunches from the cafeteria. The head custodian acts as the cashier during this time which he feels is a good way to have positive contact with many of the students on a daily basis. The lunch area is noisy and active. Most of the PWT students and the neighborhood students sit by one another and talk with each other while they eat. There is some evidence at both lunch periods that there are areas at the tables where a group or two of PWT students will sit each day and ignore local neighborhood students who may sit near them. However, this does not seem to create hostility or tension among any of the students.

As at recess and before school, the students may again choose where they want to play after lunch. Because there are half as many students on the playground now, the games are more spread out, the area is less congested, and more small groups of students can be seen playing together. It becomes apparent during this time that more interaction seems to be occurring between the PWT and receiving school students at the lower grade

levels than at the upper grades. Some of the upper grade PWT girls can be found grouped at the jumprope area practicing their "double-dutch" jumping techniques. A group of older PWT boys can be seen across the playground dominating a kickball game, while a large group of younger students (both PWT and local) are playing a game of kickball together. One of the teachers relates that he feels that there seems to be more racial grouping at the sixth-grade level and less at the lower levels. He thinks that as the PWT program continues at Goodwin Avenue (this is only the first year of the program there) the grouping will be discouraged at the sixth-grade level.

After lunch a class is seen taking care of some "once-a-month business." The teacher allows his students to change seats once a month and permits them to sit where they want as long as no one else wants it. Specific rules govern this process. A student cannot stay in his or her usual seat if another student wants it, and if two students want the same seat they "pick-a-number" to see who gets it. No conflicts or bad feelings arise during this "move." The students are polite to each other and follow the rules that have been set. As the "move" is completed it is seen that many of the PWT students are sitting among their peers who live in the local area.

The students sit in six "islands" or groups which consist of six students each. The teacher purposely has arranged his room this way so that the students are encouraged to interact with those at their "island." He also feels that the moving of seats each month is another good method for getting the students to mix with each other.

New monitors are picked at the beginning of each month so this is also done at the same time as the seat changing. The teacher names a position of responsibility in the classroom and the students volunteer for the one they want by raising their hand. They are not allowed to do a job that they have done already during the year unless no one else wants it. Line leaders, office monitors, ball monitors, president, ticket monitor, etc., are all chosen. PWT students as well as neighborhood students volunteer and are chosen for the responsibilities.

The teacher also asks each group to pick a captain to be the group spokesperson. Half of the captains turn out to be PWT students. The captains encourage their group to quickly clean up the area around their desks so they can earn some "points" for their efforts. The teacher relates that he has originated a point system and gives group prizes periodically for the groups that have the most points. He feels giving group points instead of individual points encourages the groups to unify and work together, thus aiding interaction and personal relations.

As each group has cleaned their area the president dismisses the class to go outside for physical education. The class walks out in pairs and small groups some of which have a mix of PWT and other students. As the class walks out toward the playground to play softball against another class, the primary students are being dismissed. The primary PWT students gather at a corner of the playground with the PWT aides to play while they wait until the older PWT students are dismissed so they can leave on the buses together.

The softball game is quite lively and most of the students seem enthusiastic about playing. No hostility or name calling between the students is evident and the only arguments that arise are about how many outs there are, the score of the game, and the like. Not all of the students are playing the softball game. A few of the PWT girls in both classes have opted to play jumprope instead and they are off to one side playing by themselves. Another group of girls who are from the local neighborhood play hopscotch nearby.

As the time nears 2:20 p.m. the teachers instruct their students to return to their rooms and get ready to go home. They are dismissed at that time and walk toward the front of the school. Most of the PWT students hurry toward the buses that are lined up waiting for them at the school entrance. The principal is out in front of the school supervising the students and saying goodbye to them. One of the doors of one of the buses is broken so the students who normally ride that bus must go home on one of the other buses. They complain as they get on the other bus. The bus driver yells at them to sit down and be quiet so they can leave.

The time is almost 2:25 p.m., and the buses begin pulling away. A PWT student comes running out from the school grounds as his bus leaves. A few local students stand with him and tell the principal the PWT student has missed his bus. As they stand there trying to decide what to do the bus returns for the student. The principal comments that one of the other PWT students probably had realized the boy was not on the bus

and had informed the bus driver. The principal is quite upset that the bus left a minute or two early and feels that the drivers should be more flexible about the departure time since the students are only given five minutes after school is dismissed to get on the bus. But he is glad the PWT student is on the bus now and on his way home.

PWT AT BRESSON PLACE: A VIGNETTE

The buses with the PWT students approach Bresson Place School from the busy four-lane boulevard that borders one side of the school. They turn onto Bresson Place and stop in front of the school. The single family residences across the street from the school are small, but well-kept with large shade trees and nice lawns. Similar homes border the school on three sides.

It is 8:00 a.m., and the custodian arrives to open the main gate for the handful of students who have come from the neighborhood area and for the PWT students who are waiting on the buses. As the gate is opened the buses unload one at a time. Buses with "satellite" students arrive at this time also. Some students head straight for the gate while others hold back, seemingly, to wait for students who are on the other buses. Most of the students walk calmly onto the school grounds in pairs or small groups. Others jump excitedly off the buses and run through the entrance to the breakfast line. The one PWT aide follows them to the area as the buses depart.

The students in the breakfast line are animated and talk loudly while they are waiting to get their food. Some stand in groups and a few PWT boys are playfully pushing and grabbing each other. The breakfast line moves rather quickly as the students get their food and sit at the tables in the covered patio area.

The principal comes from the office area at this time and begins to help the PWT aide supervise the area. He moves over to where the boys

are still playing, asks them in a firm manner to stand in line, and then guides them with his hand to show them where they should be. The line seems to become quite orderly with the influence of the principal's presence.

Other students from the neighborhood have arrived and this now makes the area quite loud and busy. Many of the students at the patio tables are PWT or satellite children, but some neighborhood students also benefit from the free breakfast program. The students seem to mix to a certain degree during this period by sitting together and talking with each other. Some separation --by age and by race--appears evident. Groups of younger children congregate together and groups of children from the same culture appear to cluster somewhat in different areas. One of the teachers comments that she thinks that the Hispanic satellite students seem to be most isolated at the school because of the language differences.

As the students finish their food they move to the playground area. The principal and the PWT aide continue to monitor the patio area by telling the students to keep eating and to pick up their trash as the bell is going to ring soon. Even though the students are reminded to dispose of their trash, much of the patio area is littered.

As the time nears 8:30 a.m., a bell rings to warn the students school is almost ready to begin. The first bell is their warning to get ready and to collect their things, get drinks of water, use the restroom, etc. Some of the students have been playing on the jungle gym equipment, playing hopscotch, or walking around the school, but most are standing on the playground in groups talking and laughing with each other. As the final

bell rings the students line up with their classes in their designated spot. The PWT aide hurries the last stragglers away from the breakfast area and tells them to line up with their classes.

The teachers come to greet their students and most of the classes walk in two single file lines to their rooms. No noticeable separations between PWT students and the other students are evident during this time.

PWT students can be found in almost all of the "regular" classrooms at Bresson Place. (Bresson Place also serves a number of special education students.) Few classes have significantly more PWT students than any others and within these classrooms the PWT students are seated among the other students. Because of the seating arrangements, little separation of PWT students from the others is apparent.

Upon entering one of the classrooms the students are seen to be seated in four long rows and are in two main groupings. To facilitate instruction, the second graders are on one side of the room and the third graders are on the other. The teacher speaks to the class in Spanish and in English as many of the students here are part of the satellite program. The teacher relates later that having a split grade class is difficult and the fact that there are many Hispanic children in the class who speak very little English makes it even more difficult.

Some of the students are working with the teacher on a long-division lesson. The others are working quietly on their spelling assignment. The teacher asks a question about a problem she has put on the board; a PWT student is one of the first to raise her hand to answer. The student is called upon and gives the appropriate answer and the teacher compliments

her. The teacher calls on a variety of students for the rest of the problems, both PWT and others.

As the math lesson is completed the teacher assigns some problems for other students to do. As they begin the teacher turns to work with the other students in the class. Some of the students who are now working on their math assignment interact periodically with others around them. These interactions are usually concerning supplies or about the assignment. The teacher has to turn around occasionally to ask the students to be quiet. The PWT students in this class are seen talking with the other students in the class but are also seen getting up out of their seats to talk with PWT counterparts.

Looking in on another classroom at Bresson Place reveals a somewhat different situation than the last classroom described. The classroom is louder and the atmosphere is much more active. In this room, most of the students are seated in small groups at clusters of tables, and PWT participants and others are together. A few individuals, both White and Black, are seated at their own individual desks to one side of the room.

The students are working on copying reports on a subject of their choice. The teacher monitors the class by walking around from table to table answering questions as they arise and complimenting the students on their work. This teacher seems open and friendly with the students which appears to encourage them to be the same. The students work on their assignments but at the same time converse with one another in a friendly manner. No unhappy expressions or scowls are noticed in the classroom.

As the time approaches 10 a.m., the teacher tells the students it is time for recess and apologizes for not noticing the time sooner. The students immediately put their materials away and walk outside, talking with each other without apparent regard to local or PWT status. Most of the students leave in groups of two or three and walk toward the playground.

The playground is a large, asphalt-covered area enclosed by a tall, chain-link fence. Because the area is large many different activities can be seen on the playground at any one time. Some of these include: volleyball, handball, hopscotch, kickball, jumprope, basketball, bar equipment, and foursquare. The students are allowed to play wherever they wish and can move freely about the playground. They may check out equipment from the equipment monitor to facilitate their games.

For the most part, the PWT students mix, interact, and play with the other students during the recess period. The handball courts, some of the kickball games, and the volleyball courts appear to be the games where both boys and girls and PWT and non-PWT students play together most often.

However, some separation among the students is also apparent at this time. Groups of PWT students can be seen playing by themselves and groups of receiving school students can be seen playing alone as well. When speaking to the principal about this matter he relates that he feels there still is somewhat of an "isolation problem" at the school; he also has noticed separate groups on the playground.

No critical incidents such as fights, name-calling, or teasing are seen or heard on the playground. The PWT aide and two or three other

adults supervise the students during the recess period. The aide feels that the presence of more than one adult on the yard has helped reduce the problems and fights she feels were prevalent at the beginning of the year. (Other staff members also reported that inter-ethnic tension and fights were more frequent early in the year, and confirmed that such incidents are rare now.)

When the bell rings most of the students line up in the same place that they had earlier in the morning. Some of the upper grade students line up with different classes because they participate in homogeneous (or "departmentalized") reading groups and are not with their regular teacher during this time.

Upon entering one of the classrooms that serves students in the middle reading group, it is immediately noticed that the room is very quiet. None of the students are talking. The teacher is sitting at a desk at the front of the room while the students are sitting in three large groups of tables placed in long double rows. The students are scattered about the tables so that few of them are sitting immediately next to another student. (Usually a chair or two is in between.)

Some of the students are working silently on a written assignment while a small group of students are taking turns reading aloud as the teacher listens. There are approximately five PWT students in this room, three of whom are in the group reading with the teacher. As the students finish reading their part of the text the teacher either comments on their reading or asks questions about what they read. The students respond in quiet tones. It appears, in general, that this teacher

does not compliment the students very often. Indeed, in this lesson, the Black PWT students are criticized for the very same reading errors that are overlooked when other students make them.

Another classroom which is also doing reading during this time contains the students who are working at a lower reading level. It appears that there are a few more PWT students here than in the other classroom. The atmosphere is a busy one, apparently because of the nature of the teacher's style and the activities that are going on. The teacher is working with a group of about 12 students in the front of the room. Others are at their seats working individually while still another group is working on correcting an assignment with a peer tutor at the back of the room. Again, PWT participants and local students are mixed and interacting easily.

The interaction in both the front and the back of the room is lively. The teacher calls on and compliments each of the students in her group as they read the sentence that they have written using their new vocabularly words. The students help each other at the group session. Most of the students are at their seats on task but some converse while they work.

This teacher had been transferred to Bresson Place as part of the District's program to integrate school staff. This is his third year at the school but he is hoping to return to the downtown area next year because it is much closer to where he lives. He feels that part of his effectiveness is due to the fact that he lives in the general area where PWT students live and can easily contact their parents. He finds most of the parents of the PWT students to be supportive of what he is doing but

feels that some parents often do not have the time or knowledge to help their children. The teacher attempts to remain in contact with the parents continually throughout the year and maintains that they do try to help him when he calls. (Other teachers spoke of calling the parents of PWT students, but the contacts made by this teacher seemed more frequent.)

Lunchtime is at 12 noon. Previously it had been at 11:00 a.m., but partly because of the PWT program, the staff decided to change the time so that they would have more time for basic skills instruction in the morning. The teachers feel that all of the students benefit from this change.

When the students get their lunches they move to sit in the patio area at the tables, or on the lawn which is nearby. All of the students in the school eat lunch at the same time so the area is quite congested and noisy. The PWT aide and a couple of other adults move around to monitor the students and respond to problems as they occur.

The students sit in patterns similar to those in the breakfast program, but since there are more students during lunch, they are seated with more to a table than at breakfast. This seems to increase the amount of interaction that now occurs in the patio area. Some students are sitting on the lawn and it appears that some racial separation is evident here. Groups of two or three PWT students cluster together laughing and talking while small groups of local or satellite students eat in other areas. No antagonism or tension is noticed between the students as the groups appear rather to ignore each other at this time.

As the students finish eating they quickly disperse to different

areas of the playground. As at recess, the students may play where they want and with whomever they want. The lunch games and the makeup of the groups within the game areas look similar to those at recess, with PWT and non-PWT students generally playing together. The principal comes out periodically to scan the lunch area and the playground to help the other adults monitor the activities.

After lunch a class of sixth-grade students can be heard singing songs that they will be performing at their culmination program. The teacher plays the guitar as accompaniment and is encouraging the 36 students in his class to sing louder. He kids the students at times by saying he cannot hear them which results in the students singing louder. As they sing the teacher compliments students individually on their singing; both PWT and other students are singled out for his positive remarks. All of the students sing and seem to enjoy the activity.

Part of the program will include square dancing so the teacher instructs the students to go to the auditorium to practice. The students quickly and excitedly rush over to the auditorium. Some of them comment how much fun it is to dance and they move into position without being told to by the teacher. The available positions fill up quickly with enthusiastic students.

As the music begins, PWT students are seen to be partners with local students. No isolation or racial groupings are evident on the dance floor. No hesitation or complaints are heard about partners. Most of the students take turns dancing and sitting out so that most students get a turn. A

few of the students have chosen to sit out and not dance. A group of Hispanic girls sit to one side of the room. The teacher encourages them a couple of times to join in, but a few do not participate at all.

This teacher indicates that dancing and music are important activities in his room. He feels these activities give the students opportunities to have fun together and encourage them to interact, which cannot always occur as easily during the academic instruction.

The students have about 20 minutes before dismissal. The teacher instructs them it is time for physical education. Most of the students move to the basketball area where they start a game of boys against girls. They make up two teams of five each with the teacher playing with the girls. The extras sit on the sidelines watching the game and talking. They rotate into the game periodically. PWT students play on teams with the other students and appear to join in wholeheartedly. About 10 students who are not playing basketball are permitted to engage in other activities on the playground. A few are playing at the handball courts while others sit and talk. Again, a small group of Hispanic girls are off in a section of the playground conversing and they seem to ignore the activities of the others.

The time nears the 2:20 p.m. dismissal so the teacher instructs the students to return to the class to get ready to leave. Many of the students walk with the teacher to the room talking and joking with him. As the teacher nears the room he remembers he has promised to photocopy sheets of music for a couple of students. He hurries to do this so he can give it to the PWT student before it is time for the bus to leave.

The other upper-grade students surge out of their rooms toward the school's main gate. The 10 or so primary-grade PWT students at Bresson Place have been waiting with the aide in one of the school's bungalows since their 1:30 p.m. dismissal so both sets of students can leave together. The PWT students move quickly toward the buses lined up in front of the school. Some are walking with students from the local neighborhood and say goodbye quickly as they get on the bus. The principal as well as another teacher are out to supervise the dismissal. As the time nears 2:30 p.m., the buses get ready to leave. The student who has been waiting for the sheet of music to be copied yells to the bus driver and runs to the bus. As he enters one of the buses, the first bus pulls away from the front of the school to begin the ride home.

PWT AT HARDWICK HIGH: A VIGNETTE

Hardwick High School has been receiving students through the PWT program since 1972. This year, of the school's 2276 students, 881 are participants in PWT. Some 823 of these students are Black students who would otherwise attend high schools in their local areas. Asian and Hispanic bus riders number ten and twenty-seven, respectively. The greater number of PWT students ride the buses that the District provides as part of the program, but a few do drive cars from their homes in Central, West, or South Los Angeles.

Today, as usual, the buses begin to arrive in front of Hardwick at 7:30 a.m. Most of the young people who get off are stylishly dressed and immaculately groomed. They walk toward the pavilion, or covered eating area, near the quadrangle. Small groups form and students chat. Others have breakfast or a snack as they await the Period One bell at 8:20 a.m.

All eighteen buses do not arrive at once. As a bus rolls up, its occupants join friends in the shaded area of the pavilion.

By 8:00 a.m., students who live in the nearby community have begun to arrive. Generally White and "Anglo," they are for the most part more casually dressed than their fellow students from across town.

As the local students enter the quad, they gather with friends from the Hardwick area on the grass, on the porch steps, and other areas outside the pavilion. One White student leaves the food line with a snack, walks past the pavilion to a spot in the sun, and sits down with several friends. A Black students waits in the line, makes his purchases, and

joins three other young Black men at a nearby table beneath the pavilion. Such choices recur: other Black and White students follow the examples of these two. Only a few of the local students mix with PWT participants in the shade of the covered eating area. Similarly, only a scattering of those who arrive by bus mingle in the sun with local students.

Repeated observation and conversation with Harwick faculty members confirm that the pattern which has unfolded is a daily routine. Overwhelmingly, PWT students gather under the pavilion while local students choose other areas nearby. Their separate territories, of course, are informally defined, sustained ad hoc. But they are territories nonetheless. Throughout the day, during breaks and at lunch, local students and those in PWT return to these same, distinct locations.

Staff members express varying perspectives on the scene. One teacher, commenting that the school needs to do more for the "self-worth" of PWT participants, points out that they:

> need the chance to be able to socialize with each other when they first arrive. There is nothing wrong with getting off the bus and sitting around with people they want to know. This is an effort to like who they are.

The remarks of another suggest a different set of concerns. Recalling a time when students were admitted to the building upon their arrival and thinking of days with less pleasant weather, he remarks, "These kids have no place to go when they get here," then adds, "They don't want breakfast and buy stuff that is not nutritional."

In any case, the students in both areas appear at ease, chatting and eating as the first bell of the day rings.

The hallway by the administration building is busy with students en-

route to and from the counseling, attendance, and administrative offices. Four Black women, liaison aides who have come on the buses with PWT students, are at work in the attendance and health offices, and in the library and textbook room. (Earlier in the year, the aides from PWT students' communities were assigned briefly to math classes in order to provide students with individual help. There was some staff interest, too, in the aides' functioning in a disciplinary capacity in classrooms. Ultimately, however, the aides were given clerical responsibilities. One administrator indicated that office work--particularly keeping track of attendance--was increased by the PWT enrollment.)

Students outside are walking in two's and three's to Period One classes in buildings that surround the quad. Two tall PWT students head toward the locker room with their gym bags. A Black couple moves along in the opposite direction. Two local students hang over a second-story railing to call to another. PWT and local students are, predominantly, in separate groups, but they nod and speak to one another as they pass. And there are clearly exceptions; near the door of one classroom a multiethnic group stands coversing prior to the tardy bell.

Soon, a few brief announcements are made over the public address system. They pertain to election returns and scholarship news. (It becomes apparent later that a PWT student has contended unsuccessfully in a run-off for school office, while another has become a National Merit finalist.)

Period One is under way. An "R-W" English class (basic reading and writing) is setting down to work. Thirteen students are present today--all of them PWT students. In a U.S. History course labeled "R" (for re-

medial) on the school schedule, 18 young people are laughing as one girl dominates the scene. Of the 18 present, all but one are enrolled at Hardwick through PWT. Thirty-four students are busy reading individually at their seats in a tenth-grade honors English class. Thirty-one are from the nearby area while three appear to be PWT students.

Glancing in classrooms during Period One and throughout the day, course schedule in hand, it appears that many, if not most, PWT students are taking "basic" or remedial courses. Some are enrolled in honors sections and more advanced college preparatory courses, but the number seems small.

It is, of course, impossible to know the academic backgrounds and capabilities of the PWT and local students as one looks through classroom doors. Their background, and the educational and placement practices they have experienced, remain inaccessible to the observer. The patterns of class enrollment, however, do raise questions about the academic experiences of PWT students here and, perhaps, at other receiving high schools. More to the point here, these course enrollment patterns must influence the opportunities PWT partitipants and other students have to get to know one another in class.

Exceptions to the pattern noted here do present themselves. Further on, yet another tenth-grade English class is quietly completing a seatwork assignment. Here, 10 Black and 16 White students (including two of Hispanic background) are scattered at desks throughout the room.

Following Period One and a second class period, a bell signals time for the nutrition break. Students hurry to the pavilion and quad and

find places to snack and socialize. As before school, the PWT students congregate in the pavilion; local students situate themselves on the grass and elsewhere nearby.

One group of Black youths start a basketball game on an available court near the gym, while a few others stand near the Boys' Physical Education Office. Yet another cluster of PWT students forms outside near a men's restroom in the gym building. Among at least some staff members, this restroom is viewed as a "hang out" for PWT males, local students frequent another. This seems to be another instance of informal but distinct territories.

Again, there are some few exceptions to the separation of PWT and local students. And nowhere, during the nutrition break or at any other time, are there observable instances of conflict or any palpable tension within the student body. Everyone follows his or her pursuits amicably.

The Period Three bell sounds. Students head off to their next classes as before. Social interaction appears to be largely within groups of PWT and local students.

As one group passes across the campus, they discuss whether to attend a school dance. Some comment that only Black students will attend; others say that it depends on the music to be played. According to the latter, if the student disc jockey publicizes that "rock" is to be played, White students will attend. If the disc jockey advertises "soul," the group in attendance will be Black. The casual remarks of other students to one another seem to confirm this judgment. The perception of students seems generally to be that school dances are not attended by substantially mixed groups.

By Period Four, buses are beginning to leave the campus, making the loop on the street in front of the school. Some of these take students to vocational courses at the Regional Occupation Center. Others return PWT participants to their drop-off points. For them, the school day is over.

For those who remain on campus for lunch, the nature of activity is similar to that enacted before school and during nutrition. The campus is officially closed and it seems that most students remain on its grounds during lunch. It seems easy to leave and return, however, and at least a few students do so. (In the past, there were complaints by local merchants and residents, who reported groups of Black students in a nearby shopping area. These complaints have subsided.)

Period Five and Six follow. It is difficult to visit any one classroom for very long: there is much to see and hear and only a short time for visiting. In art, shop, and similar classrooms, students work on various projects. PWT and local students chat with one another as they work. In a contemporary composition class of 23 students, 11 are Black, 11 are White, and 1 is Hispanic. A young White woman enters a bit late, and a young Black man, one seat in front, turns to say "Hi" and exchange a few words. Casual social exchanges such as this one seem more frequent in classrooms. They suggest that when classroom enrollment and teachers' styles permit, PWT and local students do become acquainted. Closer friendships may sometimes evolve. Several staff members report dating between PWT students and those enrolled from the local area.

Outside the efforts of the Human Awareness Club (which reportedly reaches no more than 50 or so students) and the efforts of individual

teachers in their own classrooms, Hardwick seems to have no policy or specific program aimed at encouraging the interaction of PWT and local students. Whatever experiences they gain with one another, it seems, occur as a result of individual initiative and co-presence in the school.

A visit to the gymnasium in the afternoon finds students viewing a videotape of an invitational dance performance given yesterday by their Dance Production Class for advanced student modern dancers. Both PWT and local young people are in the class. Each attends to the performance on the screen.

The school day draws to a close with the end of Period Six. All but the "late buses" depart. Many PWT students remain to participate in athletics, or cheerleaders, and in drill team and other after-school, extra-organized curricular activities that Hardwick provides. Those who remain take evening buses, a sufficient number of which the school administration worked hard to secure. For the students who ride them, the school day ends when they arrive in their home communities at about 7:30 p.m.

PWT AT DEWEY HIGH: A VIGNETTE

Dewey High School has been a receiving school in the PWT Program since the early 1970's. Some 331 of the school's 1872 students this year attend through PWT. About 200 of the PWT students are Black, coming from schools in the South and Central Los Angeles areas. They are joined by 48 Asian and 72 Hispanic students, who travel to Dewey from high schools in East Los Angeles. These participants in PWT join an ethnically mixed student body--one which includes roughly 90 Asian, 210 Hispanic, 35 Black, and 1200 White "Anglo" youths--from the area near Dewey.

At Dewey High, the school day begins at 7:30 a.m. with the arrival of the first buses carrying PWT students. The buses proceed along to the school's service road, dropping off their occupants near the rear of the school. Traffic at the front of the campus is congested with cars unloading students nearby. Routing the buses inside the school yard facilitates the flow of vehicles in front.

Students leave their buses and move off onto the campus. Three minority women, community liaison aides who have accompanied the students by bus, walk together and converse informally with the young people.

Many, but not all, of the bus riders head toward the breakfast lines. Those who do not scatter to buildings where their classes will begin are joking and talking as they await the first bell.

A large, covered outdoor area with tables--adjacent to the teachers' cafeteria and the student store--soon becomes the center of before-school activity. But students also congregate in smaller groups on benches located outside the various buildings and bungalows. Those who have arrived

by bus occupy these areas. And as students from the local Dewey High attendance area come onto campus, they find places in these same locations. Many groups of two, three, and four are made up of young people of the same ethnic background. Other groups are ethnically mixed. PWT students seem present in groups of both types. Everyone seems at ease.

A bell signals the time for first period classes. Students head off with friends to begin the school day.

As they pass along the hallways, PWT participants seem by and large to be walking with other bus riders. (Ascertaining whether this is the case is difficult, however, minority students may be either participants in PWT or residents of the local area. Suffice it to say that inter-ethnic groups are less frequently evident than intra-ethnic ones.)

First period classes begin. Students of various cultural backgrounds are evident in most classrooms, those in PWT among them. This appears to be true across academic departments. A visitor to "academically enriched" and honors sections, however, finds that the PWT students present are generally Asian.

The bell rings once more. Members of the student body have six minutes to pass between classes. Students call to each other in greeting; the halls are noisy. But when the tardy bell rings, the passageways become vacant and quiet.

In a biology lab, the teacher is taking attendance. PWT and local students chat amiably with seatmates from nearby and across town. The same sort of casual socializing between PWT students and others is taking place in an algebra class further on. While students seem to spend much of their time on campus with friends of similar cultural backgrounds, in-

dividuals do interact frequently and, it seems, comfortably.

On the whole, teachers appear to do nothing explicitly to encourage PWT students to work together with or to get to know those who are not in the PWT program. (Interviews with staff members also suggest this is the case.) Some instructors feel they have too many other more important concerns to do so. One young teacher suggests that any such efforts must be undertaken by the staff as a whole:

> We (individual teachers) don't have time to do group assignments. (And anyway) the students work together--and not necessarily with a friend. They ask each other for help.

The same instructor points out that PWT students with special interests seem more likely to get to know others:

> If a PWT student comes here with a particular interest, they mix quite well. If there is no special interest, --in music, science, extra-curricular activity--the student is more likely to stay in his own group. This isn't a PWT problem, but a problem for any student.

Nevertheless, a few teachers do structure class activities so that each student must work with a variety of others. In a dance class, the teacher constitutes new groups for each assignment. A ceramics instructor uses a similar tactic. Such arrangements facilitate interaction among all students and bring local and PWT students together.

The nutrition bell rings and students leave their second period classes. Outside, lines of students form to buy something to eat. Others form at the student store nearby. At the shaded tables, student groups are mixed by gender and ethnicity, although separate groups of Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites are also visible. In other parts of the campus, similar groups have engaged to find other shady, cool spots on

a hot day. Adult supervision is quite evident, but nothing occurs that calls for intervention. The atmosphere seems relaxed. A few teachers and community liaison aides converse informally with students.

Twenty minutes pass, and another bell marks the time to move on to third period.

In a modern dance class, female students choreograph a final project. The cooperation among PWT and local class members is obvious; their comments to one another are mutually supportive. Elsewhere, students in an art class talk softly as they shape clay. A local student is proud to show a chess set made with a friend who comes to school from across town. Minority students, including those in PWT, seem present in courses across the school's curriculum. They do not appear to be "over-represented" in the manual arts or basic academic classes.

After the fourth period, at lunch time, students again join one another in ethnically mixed and ethnically uniform groups at the covered tables and on benches around the campus. They talk and laugh as they eat. In time, the number of students diminishes. A campus security aide reports that most have gone to the auditorium to see a student talent show. There, the acts seem performed only by local students. None attending Dewey via PWT appears on stage. PWT liaison aides sit among the students as spectators. One points out that acts featuring students who come by bus are scheduled when the talent program continues tomorrow.

Periods Five and Six follow lunch and conclude the academic day. Students in an afternoon computer science class are working individually and in groups with Fortran and microcomputers. Some students receive and review printouts which have been prepared at the District office. Here,

again, students seem to interact without regard to where in Los Angeles they happen to reside.

Activity around the campus indicates that participants in PWT are merged into all aspects of life at Dewey. Some are working as office monitors. Others are busy in the graphic arts department, which prints the Dewey High newspaper and also an end-of-the-year paper for a nearby elementary school. Dewey students in PWT are also active on the newspaper staff, on the drill team, and in athletics.

At the end of the day, buses return to the service road to pick up students who are not currently involved in athletics or other after-school activities. (Later buses will take these students home.) Several students waiting to board engage in some friendly rough-house with friends who will walk to their homes nearby. Other local students head for the student parking lot or to awaiting cars in front of the school. As the first buses pull out into the street, two youths rush to catch another which is ready to leave.

FINDINGS: THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

1. DO PWT STUDENTS SEEM TO HAVE EQUITABLE ACCESS TO AND WITHIN ALL SCHOOL FACILITIES, SCHOOL-SPONSORED PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES?

   - In general, equitable access to school facilities and activities is evident at both elementary schools.
   - Exceptions to equitable access sometimes occur due to transportation and distance limitations.

PWT students at both Goodwin Avenue and Bresson Place Elementary Schools were placed evenly among most of the classrooms in the schools. Remedial and gifted programs were as available to the PWT students as to the other students at the schools. At Bresson, PWT students were involved in pull-out situations with the resource specialist and the speech teacher. Bilingual needs were also being met. It should also be pointed out here that it is not solely PWT students who are served by these specialists; it appeared that each student in the school was aided when it was possible to do so.

In co-curricular activities, equitable access was also extant. PWT students were involved as playground leaders and cafeteria workers. They participated in the choruses and drill teams at each school and took part in most special programs and activities that the schools sponsored. Some of the PWT students were responsible for initiating school activities. At both schools, for instance, drill teams were started because of special interest on the part of PWT students. Teachers worked with participants to get their teams together, then sponsored the activity for the duration of the year. At both schools this seemed to be a rather successful activity which both PWT and other students enjoyed.

Most of these co-curricular activities took place within normal class

routine so that all of the students could participate if they desired. Other activities, such as Back-to-School Night and Open House, took place in the evenings. Buses for the PWT students and their families were provided so that they could take part in these special events. At Bresson, it was reported, about half of the PWT parents came to Back-to-School Night. Several staff members at Goodwin Avenue related that the turnout at the Open House was excellent. They also mentioned that of the 800 people in attendance, over half were PWT students and members of their families.

At both elementary schools, some programs were not as readily available to PWT students and/or their families because of transportation problems. At both sites, the playground was open daily after school so that students could use the playground equipment, play team games, play marbles, participate in Clay Club, etc. The PWT students, however, could take part in these activities only one day per week at Bresson and two days per week at Goodwin Avenue.

As indicated previously, buses were routinely made available for the PWT students and their parents for evening programs. For "Sports Night," one of the annual events at Bresson Place, a bus was not ordered due to an administrative oversight. Only one PWT student and her family attended.

Although the above transportation limitations existed at both schools, these were exceptions to the general rule of equitable access to all programs and activities that the schools sponsored. It appeared that every student was invited to participate in each activity when appropriate and treated fairly within those activities.

2. DO STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN PWT INTERACT WITH OTHER STUDENTS IN THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS?

- In general, PWT students and other children in the receiving elementary schools did interact together. They seemed to get along well.

- The amount of interaction that occurred within the classroom seems to depend upon the structure and organization imposed by the teachers.

- Outside the classroom, interaction between students is encouraged and takes place, but some isolation is apparent.

- The quality and quantity of interaction seems to be a function of the amount of time the PWT students have been at a school.

Over sixteen hours of classroom observations were done at the two elementary schools. During these observations it became evident that the PWT students and the other students in the receiving schools were interacting within the classroom situation. Students were seen to intermingle in reading and math groups, help each other in assignments, work on class projects together, and interact informally at their seats. No hostility or tension was noted during any of the observations.

Approximately 12 different classrooms were observed at a variety of times in the regular school days. It was apparent that more interaction was occurring between the students in some classrooms than in others. This appeared to be a function of the seating arrangements within the classroom, the activity that the students were involved in, and the general organization and rules imposed by the teacher.

In very few of the classrooms visited were PWT students sitting next to each other. For the most part, they were intermixed with the other stu-

dents seemingly as much as possible. In some of the classrooms visited the students were seated in groups of five or six which appeared to encourage small group interaction. In other classrooms with more restrictive arrangements, such as long rows of tables, communication among the students was seemingly inhibited as the students had to turn around to speak with someone or get up to pass materials.

One teacher, when interviewed, related he/she purposely "divided the room into six islands" and once a month allowed the students to change seats. This was done to encourage group work and interaction. The last "monthly move" of the year was initiated by this teacher during one of the observations of his/her classroom. The students were allowed to choose where they wanted to sit. As the moves were completed, many of the PWT students were seen to be interspersed among the other students.

In addition to the seating arrangements in the classrooms, certain activities appeared to allow and result in more interaction between the students. Some of these more informal activities included group work, art projects, dancing, and physical education. Folk and square dancing were very popular among some of the upper grade classes at both schools. The students seemed to enjoy learning and practicing the dances with each other. This enjoyment was indicated by the enthusiasm of most students to take part in the activity and by the lack of hesitation to join in and dance with anyone who was available. No name calling or teasing was evident during these observations.

Besides the type of activity having a bearing on the interchange between students, the teacher's style of teaching also seemed to be an in-

fluence. In classrooms where rules or structure kept talking and moving around to a minimum, interaction was then apparently at a minimum. In classrooms where participation and a less restrictive environment was observed, communication between students in the classroom appeared to be encouraged and readily accepted. One teacher related that he/she emphasized group cooperation and had encouraged group discussions "two or three times per week" in which the class had "serious talks about social issues." Another teacher planned a "free-time period each day for 15 minutes" during which the students could choose an activity and work with whomever they wished.

Outside the classroom, i.e., before school, at recess and lunch, and after school, interaction among the students was encouraged at both schools. According to the staff personnel, one of the main methods employed to achieve this goal was to allow the students to play and eat wherever and with whomever they wanted. The students are also allowed to check out equipment to facilitate the playground activities.

Approximately 10 hours of observation were done of the playground and lunch activities at Goodwin Avenue and Bresson Place Schools. For the most part, during these observations the PWT students ate and played with the other students. Playground areas at both schools were large and many different types of activities could be initiated. Some of these included basketball, kickball, volleyball, hopscotch, jumprope, and handball. No fights or major problems were evident during any of the observations of the playground.

Although the students did generally mix informally in the lunch areas

and on the playgrounds, some isolation at both schools was evident. There were instances noted where only PWT children were playing or eating together. At Goodwin Avenue one instance was observed in which five or six female PWT students were playing jumprope together. Another girl from their class who was not a PWT student asked to join them but they ignored her and did not offer her a turn. In the lunch areas, instances were noticed in which PWT students and students from the receiving schools ate in separate places.

This fact was acknowledged by some of the personnel at Bresson. One teacher commented that "Yes, some Black girls won't let White girls play in certain games." Some were of the opinion that the Hispanic students were more isolated than the other minority students because of the language differences. Another stated that, "We haven't licked the isolation problem. We have some people that play in ethnic groups in the yard." This same person also related that the staff attempted to curtail the isolation problem by encouraging the students to play games together, and to take part in the various activities that the school offered.

The playground activities offered after school were popular with the students, especially at ("late bus") Goodwin Avenue. The after-school program for PWT students was not started until January but from that time over 40 PWT students typically stayed for the playground activities twice per week. One of the students from the receiving school commented that he only stayed after school when the PWT students were there "because it was more fun and there were more kids to play with."

There was also some indication that besides playing on the playground after school with each other, PWT students also went home with the other

students. According to the teachers, this was not a frequent occurrence partially due to the permission that had to be obtained, but one teacher mentioned that at least five of his PWT students had gone home with their friends at some point during the school year.

At both Goodwin Avenue and Bresson Place many of the school personnel also commented that the quality and quantity of interaction between the students that was evident during the observations was an improvement from the beginning of the year. The following quotes reflect these opinions:

> ... the students are not antagonistic. There is some mixing; they do get along. There are very few racial slurs. At the beginning of the year there were more. Exposure has made a difference.

> ... mixing is a slow process because some of the PWT kids are large kids and create some fear in local kids because they are so physical... but kids are kids and they want to make friends. I believe there is as much friend-making as would be expected in any group of children.

> ... They are in much better shape than they were six months ago. There was some fighting before but not necessarily because of who they are. The atmosphere is much better.

These comments reflect the point that problems had occurred at the beginning of the year but with discussions, exposure, and discipline, the major problems had been curtailed and the relations between the students improved.

3. WHAT ARE THE QUALITIES OF THE STAFF-STUDENT INTERACTION IN THE SCHOOL SETTING?

   The quality and quantity of staff-student interaction appears to be dependent upon the actjvity and the attitude and teaching style of the teacher.

As noted in the last section with regard to student-to-student inter-

action, similar factors seem to be related to the quality and quantity of student-staff interaction. During the observational periods, interchanges between students and teachers and other staff members appeared to depend upon the activity that the participants were involved in, the apparent attitude of the teacher and the teaching techniques the teacher utilized.

As expected, more interaction between students and teachers took place in the informal activities than in the formal ones. During the observations of art lessons, group project work, physical education and the like, the teachers and students interacted openly but respectfully in most instances. In these types of activities the teachers were able to move around and speak with individuals and groups of students more easily than in a more structured instructional situation. For example, during reading, math, or language lessons, the teachers who were observed normally stayed in a particular area of the room with a small group of students while the other students worked on assignments at their seats, and this obviously restricted the interaction that could occur.

Although a more structured situation seemed to lead to less interaction, the teachers still appeared to give most of the students an equal opportunity to ask and respond to questions and participate in the group discussions. Also, the majority of the teachers observed seemed to respond to most of their students as fairly as possible. When interviewed, some of the teachers commented that they made a point not to give any of their students preferential treatment if at all possible.

In some classroom environments students appeared to be more encouraged

than in others to initiate and participate in conversations with other students as well as the teacher. These classes seemed to be characterized by having a teacher who was warm and friendly, open to questions and discussions, used humor in appropriate situations, and was accepting of all students. The principal at Bresson Place explained the differences in classroom environments by the fact that "different staff members are at different points of acceptance of the (PWT) children."

The amount of interaction, both student-to-student and student-to-staff member, varied from clasroom to classroom. With few exceptions, the teachers and principals at both schools appeared to have developed a friendly, caring environment which encouraged communication among the students and the teachers.

4. WHAT POLICIES, PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES FOR PWT STUDENTS ARE DESIGNED AND IMPLEMENTED AT THE SCHOOLS?

- Overall, few activities seem to have been planned or carried out specifically for PWT students in the schools visited.
- Nevertheless, some formal and informal activities were conducted within the schools to facilitate interaction between the students.
- Some staff development had occurred at both elementary schools that was related to the PWT program.

At both Goodwin Avenue and Bresson, school personnel emphasized that the main procedure they followed with regard to the PWT students was "just to treat them like everyone else." One teacher commented that he worked diligently in his classroom to attempt to reduce the amount of labeling, such as "PWT kids" or "the kids who come on the bus," that was occurring. The emphasis at the two schools seemed to be to make the PWT students

feel as much a part of the receiving school as possible, but to do so by not focusing attention upon them with special programs and policies.

This was the main reason given for the limited number of activities that occurred specifically for PWT students. At Bresson, the one special activity for the PWT students was an orientation session held before school started in the fall. The PTA sponsored the one-day program with some of the school staff. The PWT students and their parents were welcomed at the school, and given a tour and an explanation about the school program. No other students were involved.

At Goodwin, the parents of the PWT students were called during the summer by school personnel to explain about the school program and to invite them to visit the school at Back-to-School Night, which was part of the school's regularly scheduled annual program. As the PWT students arrived for their first day of school at Goodwin Avenue, the only activity designed especially for them was a brief orientation to the school conducted by the main office secretary.

Again at Goodwin, a "United Nations" group was organized to focus on issues (specifically cultural and desegregation problems) that the students were interested in. The group met once a week and consisted of representative PWT students and non-PWT students from each classroom. The students discussed the issues in the group and then reported to their class on what had occurred.

The PWT students at Goodwin Avenue were also encouraged to become involved in some of the more formal activities, such as one of the choruses, the after-school playground activities twice per week, one of the school newspapers, the drill team, Back-to-School Night, Open House, Science Fair,

and any of the multicultural activities that the multicultural coordinator developed. Most of these programs appeared to be well attended and supported by many students at the school.

At Bresson Place, the PWT students were also urged to participate in the school-wide programs. Some of Bresson's offerings included the chorus, the drill team, the after-school playground program once a week, the Clay Club, the weekly awards assemblies, Back-to-School Night, Open House, Sports Night, etc.

At both schools, some of the teachers interviewed commented on informal things they did within the classroom to facilitate interaction. One teacher explained how she paired the PWT students with the local neighborhood students when the PWT students first arrived. She had the local students show the PWT students around to help them become familiar with the school. This was also seen as a way to encourage interaction. Another teacher related that she did "...square dancing, sports, and art projects to encourage interaction." Others utilized discussions as a means of helping the students to get to know each other. Some of the other informal strategies that were mentioned by the teachers included seating arrangements, group work where "...there has to be one of each color in the group, putting on multicultural programs for the school," "... a lot of dancing," study of foreign languages, emphasis on current events, etc.

To help the teachers facilitate the interaction between the students, some staff development efforts were employed at both elementary schools. According to the principals, these sessions dealt with values and communications, integration issues, social studies, and multicultural ideas and

activities. None of the teachers were approached about how useful they found these activities to be, but the principal at Bresson Place described some of the multicultural ideas that had been used for a series of assemblies and done during the year by different classes.

5. ACCORDING TO THE STAFF MEMBERS AT THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS VISITED, WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE PWT PROGRAM?

Advantages for students:

- The students are exposed to others of different ethnicities.
- They have an opportunity to learn about different cultures.
- The program is used as an extended day care service for PWT parents.

For teachers and other school personnel:

- The teachers have an opportunity to learn to work with different types of students.

For school and community:

- The school population is heterogeneous.
- The receiving schools were not forced to close.
- The students from receiving schools were not required to change schools as part of mandatory integration.

Disadvantages for students:

- PWT students have a long and restrictive bus ride to the receiving schools.
- Labeling effects are apparent to some.

For teachers and other school personnel:

- More discipline problems are evident.
- Contact with parents is limited.
- Bus coordination problems exist.

The advantages and disadvantages listed above are a compilation of those given by the staff members at both sites. As one might expect, the school personnel offered varying viewpoints. Their opinions seemed to de-

pend upon their attitudes toward and experiences with the PWT program.

According to many of those interviewed, the main advantages of the PWT program were to the students and the school. Responses such as, "They (the students) will see and learn to live with differences," "They are exposed to others," and "It helps children to know children of other races," characterize the beliefs of the majority of those interviewed. One teacher also commented that, "If the teachers get good Black kids, it's an advantage because it will help to break down stereotypes." Very few responses varied from these.

In the same vein, one of the advantages to the schools cited by some was that the student population was more heterogeneous than previously. One person made the point that, "This is the makeup of society" while another stated, "Racial isolation is a handicap. We are ahead of other schools. We have the experience."

Others noted that if the PWT program had not been initiated at their school, the school would have run the risk of being closed. Also, mandatory busing had been considered for the students at Bresson Place at the beginning of the school year. The principal reported, "they have had some tough meetings this year." When the School Board decided to continue the PWT program at Bresson, he reported, "the parents were relieved." According to school personnel, the community of parents around both schools were glad their children were not being bused to other areas and welcomed the PWT program for that reason.

More than one person interviewed made the interesting point that the PWT program served advantageously as a day-care service for some PWT parents. They related that because of the bus ride a child had to be ready for school

earlier and would arrive home later than if they attended their "home school." This would alleviate the need some parents have for extended day-care. This point was not merely speculation; it had been verified by some of the teachers when talking with parents.

Advantages of the PWT program for the teachers were not mentioned as frequently as those for the students. One opinion, related in a few instances, was that the program was a "new challenge" and gave the teachers new opportunities to work with different types of students. One teacher commented that, "I like the challenge. You can see the improvement; it's very rewarding. I enjoy motivating the children to learn." Other teachers, however, were not as positive. They commented that there were no advantages for the teachers and that the program presented more work for them and the school.

The presence of more students with discipline problems, some felt, contributed to the increase in work load and was a disadvantage to the program. Some believe the nature of the bus ride contributed to the discipline problems. A staff member from Goodwin Avenue stated, "They (the PWT students) get up at 5:00 a.m. and they go to sleep late; this contributes and the bus situation contributes." Another person reiterated this opinion, "The rumbles on the bus make the PWT students more difficult to handle."

Others felt that the behavior problems were a product of higher student-teacher ratios in the classrooms. And still others were of the opinion that PWT students simply "tended to be more active." A member of the staff at Bresson Place commented that, "The PWT students are a harder group to work with. You're well aware, I'm sure, that the Blacks react more emotionally."

The labels that were placed on the PWT group were also considered a disadvantage by some of the schools' staff members. All of the personnel who were interviewed agreed that the local students knew who the "PWT kids" were and labelled them as such. Some teachers considered the titles, "PWT kids" or "the kids who come on the bus" to be detrimental. One teacher in particular worked hard to get the students not to use such labels, which he felt inhibited the interaction among the students.

Another concern of most of the staff members at the two schools was the length of the bus ride to and from the receiving schools. The ride varied from 45 minutes to almost 2 hours depending upon the time and the day of the week. The students were reported to be "overly tired" and "explosive" on occasions which, as indicated above, some attributed to the bus ride. Others noted that bus riding cut into class time when the bus was late.

A major complaint by many staff personnel was that the bus ride was too restrictive for the students. The rules on the bus were reported to be rigid and unfair. According to different sources, conflicts occurred frequently on the buses, which (the teachers felt) then carried over into the classroom. A few teachers also complained that the bus schedule restricted teacher-student interaction after school because the students were given only 5 minutes from the time they were dismissed to get on the bus. One teacher reported that, "The students must make the bus; they can't stay and talk even if absolutely necessary."

Both administrators commented on bus coordination problems. The principal of Goodwin Avenue believed this was a major problem of the program.

He related that:

> ... the biggest drawback of the program is the lack of coordination between the way the school handles problems and the way the bus drivers handle them. Our problem is the union. We have no way of controlling who is a bus driver. These drivers bid on these routes based on seniority, so that if you get an unsatisfactory driver on a route it takes an act of Congress to remove him... These people are marginally trained to work with kids. They are with them for two hours a day -- they are oppressive -- they are unfair -- they take one kid's word for an incident.

Another concern was the frequent change in bus drivers, which the administrators felt was detrimental to the program.

Another disadvantage that some of the teachers noted was the lack of contact with PWT students' parents. Teachers felt that distance and transportation factors contributed to this. One teacher commented that if the parent worked and could not be contacted until evening, the phone call would be a toll charge from her (the teacher's) house. Others related that they missed the opportunity to meet the parents face-to-face more often and were hesitant to ask them to come to the school for conferences because of the distances involved.

None of the persons interviewed saw any disadvantages of PWT receiving-school status for the community or school as a whole. As a general rule, the staff at both schools felt the program was worthwile and hoped it would continue.

6. WHAT ARE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF MEMBERS AT THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS VISITED, REGARDING THE PWT PROGRAM?

   - Additional funding for PWT students should be provided.
   - A lower norm (student-to-teacher ratio) in the classrooms should be maintained.

- PWT students should be moved from one school to another as little as possible; programs should be stabilized.
- More PWT parental involvement should be encouraged.
- PWT participants should be screened.
- Bus drivers should be given some inservice classes.
- More support services should be available.

Funding. Both principals made the point that better budget provisions should be made for the schools involved in the PWT program. One of the principals stated that, "We really miss that money. We have had a shortage of supplies all year because this year's budget was based upon the previous year's enrollment and this year we have more students." The other principal commented that, "Better budget provisions are needed. If you are new in a program, you need support." The principals indicated that they would primarily use money to purchase supplies if funds were restored.

Norm. Many who were interviewed related that previously a 27:1 student-teacher ratio had been a requirement of the PWT program. This was no longer the case (as of this year), and one teacher stated, "They are no longer strict about the ratios; some classes have gotten as high as 38:1." The principal at one of the schools confirmed this point:

> Unfortunately, the norm in this school, because it is a PWT school and an isolated White school, is 35-36:1, while a lot of other schools are 27:1. This situation has made a lot of parents of PWT children extremely angry about sending their children to a school 40 miles away where the ratio is 36:1 while their local school is 27:1.

Need for stability. The topics, "Moving Students From School To School" and "The Stability of the Program," were of major concern to many

on both schools' staff. They felt that stability was of "utmost importance," so that "once a program is going it will continue." Two of the teachers related that some of their students had been to as many as three or four schools because of District changes in sending-receiving school match-ups. It was the belief of all of those interviewed that, as the students were at the school longer, they did better.

When asked about this, one teacher responded:

> Yes, the students have done much better since the beginning of the year and I feel it will be even better next year. A junior high school teacher friend of mine has been involved in PWT and says that after two to three years with the same students the program has really improved.

Parental involvement. A few interviewees made the recommendation that PWT parent participation should be encouraged. One of the teachers suggested that, "It is very difficult to be effective over the phone and I enjoy talking to parents face-to-face." She felt the long distance inhibited the interaction. Two of the PWT bus aides who had been at other schools with PWT programs felt very strongly about parental involvement. They had seen, they said, programs with a very supportive PWT parent group that resulted in a more cohesive and effective program. They both felt that more school-sponsored activities would help to encourage this involvement.

Screening. More than one of the persons interviewed at the two schools felt that the PWT students should be screened before being allowed to participate in the program. The main intent of this recommendation was to reduce the number of behavior problems. A teacher stated:

> They (the District) shouldn't send us problem children. We lose a lot of time, waste time.... This is particularly important because we can't do much here. In the past, children with behavior problems could be sent back but now we have to keep these children regardless.

Bus drivers. Another recommendation (made primarily by the principal at Goodwin Avenue) was to provide inservice courses for the bus drivers who transported PWT students. He had found that the bus drivers "tend to be very poorly prepared. They are insensitive to the fact that the kids get up at 5:30 in the morning. They had an oppressive attitude and that oppression makes it difficult on the kids." He also commented that this issue has been brought up by the teachers at staff meetings. He related that the teachers also had heard reports from their students that the bus drivers were rude. Thus, they felt the children were "glad to get here and sad to leave each day." The principal felt that topics relating to discipline and communication techniques would be most effective topics for bus personnel inservice.

Support services. Many of the personnel interviewed related that more support services were needed. Nurse time had been cut to a minimum (two days per month at Bresson Place; one day per week at Goodwin Avenue). Nurse services were considered an important need at both schools, especially since the PWT students' homes were over 40 miles from the schools. Psychological services, and not "simply for testing," was another area that some of the teachers and other staff members called for to be increased. One teacher thought that a counselor would be useful for the purpose of organizing group discussions for PWT and other students to help them resolve conflicts as they occur. Another staff member thought that if mo[illegible]

psychological services were available, the discipline problems could be decreased.

More than one teacher thought that the "late bus" should be available for the students on a daily basis rather than only once or twice per week. These teachers were of the opinion that this would give the students more opportunities to interact with the teachers and the other students.

FINDINGS: THE HIGH SCHOOLS

1. DO PWT STUDENTS SEEM TO HAVE EQUITABLE ACCESS TO AND WITHIN ALL SCHOOL FACILITIES, SCHOOL-SPONSORED PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES?

   - PWT students have equitable access to all school facilities.
   - All school-sponsored programs and activities are open to PWT students and local students alike. Many PWT students seem to participate.
   - However, certain classes or programs have either a preponderance of or an absence of PWT students.

All facilities at both schools were available to all students. During our visits, PWT students were observed in all types of classrooms, in offices, in the gym areas, in the lunch area, in various corridors, in the library, etc.

As a matter of policy, all programs and activities were open to all students. However, principals at both schools stressed that participation by PWT students at most after-school activities was largely dependent on the availability of late and extra buses. Both principals indicated that late buses were not an automatic provision of PWT and were obtained only after special requests. The principal at Hardwick High, for example, recalled that in their first year as a receiving school there were no late buses, and that "we fought tooth and nail" to get them.

PWT student participation occurred in a wide range of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, including: athletic teams, modern dance productions, student council, newspaper staff, print production, office work, cafeteria work, drill teams, band, orchestra, and madrigals. At Dewey four out of five yell leaders were PWT students this year. At Hard-

wick the number of cheerleaders was increased specifically to accommodate interested PWT students.

Parents of PWT students were invited to attend such school functions as Back-to-School Night, orientation for incoming tenth-graders, and others. It was reported that buses regularly provided to transport parents to these programs. Otherwise, parents of PWT students seem to have received the same communications about school activities as were sent to parents of local students. Reports of PWT parents' attendance were imprecise or conflicting.

There were no categorical restrictions on the classes that PWT students could take, and there were no classes designated exclusively for PWT students. Staff members at Hardwick High school indicated that in actuality proportionally fewer PWT students would be found in honors and college preparatory classes and proportionally greater numbers would be found in basic and remedial classes. At Dewey High School, staff members said that PWT students were well-represented in honors and college preparatory classes, elaborating that those PWT students tended to be Asians.

Observation confirmed a disproportionately high representation of PWT students in remedial classes and a disproportionately low representation of PWT students in honors classes at Hardwick High. During one observation period, for example, eight English classes were visited. Five were proportionally representative of the Hardwick High population, two were totally populated by Black students (both remedial English), and one had 31 Whites and three Blacks (Honors).

The reasons for the greater number of PWT students in basic, remedial,

and manual arts classes were not clear. Some staff members suggested that PWT students tend to choose easier courses; others suggested that the students have been advised in counseling toward such courses. An administrator said that placement was based on prior levels of achievement and that the PWT students' skills were not at the same level as the local students. Another administrator attributed the generally lower achievement of PWT students to differences in family background (fewer books in the home, more television). He said, "It amazes me that they can go to the same junior high, but when they get here the majority of PWT go to remedial."

Since there appears to be a pattern which finds PWT students over-represented in some clases and under-represented in others, further investigation seems warranted. Furthermore, when PWT students are not in the same classes with local students, the opportunities for interaction are reduced.

At Dewey the pattern of class enrollment was not so clearly defined; for example, the basic and remedial classes do not appear to be populated by disproportionately large numbers of PWT students. In one observation period, two "basic" academic classes were observed with PWT represented proportionally to their numbers in the school, and a "WRITE/SHARP" preparation class of 17 had only three PWT students. In honors and college preparatory sections, however, there seemed to be markedly fewer Black students than their proportion in the school population. An honors English class of 32 was observed with eight PWT students, two of whom were Black. A geometry class (identified by a counselor as "college prep") of 29 had one Black and four other minority youngsters. A chemistry class of 17

(also college preparatory) had eight White, one Black, and eight other minority students.*

A program which was not available to PWT students at Dewey was the continuation school, which is designed for students who have problems in the regular school, especially attendance problems. The principal of the continuation school explained that this option was not afforded PWT students because it has shorter hours than regular school; there would be problems with PWT students being unsupervised for periods of time before and after school, given the arrival and departure time of buses. Since the dean at Dewey identified class attendance as a specific PWT problem, perhaps some way of offering continuation to PWT students could be explored.

The photography class at Dewey was another exception to equal access for PWT students. The class routinely includes few PWT students, which the teacher attributes to the fact that the "cost of processing is too prohibitive for most (PWT) kids."

2. DO STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN PWT INTERACT WITH OTHER STUDENTS IN THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS?

   - Overall, there was no overt tension or hostility between PWT students and others enrolled in the high schools visited.
   - In classes where instructional activities encouraged movement and interaction, (e.g., P.E., industrial arts, ceramics, journalism, band, etc.), students and others in the school did interact frequently.

*It should be noted that accurate observation is more difficult at Dewey than at Hardwick. At Hardwick virtually all PWT students are Black and most local students are White. At Dewey, on the other hand, the PWT participants are a combination of Black, Asian, and Hispanic students and the local population has minorities as well.

- The two schools differed in the amount of informal contact between PWT and others in out-of-class settings. Such interaction was much more frequent at Dewey than at Hardwick.
- PWT students participated in the entire range of organized non-classroom activities.

In class, as teachers' styles of classroom organization permitted, PWT students and their fellow students from the local attendance areas appeared to interact amicably. There was no evidence -- observed or reported -- of hostility or overt tension between local students and those who attended the high schools through PWT. Outside the classroom and on campus, however, students at both schools appeared to associate predominantly with those of their own ethnicities. This was more strikingly evident at Hardwick than at Dewey.

Within classroom ovservations are discussed below:

A P.E. class at Dewey with 40 students (including 15 in PWT, six of them Black) chose partners for volleyball. The teacher organized the game so that sets of male students had to choose female students to complete the teams. There were many cross-cultural choices, and students responded good-naturedly. They spent the period playing volleyball in their integrated teams.

The school band at Dewey was rehearsing. Several PWT students were involved into the activities; they conversed with one another and with local students.

A journalism class had a staff meeting which included both PWT and local students in animated discussion and decision making.

Students in an advanced dance class were working in integrated PWT-local groups to prepare for an upcoming performance.

During one class period at Dewey, twelve academic classes were observed. In general, the classes appeared to reflect the composition of the school and within the classroom the students' seats were intermingled. But all seats faced the front and few opportunities for students to interact were observed. The conversation was primarily between students and teacher. For example, in an English class the teacher named a word and individual students responded with definitions. In a geometry class, the teacher worked a problem at the chalkboard while individual students asked questions. An exception was a popular class in which the desks were arranged to face each other instead of the teacher. The class was filled to over capacity, and although the dialogue was primarily with the teacher, the students did respond to one another in discussion to some extent. There were three or four PWT students taking part. The teacher's perception of why few PWT participants were enrolled in the popular course was that, "Only students who want a challenge take the class." A similar pattern of limited student interaction was observed in academic classes at Hardwick.

At the latter school, however, considerable numbers of students attending through PWT were to be found in remedial, "basic," and non-college preparatory courses. (Observations in support of this generalization appear in the previous section of these findings and in the "day-in-the life" narrative.)

Thus, students at both schools seemed generally to have minimal opportunities in their academic classes to get to know one another or to share life experiences (1) because most teachers of academic subjects structured teaching-learning in ways that minimized student-student interaction, and

(2) at Hardwick (and at Dewey, although in far fewer instances) many classrooms contained either few local or few PWT students. In the arts, manual arts, gym, etc., PWT and non-PWT students generally took advantage of opportunities to converse and work together. The qualities of their inter-group interaction were similar to the intra-group interaction observed in the same classrooms.

Administrators and teachers interviewed routinely remarked that they knew of no teachers who used deliberate strategies in class to increase opportunities for local and cross-town students to become better acquainted. Classroom observations at one school, followed by informal talks with the teachers observed, did identify two teachers whose ways of structuring assignments afforded such opportunities. The general direction of the evidence, however, suggests that neither high school had formulated a policy to encourage or require teachers to undertake strategies of this sort.

Overall, it appeared that PWT and local students became acquainted solely on their own initiative, given opportunities that occurred as a result of their co-presence in the schools and in particular classrooms.

The scope of the present study precluded exploration of staff members' perceptions and reasoning on the latter issue. Implicitly, some faculty members seemed to feel that they had no time to develop strategies to facilitate the interaction of PWT and local students. Others may have felt that to use such strategies was unnecessary. The remarks of yet others indicated a reluctance to undertake activities that would make PWT participants "different." Reduction of funds may also have led to the absence of identifiable efforts toward the ends in question. Again, perhaps earlier attempts to realize such goals were found to be unsuccessful. This matter

clearly deserves further study. A discussion of the social interaction of PWT and local students on campus, but outside the classroom, now follows.

There were striking differences in the extent of informal contacts between PWT and local students at the two high schools visited. Although friendship groups at both could be identified as belonging to one ethnic group or another, only at Hardwick was a marked spatial separation of PWT and non-PWT pupils clearly evident.

At Dewey, a counselor and an administrator independently mentioned that ethnic groups sit in separate areas at lunch. But lunch-time observations on three occasions indicated that, while small groups of students did cluster with others of the same race, there was no "turf" or "territory" identifiable with any group. That is, it was not possible to identify a White or Black or Asian or Hispanic area on the campus at lunch time. Numerous conversations between members of diverse ethnic groups (including PWT and local students) were also observed.

The Dewey High librarian noted that friendship across groups exists and that there is not merely a "detente" between bus riders and students from nearby. The head counselor made a similar observation. And one teacher remarked, "Everyone here is color-blind." The latter may be an exaggeration but students of various cultural groups -- from the local area and across town -- seemed at ease with each other, and acquaintances between PWT students and others were obvious.

The situation outside the classrooms at Hardwick was quite different. Black PWT students routinely congregated under the covered lunch area; White students from the local area regularly gathered in the sunshine of the

quadrangle. One teacher highlighted the point at which the color line changed as he took the researchers on a campus tour. Other staff members spoke of the apparent separation of the groups. Although there were some exceptions, we found this split in territory to be generally maintained. Other evidence of separate territories (different bathroom "hangouts") was also present at Hardwick. In short, the informal division of groups seemed much sharper at Hardwick.

The obviousness of the ethnic difference between local (White) students and PWT (Black) students may have contributed to the more distant separation at Hardwick. The greater ethnic diversity of the local school population at Dewey may facilitate non-PWT and PWT students' social relations. Further, the fact that many PWT students at Hardwick are in several classes where few local students are present must reduce opportunities for becoming acquainted.

How PWT and local students at Hardwick and Dewey felt about one another and about the state of their social relations was impossible to discern within the bounds of the study. On the surface, no widespread dissatisfaction was evident among pupils at either school. There were hints at Hardwick, however, that an underlying competitiveness, not entirely positive in nature, may have existed between the Black PWT students and the White students from the local area. (Researchers' time on site was insufficient to confirm the reports in question, and therefore details have been omitted here). It is important, then, to underscore that the picture provided here is derived from the scope of the research, which is only a picture of surface phenomena. The qualities of students' social

relations as students experience them and what the behavior observed means for students are the issues that matter most. Further evaluations of the Los Angeles Permits With Transportation Program must examine the realities of social life in receiving schools as students perceive them.

Related Observations:

At both schools, there was general agreement that school dances were rarely attended by both White and minority students simultaneously. Cultural differences in musical tastes and dance styles were cited by several respondents as "explaining" this pattern.

While PWT students appeared to participate in the full range of extra-curricular activities and mix with local pupils in doing so, certain school-sponsored groups attracted predominantly PWT participants. The Pep Club at Dewey High School, for example, drew its membership primarily from among Black students in PWT. An administrator at the school commented:

> Blacks really like the Pep Club activities. It's something they brought with them from their neighborhood schools. That's why they join Pep Club.

At Hardwick High School and at Dewey, drill teams were composed primarily of PWT students. Again, staff members pointed to cultural preferences as a factor underlying this phenomenon.

3. WHAT ARE THE QUALITIES OF THE STAFF-STUDENT INTERACTION IN THE SCHOOL SETTINGS?

   - No overt instances of differential treatment of PWT students were observed in the limited time on site.
   - In formal interviews, staff members expressed generally positive attitudes toward participants in PWT, but some negative perceptions were voiced informally by faculty.

students than PWT participants were arriving late to class; nor were PWT students located after bells with greater frequency than others in restrooms or other such typical "hang outs" of those who cut classes or are tardy in high schools. Similarly, several through-the-doorway surveys of classrooms failed to turn up instances of PWT students disrupting classes. (Nearly every class observed was routinely more on-task than off.)

Few firm conclusions can be drawn from this set of observations and participants' comments. Observations were too brief to examine staff-student interaction in depth, to distinguish the particular from recurrent patterns. What is apparent, once more, is that further evaluation is necessary. Such evaluation should examine both staff members' and students' perceptions of the other group's feelings and behavior. Continued evaluation must include observation to document recurrent patterns of social interaction. Site visits for these purposes should be conducted, with the cooperation of school administrators, on a "drop in any time" basis. Furthermore, staff development programs which have proven useful, in participating teachers' views, should be identified and employed as further evaluation suggests is necessary.

4. WHAT POLICIES, PROGRAMS, AND ACTIVITIES FOR PWT STUDENTS ARE DESIGNED AND IMPLEMENTED AT THE SCHOOLS?

- Aside from the provision of bus transportation and the individual efforts of a few teachers in their own classrooms, programs specifically for PWT students and families were generally absent.

Prior to reductions in "follow-the-child" funds associated with PWT,

Hardwick High School had counseling services exclusively for PWT students, an after school workshop program taught by teachers in which PWT students had priority, and classes in preparation for the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) which PWT students took advantage of. These programs, together with in-school tutoring, have ceased--according to school administrators--because of cuts in program funds.

At Dewey High School, past activities included overnight trips with as many as 60 students, plus faculty and District staff development specialists. These were aimed at fostering human relations.

After-school tutorials have also ended with loss of financial resources. Formerly, too, both schools had PWT coordinators. Again, as a result of budget reductions, these positions were eliminated.

Both schools have, in past years, held orientation activities exclusively for new PWT students. Hardwick abandoned this approach some years ago. As the principal explained:

> The third or fourth year we extended the (orientation) program to all students. We previously had just Black students and Black parents. We decided to get everyone acquainted and have an integrated meeting (for all new students).

Dewey's separate orientation for PWT students ended this year. (School officials did not know who will be attending via PWT next year; the sending schools associated with Dewey are being changed). PWT students will be included in a fall orientation program for all entering tenth graders.

Only one current, school-wide activity, specifically taking into account their status as receiving schools, was identified at either Hardwick or Dewey; once each year, the Hardwick School Community Advisory

Counsel meets in a neighborhood from which PWT students come. (Of course, both schools also assure bus transportation to and from school activities for parents and students. And, as noted earlier, regular school programs are open to PWT participants and, as appropriate, family and friends.)

Some LAUSD documents suggest that new PWT students might be paired with local students in a "buddy system" to facilitate their transition to the new environment. "Extra neighbors" for PWT students in the community of the receiving school and other special programs are also mentioned in District materials. Such recommendations imply that PWT students should be welcomed and given assistance in acclimating to a new educational and social setting. The same document* identified another factor as having "a positive correlation to a successful Permits With Transportation Program": a "planned program of positive assimilation of PWT students into the routine of the school including curricular and extra-curricular activities." Staff development for those in receiving schools is also mentioned as desirable.

Even before the reported cuts in funding, the high schools visited during this study were not, it seems, engaged in the level or the range of effort this document suggests. Each did supply some additional academic support services. But programs addressing the assumed social needs of students were generally absent. They continue to be.

Perhaps the District documents cited do not represent a firm, cur-

*Entitled "Factors Contributing to the Success of the Program at PWT Receiving Schools" (authorship unknown), obtained from LAUSD Research and Evaluation Branch.

rent District policy. If they do, perhaps this policy has not been effectively communicated to school administrators. Perhaps, too, school administrators find the policy unworkable amidst the many other mandates to which they must respond. Again, it may be that those in the schools see no need for staff development, buddy systems, "progressive dinners in both communities," and the like. Certainly, however, reductions of funds do not account for the rather limited number of social-support programs reported and observed at the sites.

Once again, considerable follow-up to the present research effort is essential to ascertain just what does account for the limited social supports provided participants in PWT. Those who conduct such follow-up should begin with an attempt to clarify current PWT Program goals as they are articulated by key program administrators at the District level. Research should continue by tracing the communication of program goals through successive administrative levels to the school administration. The presence or absence of structures for assuring implementation of goals at local sites should be identified. In addition, interviews should be conducted with parents and students presently and recently involved in the program, to ascertain the needs they currently feel they have. These steps should probably precede further research at school sites.

5. ACCORDING TO THE STAFF MEMBERS AT THE RECEIVING SCHOLS VISITED, WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE PWT PROGRAM?

Advantages for students:

- Students have opportunities to study in an environment with others of different backgrounds.

- PWT participants can avoid negative aspects of the social environment in some of their local schools.

Advantages for teachers and other school personnel:

- Staff members have an opportunity to meet and understand a broader range of types of students.

Advantages for the school and community:

- The receiving schools avoid losing staff positions and funds as a result of declining local enrollment.
- Augmented enrollment allows more courses to be offered.

Disadvantages for students:

- Bus rides are long; students' school day is long.

Disadvantages for teachers and other school personnel:

- More discipline problems are evident, especially absence from class and tardiness to class.
- The program takes extra time to administer.

The advantages and disadvantages summarized above were compiled from those mentioned by interviewees at both high school sites. They represent recurrent themes in the comments of staff members in various roles.

Administrators, in particular, seemed keenly aware that declining local enrollment in their schools threatened to reduce staff positions and the breadth of course offerings; receiving PWT students offset the likelihood of such reductions. Both principals commented that teachers needed to be reminded of how important participation in PWT is for their school. They implied that teachers with negative views on the school's involvement in PWT would re-evaluate their judgment if they realized that many staff positions were "saved" by the enrollment of PWT pupils.

Many staff members felt that encountering students of different backgrounds was a real benefit for teachers. (Only a few spoke of the same benefit for students.) A dean at one school, for instance, noted that teachers had originally been "frightened" when they faced the challenge of working with PWT students, but "this is no longer true." A counselor pointed out that, "Counselors get a mix of students which gives them a better perspective of kids." And an administrator observed, "It's been a growing experience for our staff."

Others responding to interview questions simply noted (as one put it) that, "It's important for the minority to mix with the majority." Such general remarks citing the worth of "integration" were frequent.

As noted above, few staff members pointed to advantages of the PWT Program for students. Of those who did, most focused on the value of integration in general. Several, however, felt that PWT participants gained by escaping gangs and (in these staff members' views) the more violent environment of the inner city. In the words of one person interviewed, "These kids are not fearful here like at home."

One coach noted that the participation of Black athletes had greatly improved the school's athletic program.

Over a dozen interview respondents felt that the greatest disadvantage of PWT was that it brought students who frequently "cut" or "ditched" classes to their school. (In the view of these staff members, students in PWT were, as a group, out of class more than local students.)

That program required extra time to administer was mentioned as a disadvantage by several administrators.

The only disadvantage of PWT that school personnel perceived for students was the long bus ride. "The kids hate to travel so far," one teacher reported. Another observed, "They feel tired and wilted by fourth period." One staff member, however, dismissed these opinions, arguing that most of the students had traveled to school by bus for many years and, thus, were used to the ride. This viewpoint did not seem widely shared.

In addition to questions on the advantages and disadvantages of the PWT Program, administrators, counselors, and faculty members interviewed formally were asked to discuss, "How the program is working out here." Almost without exception, they expressed positive opinions: they wanted to see the program continue at their schools.

6. WHAT ARE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF STAFF MEMBERS AT THE HIGH SCHOOLS VISITED REGARDING THE PWT PROGRAM?

- Special funding for PWT receiving schools should be available.
- Special counseling should be given to PWT students who do not go to classes.
- More information in incoming PWT students should be provided--and provided more promptly--to receiving schools in order to facilitate student placement in classes.

At the close of each interview, staff members were asked whether there were "things that need changing" in the Permits with Transportation Program. As the summary above shows, their recommendations (and those provided by others in informal conversation) are consonant with the program disadvantages listed earlier in the interviews.

The call for reinstatement of PWT funds came from nearly every staff

member with any administrative responsibility in connection with PWT. On the other hand, the call for the counseling of those PWT students (but not for local students) who are regularly absent from class came from many teachers.

Administrators and counselors reported that students' records often arrived at their schools after the students themselves had appeared. This, they explained, made it difficult to place students in appropriate classes in an informed way. Thus, they urged that the transfer of students' academic and behavioral records be facilitated.

These represent the recommendations that recurred frequently in researchers' talks with personnel at Dewey and Hardwick High School. Rarely were other suggestions offered. Two teachers felt that the faculty in receiving schools could use "better preparation" and "training" in working with PWT students. One administrator believed that a six-period day should be offered for all students. He argued that, especially in view of the considerable travel time PWT students put in daily, additional instructional time at the receiving schools would make good sense.

What staff members did not recommend is, perhaps, as important to note as the changes they did recommend.

Even in discussing the need to reinstate funds, interview respondents did not cite a need for social-support programs for PWT students (buddy systems, extra neighbor programs, more extensive orientation activities, additional human relations programs, etc.). Staff members reported no continuing contact with District personnel on issues related to the PWT Program (e.g., supervision of program activities, technical assis-

tance toward strengthening the program, etc.). But no respondent recommended on-going District services in support of the program. Similarly, none of those who were interviewed expressed interest in what other receiving schools might be doing.

In short, there seemed to be no widespread view among staff at the high schools visited that PWT--as a program of schoolwide and District-wide effort--could be or should be something more than a set of activities that had been in place locally prior to fund reductions.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Without exception, buses were available to take PWT students to and from the four receiving schools.

- Late buses were routinely provided for those program participants who wished to take part in after-school activities.

Late buses were available daily at the two high schools. In one elementary school, they were provided twice a week; at the other, once a week. Thus, at the elementary schools, PWT students could not make use of school playgrounds on a daily basis, as local students were able to do.

- Bus transportation was regularly available to take students and (as appropriate) parents to and from evening and weekend school programs.

In only one instance (an oversight) in one school, according to reports, buses were not available for such purposes.

- Students participating in PWT seemed to have equitable access to all school facilities, programs, and activities.

In the elementary schools, PWT students were mixed throughout classrooms and were taught side-by-side with classmates from the local area. They also received, as appropriate, special instructional services (bilingual, remedial reading, etc.).

In the high schools, PWT students were present in all curricular programs. But at Hardwick High, in particular, large numbers of PWT participants seemed to be enrolled in basic, remedial, and non-college prep courses. They were "under-represented" in honors classes. These course placements resulted in some social isolation.

At Hardwick High School, it was further observed that PWT students and local students routinely occupied separate "territories" on campus during free time (at lunch, during nutrition, etc.).

PWT students took part in the full range of school-sponsored extra-curricular activities--sports, musical groups, pep activities, clubs, and so on.

- No overt hostility (fights, ethnic epithets, etc.) was observed between PWT and local students. No tension between groups was clearly palpable.

Inter-group hostility was reported to have occurred earlier in the school year at one elementary school. But staff members agreed it had ceased. Some evidence suggested underlying Black-White tensions at one high school, but the evidence could not be confirmed.

- In class, PWT and local students in all the schools spoke together and worked together as teachers' styles of classroom management permitted.

- On the playgrounds, elementary school children generally joined in games and otherwise played together--although occassionally students of different ethnicities demonstrated explicit action to avoid one another.

- Outside classrooms, at the high schools, students most frequently chose members of their own ethnic groups for socializing. (This was more marked at Hardwick than at Dewey.) Casual interaction on campus occurred between PWT and local students at both schools, however. (It seemed more frequent at Dewey.)

- Staff members seemed to deal equitably with PWT students at all four schools.

At one elementary school, however, several teachers appeared to interact differentially with Black PWT students. Negative attitudes toward

PWT minority students were clearly evident in one elementary and one high school. In both of the latter, PWT students, in general, were viewed as having behavior problems. (Brief observation did not confirm that their behavior was different than local students'.)

- There were few schoolwide programs and activities which explicitly took into account the presence of PWT students.
- Organized social and psychological support services for PWT students were generally absent.
- Academic support services had existed in both high schools, but were discontined due to funding cuts.
- Some teachers structured class activities in ways that encouraged PWT and local students to interact; most teachers, however, apparently did not.
- Among the chief advantages of the PWT Program cited by staff members were the following:
  - --Students and staff members are exposed to others of different cultures and social backgrounds.
  - --Receiving schools were able to remain open, keep staff positions, keep curricular offerings, etc., in the face of declining local enrollments.
  - --PWT provides extended day care for working parents (of elementary students) and a safer, "gang free" environment (for high school students.)
- Among the chief disadvantages cited by staff members were the following:
  - --PWT students bring additional disciplinary problems.
  - --PWT students have long bus rides; many become tired (and at the elementary level, restless) in school.
- The single most frequently voiced recommendation of staff members in all schools was that additional funding for PWT students be restored.

In Overview

Students in the Permits With Transportation Program were delivered to assigned receiving schools. Once there, they participated in the social life of their new schools in ways that their individual personalities allowed. Aside from providing transportation and concomitant access to another school, however, few programmatic efforts were carried out in behalf of PWT students, especially on a schoolwide basis. Materials produced by the School District suggest that an effective local PWT Program depends upon activities to assist students in acclimating to a new social and educational environment, i.e., social and psychological support services. Beyond the efforts of individual teachers (which were reportedly few), such activities and services were extremely limited in all four schools (even before fund reductions). Also limited were programs to increase contacts between sending and receiving schools and communities.

If the goal of the PWT Program is to provide access and opportunity, that goal is being met in the four schools chosen for this study.

If the PWT Program is intended to facilitate, encourage, and support inter-group contact, to foster social relationships, and to assure, programmatically, the positive adaptation of PWT participants to new environments, this brief exploration suggests that more needs to be done.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER MONITORING OF THE PERMITS WITH TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

1. A Precise Statement of PWT Program Goals Must Be Obtained Prior To Further Evaluation.

Preceding further evaluation of the PWT Program, researchers should meet with appropriate Los Angeles Unified School District officials to discuss and clarify: (a) the intended outcomes of the program; (b) the expected scope of program-related activity at local school sites.

Sufficient time should be allowed for this process. A series of meetings with groups and individuals with the District should occur periodically for several weeks.

2. The Academic Experiences Of Program Participants Should Be Closely Examined.

Such an examination should include (a) a review of PWT students' placements in specific curricular programs in light of their academic histories; (b) a study of PWT students' mobility across curricular programs; and (c) interviews and observations to ascertain the practices and beliefs that underlie the findings of (a) and (b).

Classroom observation should be conducted in conjuntion with (c).

Special attention should be given to the academic progress of students who have been long-term PWT participants. Their progress should be compared to non-PWT students matched on appropriate dimensions, e.g., aptitude and achievement test scores, socioeconomic status, etc.

A wide range of measures should be used in assessing academic pro-

gress: curricular placement, class grades, teachers' comments, standardized test scores, minimum-competency-test performance, etc.

3. Students Participating in the PWT Program and Local Students In Receiving Schools Should Be Interviewed.

Students participating in PWT should have the opportunity to express their experiences of social and academic life in the receiving schools they attend. They should identify needs that they feel have been met by local-site programs, as well as those which they feel have not been met.

To provide a full picture of student social life at receiving schools, students from the local attendence areas should be interviewed. Their perceptions of social relations, and PWT and local students' attitudes toward one another, should be elicited.

4. Parents Of Students Participating In PWT And Parents In the Receiving School Community Should Be Interviewed.

Parents and guardians of PWT students should have opportunities to identify the advantages and disadvantages, all the costs and benefits of the PWT program as they see them. Inquiry should be directed particularly toward assessing the quality of information they receive about the program and about activities at the local schools that their children attend.

Parents of students in the local attendence area of receiving schools should be afforded opportunities to express their reactions to the program and to identify the benefits and costs of the program that they perceive.

5. Research Should Trace The Flow Of Communication And Technical Assistance To And From District Offices And PWT Receiving Schools.

What information do school administrators receive about the program and how do they receive it? What information do District administrators receive about local-site activities and how do they receive it? The present study was too limited to answer these questions. (Few contacts with with District personnel about the PWT Program were reported by school administrators, however.) Adequate definition of program goals and expectations, effectively communicated to local-sites from appropriate District offices, is a necessary prerequisite to an effective school-level effort. Equally important is a regular flow of data and requests for assistance from local-sites to District Offices. Future monitoring of the PWT Program should, therefore, trace the chains of program communication that currently exist in order to identify where information and communication channels are adequate and/or inadequate.

6. The Impact Of The PWT Program On Sending Schools Should Be Assessed.

PWT influences the local schools that participating students do not attend, as well as the receiving schools they enroll in through the program. What the "loss" of PWT students means for administrators, counselors, teachers, and students in the sending schools, and how PWT affects those schools and the communities they serve, are issues that should be addressed in future program monitoring.

APPENDIX:

Explanation of School Selection Procedures

As part of the larger PWT Study (see the preface), twenty Los Angeles schools were chosen in a random sampling procedure. Included in this set were nine elementary schools, six junior highs, and five senior high schools. A decision by the Integration Evaluation Planning Team required that schools chosen for the "ethnographic study" be selected from among these twenty schools.

Time and monetary resources for the ethnographic study restricted work to a maximum of four schools. It seemed most reasonable to choose two schools at two different grade levels. The research team decided to "bracket the range" by looking at two senior high schools and two elementary schools.

In choosing two of the five high schools and two of nine elementary schools, the ethnographic study team employed the following general criteria:

1. Choose schools with larger, rather than smaller, proportions of PWT students enrolled.
2. Choose, if possible, one school with a multi-ethnic PWT group and one with a PWT group of predominantly one ethnicity.
3. Choose schools that are involved only in PWT Program and are not associated with other desegregation programs. (For instance, several elementary schools also had "gifted" magnet programs.)
4. All other things being equal, choose schools easy to reach for the researchers, so that the research budget will not be absorbed in extensive travel time and reimbursement.

Using these criteria, four schools were selected: Hardwick and Dewey High Schools; and Goodwin Avenue and a second elementary school.

A first visit to the second elementary school, however, revealed

that nearly 500 minority students were attending the school through a "satellite" program. The PWT Program seemed to be less salient to staff members there; PWT students were "lost" (to the observer) among satellite program students. Therefore, a re-selection was made. The second elementary school originally chosen was dropped and replaced by Bresson Place Elementary School.

"END OF DOCUMENT"