Parent involvement : factors influencing parent and teacher perceptions and practices for six types of involvement in Montana public schools
by Cheryl Strasburger Johannes

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Montana State University

Abstract:
The purpose of this study was to determine whether certain parent factors and teacher factors explain and contribute to the variation of parent and teacher perception of a school's program of parent involvement in Montana public schools. A six-part typology (Epstein, 1993) defined the types of parent involvement as: 1)parenting information, 2) communication between home and school, 3) utilizing parent volunteers, 4) helping parents to help with homework, 5) decision-making and leadership, and 6) relating community services and resources for families. The theory underlying this study is the overlapping sociological empathetic influences on child development created by the home, the school, and the community.

The findings showed a difference in the types and magnitude of perception between parents of high school students and parents of elementary/middle school students. Evidence pointed to certain factors explaining a significant amount of variation in some of the types. Parents at both levels perceived the need for better communication. Variables that most often explained a significant proportion of the way parents view the school program of involvement were parent view of the school and parent perception of the school's effort to involve parents. Other variables that explained variation in the ways parents view the school's parent involvement program were parent perception of child's success in school, gender, and income level. Variables which did not offer much explanation of the way parents perceive the school parent involvement program were education level and adults in the household.

For the teacher data, the identified variables did explain variation in some of the types of school program of parent involvement for teachers at all levels. There were differences between high school teacher perceptions of the school parent involvement program and the elementary/middle school teacher perceptions.

Conclusions and recommendations support the need for school-home collaboration.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT: FACTORS INFLUENCING PARENT AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES FOR SIX TYPES OF INVOLVEMENT IN MONTANA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Cheryl Strasburger Johannes

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY - BOZEMAN
Bozeman, Montana

April 1997

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Cheryl Strasburger Johannes

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

Dr. B. Keith Chambers — B. Keith Chambers — April 21, 1997
Chairperson, Graduate Committee — Date

Approved for the Department of Education

Dr. Gloria A. Gregg — Gloria A. Gregg — April 21, 1997
Head, Major Department — Date

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

Dr. Robert Brown — R. Brown — 6/12/97
Graduate Dean — Date

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University- Bozeman, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this thesis should be referred to University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation in and from microfilm along with the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part."

Signature Cheryl N. Johannes

Date April 21, 1997

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am humbled by the awareness of how many people have contributed time, energy, and intellect in assisting me with this dissertation. I am indebted to my faculty advisor and committee chair, Dr. Keith Chambers, whose patience and unwavering encouragement helped me deal with personal frustrations and meet challenges with a positive spirit. I also recognize the mentoring of committee member, Dr. Gloria Gregg, who gave me the opportunity to assist with the Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools which was funded by the U. S. Department of Education. Her high expectations, support, and faith in my ability inspired me to reach higher goals. I acknowledge the time and effort of my committee in helping me grow personally and professionally in the dissertation process and throughout the doctoral program: Dr. Leroy Casagranda, Dr. John Kohl, and Dr. Strohmeyer. I am also indebted to Dr. Larry Baker for the many hours of running data analyses and his upbeat approach to solving problems which in retrospect were probably "insignificant." I acknowledge my family and my friends for their support and encouragement. Finally, I thank my wonderful husband, Jim, for caring, helping, and always being there for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether certain parent factors and teacher factors explain and contribute to the variation of parent and teacher perception of a school's program of parent involvement in Montana public schools. A six-part typology (Epstein, 1993) defined the types of parent involvement as: 1)parenting information, 2) communication between home and school, 3) utilizing parent volunteers, 4) helping parents to help with homework, 5) decision-making and leadership, and 6) relating community services and resources for families. The theory underlying this study is the overlapping sociological empathetic influences on child development created by the home, the school, and the community.

The findings showed a difference in the types and magnitude of perception between parents of high school students and parents of elementary/middle school students. Evidence pointed to certain factors explaining a significant amount of variation in some of the types. Parents at both levels perceived the need for better communication. Variables that most often explained a significant proportion of the way parents view the school program of involvement were parent view of the school and parent perception of the school's effort to involve parents. Other variables that explained variation in the ways parents view the school's parent involvement program were parent perception of child's success in school, gender, and income level. Variables which did not offer much explanation of the way parents perceive the school parent involvement program were education level and adults in the household.

For the teacher data, the identified variables did explain variation in some of the types of school program of parent involvement for teachers at all levels. There were differences between high school teacher perceptions of the school parent involvement program and the elementary/middle school teacher perceptions.

Conclusions and recommendations support the need for school-home collaboration.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Nearly every country has developed a system of family support that has served to cushion the effects of change in the family structure. Many European countries have made social provision for child care, parental leave, and health benefits, which Europeans consider essential adaptations to conditions of modern life. In America, the traditional celebration of family self-sufficiency and rugged individualism, along with a traditional antipathy to government interference may have impeded some needed adjustments to change (Coontz, 1989). In the United States, political leaders and educators have talked a great deal about the importance of parent involvement in the education of youth, perhaps more than any other Western nation. In the early twentieth century, Theodore Roosevelt opined that the nation's future rested on the right kind of home life. Lyndon Johnson declared that a goal of the Great Society was to strengthen the family. Richard Nixon vetoed a child care bill on the grounds it would weaken the family. Ronald Reagan succinctly put it: "Strong families are the foundation of society" (Coontz 1989).

Elkind (1995) emphasizes that schools have undergone a transformation in keeping pace with the changes in society. Schools in postmodern society have continued the historical trend of gradually assuming parental functions. The theory of the two working collaboratively has for the most part been overlooked. Recent trends suggest that school policies and practices have not kept pace with the needs of the changing family (Swap, 1993; Levin, 1987).

During the current era of school reform and change, attention is focusing on parent involvement in the education of children. While educators look for solutions to the multi-faceted problems faced daily in classrooms, they generally have not considered partnerships with parents as an approach to diminish many of these problems. Research (Coleman, 1966; Bronfenbrenner, 1974; Comer, 1986; Moles, 1987; Henderson and Berla, 1994; Epstein, 1987, 1987b, 1990, 1991, 1995; Epstein and Dauber, 1991; Swap, 1992, 1993) has shown that any amount of parent involvement will positively impact a child's success rate in school; yet, often those parents whose children are struggling the most are the absent ones in the school-home relationship. Although parents and teachers are engaged in complementary socio-cultural tasks, they often find themselves in conflict with one another. According to Kagan and Schraft (1983), this adversarial relationship emerges out of their roles as defined by the social structure of society. Collaboration between schools and families is not the dominant model for the management of schools or the practice of teaching (Swap, 1993; Noddings, 1988). Kidder (1989) in *Among School Children* points out that teaching has been and continues to be an isolated and isolating experience. Seeley (1985) describes this system of managing schools as fundamentally flawed.

> The essential trouble is the nature of the system itself, a system that has become beguiled by a "delivery system" mentality. Public education today is a professionalized, bureaucratized, governmental enterprise attempting to deliver education as a service. The system is faulty because it is designed to deliver something that cannot be delivered. The system is failing and will continue to fail until education is rediscovered as a dimension of human development dependent on personal motivation, initiative, and relationships, not on systems and "service delivery." (p.4)

Schools need to look at parent involvement in new ways. These ways can serve to build partnerships between the home and the school that are two-way in terms of helping one another to provide educational opportunities for children. A closer examination of the

relationship that exists between the school and the home and ways of maintaining and/or strengthening that relationship is needed.

The purposes of this study were to contribute to research about parent involvement in public schools in Montana and to provide educators with data about parent perceptions of schools' efforts to involve or not involve them and about which involvement practices may be more effective for diverse family groups.

Problem Statement

The problem of this study was to determine what proportion of the variability in the dependent variables of parent perceptions of a school's program of six types of parent involvement was explained by a set of independent variables and whether those variables helped to predict a type of parent involvement. The six types of parent involvement were 1) providing parenting information, 2) communicating with parents, 3)utilizing parent volunteers, 4) helping parents to help child with homework, 5) involving parents in decision-making and leadership, and 6) informing parents about community services and resources to help families. The independent variables for parents were perception variables of parents' views of the school, the parents' perceptions of their child's success in school, the parents' perceptions of the school's effort to involve parents, and the demographic variables of gender, adults in household, levels of education and income.

Conceptual Framework

Developmental psychologists widely accept ecological theories of human development; however, these theories are not always put into practice when intervening for children (Bronfenfrenner, 1979; Garbarino, 1982; Werner, 1990). Events and experiences that occur in the lives of individuals or families (their ecology) influence the ecological emphatic perspective. These individuals and families can understand and

influence these events and experiences to promote healthy modes of development and learning. This concept uses the following framework for approaching the study of families: all human systems are comprised of elements that enable them to function; human systems are connected to other systems in a transactional manner; the elements within a human system influence each other; human systems strive to maintain their integrity through a needs-resources balancing process (Swick, 1987). Using this perspective, ecological theorists see a child's behavior (as well as the family's) as a part of a set of interrelated systems that have a powerful influence on each other (Garbarino, 1982; Swick and Graves, 1993).

In the 1980s, Epstein (1995) found that older sociological theories stressed that social organizations would be most effective if they set separate goals and worked efficiently and effectively on unique missions. Epstein and her colleagues did not find these theories supported by the data. She has developed a theory of overlapping spheres of influence (See Figure 1) in which the contexts of family, school, and community create an environment that directly affects how well a child learns in school and how successful he/she is in life. This social organizational perspective posits that the most effective relationship of families and schools contain overlapping shared goals and missions concerning children.

Figure 1. Overlapping Spheres of Influence Model Developed by Joyce Epstein

This ecological emphatic concept and the theory of overlapping spheres form the framework for this research. Epstein's six-part typology of parent involvement clarifies the term parent involvement.

Definition of Terms

Classroom Structure - The scheduling and grouping of students in a classroom, i.e. self-contained in which the students have most of their classes taught by one teacher throughout the school day, semi-departmentalized in which the students have one teacher for more than one class and have other instructors for other core curriculum courses, and departmentalized in which the students move from one teacher to another teacher for instruction.

Communicating - The using of effective forms of school-to-home and home-to-school exchanges of information and interaction about home observations of children's behavior

and attitudes, school observations of children's behavior and attitudes, and children's social and academic progress.

Family Involvement - Broader context of parent involvement which includes other members of a family. Involvement may include members of varying family structures and extended family as well.

Learning at Home - Information and ideas that families can use to help students at home with homework and other activities, decisions, and planning that create positive learning environments.

Middle School - The grouping of grade levels sixth, seventh, and eighth or seventh, eighth, and ninth for instructional purposes based upon the developmental needs of that age group to facilitate easier transition into the high school setting.

Parenting - The skills and information that families need to establish home environments to meet basic family obligations and to support children as students.

Parent Involvement - The contacts, interactions, and patterns of influence that occur between individuals at home and individuals at school who have responsibility for the education of a child living in both environments.

Partnership - The collaborative relationship that occurs when parents, teachers, and students share a joint interest in working together to create an appropriate environment to promote student success.

Permeable Family - The changing nature of the unit in which a child resides due to the current trend of having adults entering the unit and later leaving the unit due to divorce, separation of parents, remarriage, death of a family member. This can also refer to the increasing numbers of adults in a child's life in terms of child care providers, specialized staff in schools, and agency workers.

Shared Decision-making - Parents and schools working together to decide appropriate curriculum and programs for children.

Student Success, also referred to as Achievement - Parents' perception and report of their child's grades in school, their child's progress in school, and their child's attitude toward school.

Typology - The study of types; framework of types.

Volunteering - The unpaid services of parent help and support for school purposes either in the setting of the school or at a school-related activity away from the school or completing a task for school in the home.

Type I Involvement - Parenting activities which help all families establish home environments to support children as students.

Type II Involvement - Using effective forms of school-to-home and home-to-school communications about school programs and children's progress.

Type III Involvement - Recruiting and organizing parent help and support.

Type IV Involvement - Providing information and ideas to families about how to help students at home with homework and other curriculum-related activities, decisions, and planning.

Type V Involvement - Including parents in school decisions and developing parent leaders.

Type VI Involvement - Identifying and integrating resources and services from the community to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning and development.

Questions to Be Answered

1. What proportion of the variance in parent attitude toward each of the six types of parent involvement is explained by the individual and the combined effects of factors of parent

gender, parent education level, number of adults in household and parent perception of the school's effort to involve parents, parent perception of the school, and parent perception of their child's success in school at the elementary level and at the high school level?

2. What is the interrelationship between parent attitudes toward each of the six types of parent involvement and parent self-reported practices of each of the six types of involvement?

3. What proportion of the variance in teacher attitude toward each of the six types of parent involvement is explained by the individual and combined factors of teacher education level, years of experience, number of students taught per day or classroom structure, gender, teacher perception of parent strengths, teacher perception of importance of parent involvement, and perception of support from others for parent involvement at the elementary level and at the secondary level?

Assumptions of the Study

1. All parents who responded have children who were enrolled in public schools in Montana.

2. All teachers who were employed in K-12 public schools in Montana and are members of the Montana Education Association.

Significance of the Study

The study contributes to the knowledge base of parent involvement in public schools in Montana. The data helps to explain the influence of a set of perception factors and demographic factors upon different types of parent involvement. Educators and parents in public schools can use the data to make decisions regarding parent involvement practices in their schools.

Review of Relevant Research and Theory

Historical Review

The balance among the environmental contexts that influence children's lives has shifted throughout history. This section will present a generalized view of the interactions between families and schools during the development of the public school systems.

In the Colonial Period, English common law required a person to be a part of a family, either the family of origin or one to which the authorities assigned him/her. The family was responsible for teaching the child how to make a living, to respect and obey constituted authority, to participate in community tasks, and to perform his/her religious duties (Sinclair, 1983). If the family did not have the capacity to do this, then the child was apprenticed or bonded to another person or family who could assume this responsibility. From the earliest establishment of schools in colonial New England, government steadily increased its control over the form, content, funding, and clients of schools (Perry and Tannebaum, 1992).

During the 1800s, many unsuccessful efforts failed to establish a national public school system (Perry and Tannebaum, 1992). According to Sinclair, every state established common schools to teach basic skills. Many children attended when their parents believed that they could be spared from their work at home, on the farm, or in other places where children were employed (Sinclair et al., 1983). The schools were not graded and when a child could not attend, it was expected that he/she would start at the place in his/her studies where he/she had left off when last in school. With the *Kalamazoo* Case (1874), compulsory attendance regulations and child labor laws began making an impact on families sending their children to schools supported by tax dollars (Perry and Tannebaum, 1992).

Until the Industrial Revolution, the home had assumed a major responsibility for the care, education and training of children. This was possible because the occupational skills that most young people had to learn were relatively simple. As the demands for better trained workers increased, the need for instruction outside the home became apparent. As knowledge expanded and more skills were necessary in the workplace, full-time teachers were needed to prepare youths for their roles in society. Communities came to accept education and training as their responsibilities (Kellaghan et al. 1993). In 1892, a movement by the National Education Association to standardize the high school curriculum was an effort to exercise professional control over educational content (Levine, 1982).

In the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, American education became more of a situation of the home against the school and parents against the teacher as political and social forces were moving together (Sinclair et al., 1983). Seeley (1989) suggests that parents may have signaled that they were unwilling to be involved in their children's schooling. Some researchers dispute this, citing evidence that parents have always wanted to be involved (Berger, 1991; Epstein, 1987; Swap, 1992). The increased professionalization of teaching may have had the unintended consequence of reducing parental responsibility for children's education and parent involvement in the educational process (Christenson and Conoley, 1992).

Between the 1940s and the 1980s, changes in the family have increased dramatically. Schools have attempted to keep pace. Nostalgic recollections of times when home-school relationships were stronger and more reliable are illusory. Sara Lawrence Lightfoot (1978) maintains that home-school relationships are inherently in conflict because tensions exist between the particularistic concerns of parents and the universalistic concerns of schooling. Tensions in contemporary society are evident as parents' rights and power

are becoming new dynamics in the American public education system.

Changing Families in America

Psychological and social changes have resulted from new life-span events, such as increased longevity, negotiating psychosocial identity within more complex family arrangements, and relating to the more intense needs of children as they experience higher educational and social expectations (Hamburg, 1992). Hamburg reports that the effect of this change is felt most critically within the family system. Families provide the vision, energy, and structure by which the change process is negotiated (Skolnick, 1991). When the stresses promulgated in society overwhelm families and create a high risk for dysfunction, the result can be loss of vision, energy, and structure for society at large. The increase in family stress since the 1950s has been significant. Increases in family dissolution, child abuse, teen parenthood, alcohol and other drug abuse, and other family pathologies are cause for alarm (Gibbs 1990; Hewlett, 1991).

The number of single parent families has increased. Since 1960, premarital childbirth to women under 20 years of age has been a national concern. Three quarters of a million unwed teenage females become pregnant each year (1995 National Kids Count Data Book). This translates into a 400 percent increase in out-of-wedlock births. Evidence shows that the mothers, the children born, and couples who marry as a result of a premaritally conceived child experience economic disadvantages both in loss of earning power and loss of human potential.

The divorce rate in the United States has quadrupled (Bennett, 1993). The percentage of children in single-parent families climbed from just under 10 percent in 1965 to nearly 22 percent in 1989 (Kilbourne, Decker, Romney, 1994). Single parents accounted for 27 percent of all family groups with children under 18 years old in 1987, a

proportion more than twice as high as it was in 1970 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1988). The 1995 National Kids Count Book reports single parenthood figure to be 25.3 percent in 1992 with every state recording an increase in this measure between 1985 and 1992. More than half of today's children are likely to spend some of their childhood in a single-parent home (1994 Current Population Survey, March). In Montana, that figure is reported to be 23.1 percent in 1992 with the trend showing an increase in the past five years (1995 Montana Kids Count Book).

Swick and Graves' (1993) findings on family environments point to other factors which have impacted today's families. New challenges such as AIDS, drug abuse, increasing crime, and increasing mental health problems are confronting families. The juvenile violent crime arrest rate reflects an increasing number of youths between the ages of 10 and 17 arrested for homicide, forcible rape, robbery, or aggravated assault since 1985 (1995 Montana Kids Count Report).

Cowan and Cowan (1992) describe aspects of current familial social arrangements. In recent decades, there has been a steady ripple of revolutionary social change. Birth control technology has allowed parents to control the number of children. Smaller family units live more isolated lives, often feeling cut off from extended families and friends. Mothers of young children are entering the work force earlier and e, teachable, and worthy of their attention and effort thereby holding higher expectations for those students (Alderman, 1990).

-home c This section has described various barriers to These factors interact differently with teacher characteristics and family characteristics. According to Seeley (1985), successful educational partnerships do exist in some classrooms and schools. However, partnership for education is limited. Partnership occurs when parenh little education (1995 National Kids Count Data Book). George Mason University professor Roger Wilkins (1995) posits that "Poor children need families, and in a culture where almost half the marriages

end in divorce, the very least the most vulnerable citizens need for a chance to form and keep families is a real shot at earned income. But America is going through a profound economic upheaval that is pinching middle-class people, doing severe damage to unskilled whites, and devastating unskilled blacks."

Based upon a growing body of research, there is an effort nationwide to involve men more directly in their children's education at school and in the home. Fathers or father figures play an important role in the positive cognitive, emotional, and social development of their sons and daughters (Nelson cited in 1995 Kids Count Data Book). Traditionally, women have held the role of providing most of the interaction with children in the home especially when the children are young. This responsibility has extended into the context of the school where mothers are most often the parent connected with the school. The research consistently shows that the impact of involving fathers or any significant male figure in a child's life is beneficial (Levine, Murphy, Wilson, 1993). Levine et al. state that "children benefit from warm and nurturing relationships with men, and men are most likely to develop those sorts of relationships in environments which value, support, and encourage them" (p. 9).

Choices about how to create life as a family are much greater now than they were thirty years ago. Men and women are having a difficult time regaining their balance as couples after they have babies, partly because radical shifts in the circumstances surrounding family life in America demand new arrangements to accommodate the increasing demands on parents of young children. New social arrangements and roles simply have not kept pace with these changes, leaving couples on their own to manage the demands of work and family (Skolnick, 1991).

Society is dealing with a large number of complex youth problems. Nearly half a million students drop out of public schools in the United States (Kaufman, Frase, 1990). This amounts to an annual economic impact of billions of dollars in lost tax revenues, in

welfare payments, and crime prevention (Caterall, 1986). Careful study of the dropout phenomenon reveals symptoms of deeper, underlying societal problems. Annual estimates of adolescent behavior present some startling statistics:

Three quarters of a million children are physically abused.

Almost half a million young people attempt suicide and 7,000 succeed (Capuzzi and Cross, 1989).

Nearly 150,000 youth run away from home (Willis, 1986).

During 1993, twenty-three percent of everyone arrested for a violent crime was under age 20 (Peck, Law, and Mills, 1989).

Arrests for teenage drug addiction have increased sixty-fold since 1963 (National Kids Count Book).

Treating these problems as though there are singular solutions will not suffice. The answers are complex, costly, and long-term.

Other factors outside the home impact the development of children. Seventy-three percent of parents want to limit their children's television viewing (Finnery, 1993), but studies show that children watch three or more hours of television a day (Puma et al, 1993). Academic achievement drops sharply for children who watch more than ten hours a week or an average of two hours per school day (U.S. Department of Education, 1987). The quality of the programs being watched may have such negative effects on children as less sensitivity to pain and suffering of others, greater fear of the world around them, and increased likelihood of being aggressive or harmful to others (Murray and Conneborg in Strong Families, Strong Schools, 1994).

Elkind (1995) points out the school is a mirror of society and of the family. As society has changed over the past fifty years, the school has reflected those changes in the family and in the larger society. The shift from modern to postmodern times is evidenced

by the shift from the traditional family to the permeable family. A change occurred in fundamental beliefs from modernity's regard for reason as the engine of human progress to postmodern's veneration of language, rather than thought. While modernity expounds human individuality, postmodernity honors human diversity. These postmodern themes of difference, particularity, and irregularity are increasingly transforming science, the arts, and industry. They have also transformed the family and, increasingly, are transforming the school. Historian Lawrence Cremin best describes this modern educational agenda (quoted in Elkind, 1995):

> First, it meant the broadening of the function of the school to include direct concern for health, vocation, and the quality of family and community life. Second, it meant applying in the classroom the pedagogical principles derived from new scientific research in psychology and in the social sciences. Third, it meant tailoring instruction more and more to the different kinds of classes of children who were being brought within the purview of the school.... Finally, progressivism implied the radical faith that the culture could be democratized without being vulgarized, the faith that everyone could share not only in the benefits of the new sciences but in the pursuit of the arts as well (p. 11).

Progressive education became the accepted model in modern society. Schools mirrored the traditional family's sentiments and values. The context and content of public schools reflect these sentiments. Because this was in accordance with modernity's belief in maternal love and domesticity, kindergartens began as half-time, play-oriented, and optional. The school's purpose was to reinforce the home. Schools did not offer food service programs because children would go home for lunch. Schools focused on the personal adjustment of children in helping them adapt to the larger society. Children were viewed as being well-adjusted and maladjusted. The curriculum was basic and contained little that was considered controversial (Elkind 1995).

Several changes characterize postmodern times. The family itself is no longer seen as a traditional unit but a permeable one of many different family structures, each of which

can provide quality child rearing. Other changes in the postmodern family are noted. Working mothers and child care by someone outside the family have led to shared parenting. The boundaries between home and workplace, public and private life, and child and adult are much more open and flexible than they were during the modern era. Information barriers between youth and adults are much more penetrable (Elkind 1995).

Rich (1987) of the Home and School Institute contends that "Families and teachers might wish that the school could do the job alone. But today's school needs families and today's families need the school. In many ways, their mutual need may be the greatest hope for change" (p. 62).

Many factors influence human development. Young people are not completely absolved of the responsibility of making choices while growing up. However, adults must recognize that children do not grow up in isolation; they grow up in environments. Not only the family but also peers, school and work setting, and community influence children (Bogenschneider, Small, and Riley, 1990).

Ecological Theories and Models

Early sociological theories emphasized the importance of separating the home and the school authorities (Weber 1947), their responsibilities (Waller 1932) and the importance for student development of particularistic behaviors in families and universalistic behavior in schools (Parsons 1959). Recent sociological, social psychological and ecological theories emphasize the nested characteristics and interrelated behaviors of families and schools (Litwak and Meyer 1974; Bronfenbrenner 1979). Specific theoretical stances influence the extent to which educators and parents collaborate.

Coleman's Theory

Coleman (1987) posits that home and school provide different inputs for the socialization process of children. One set of inputs, opportunities, expectations, and rewards comes from the school. The second set of inputs, attitudes, efforts and self-concept comes from the social environment of the home. Educational outcomes result from the interaction of these two sets of qualities. He stresses that the two do not always have an equal effect on children. Those children from strong family backgrounds have more advantage than children from weak ones. The greater the variation exists between the two sets, the less equal the influence that exists on the child. Coleman argues that the social capital in homes is shrinking. Consequently, replacing home resources with school-like resources does not maintain or increase school achievement. Academic and developmental outcomes for children need to be maintained or increased by the resources created within the home more effectively interacting with those from the school.

Taxonomy of Models of Parent Involvement

Perry and Tannenbaum (1992) organize a four-part typology of the dimensions of parental involvement activities acknowledging both supportive and adversarial roles. They outline underlying assumptions that school professionals and parents make about the nature of schools and the nature of families. In addition, they identify benefits and limitations of each model.

The child-centered model directly involves parents in the education of their own children. This model is generally supportive of the school. The formalized aspects are initiated by the school with the building as the center unit. The parent is part of a network of interrelated positions linked to the organizational goal of imparting knowledge and skills to the students at a particular school. A limitation of this model is that the organizational

goal of a public school system is often unclear and ambiguous regarding the role of the parent.

The collaboration model defines the role of a parent as being a service-oriented assistant acting as an accessory or educational volunteer. The idea of a partnership can perhaps be described as a professional-client relationship. Even school personnel who espouse the value of involving all parents as partners question whether the current system could handle such time commitment and energy.

The third model is the decision participation model. The parent is a participant in planning, policy development, and decision making. Historically, the focus in this model is on gaining access to power and governance through the school board. However, the increasing presence of parental advisory committees suggests political parental participation. These councils are going beyond ad hoc committees being used to address a particular need to broader, ongoing councils being used to deal with public relations or curriculum.

The fourth type of parent involvement is the parent activist or conflict model. This pattern of involvement is more likely to be evident in areas of socioeconomic and ethnic diversity. These groups frequently are the ones attempting to bring about a grassroots involvement in schools and greater educational equity. The goal of most parent action groups is reform, not abolition, of the school.

Epstein's Theory

Joyce Epstein (1986) relates four events in history explaining the movement from theories and practices that stressed separation between family and school to those that stress partnership. The four events were 1) an increase in college attendance and completion of bachelor's degrees, 2) Dr. Spock's guide to child rearing, 3) federal programs for

disadvantaged children, and 4) the increase in single parents, working mothers, and other changes in family structure. These events served to increase the education level of many parents compared to that of teachers. Parents were also receiving information and assistance from publications and early childhood programs that increased their sense of efficacy in raising their children. The need for shared parenting has increased as the number of parents working outside the home has increased.

Based upon her research and that of her colleagues, Epstein (1995) has developed a theoretical perspective she calls "overlapping spheres of influence." These overlapping spheres form the contexts in which children learn. She describes the three contexts most influencing a child's growth and development as the home, the school, and the community. Each of these spheres overlaps to some extent in that the contexts share the values, expectations, and encouragement for the child. When the overlap is increased, then the student has a more stable and reinforcing climate in which to learn. Epstein proposes that three forces alter the interactions of parents, teachers, and students. One force is the changes in ages and grade levels of the student. Another is the philosophies, policies, and practices of the family and how those conflict or coincide with the school. The third force is the philosophies, policies, and practices of the school and whether those conflict or coincide with the family's. In the interest of fairness, most schools have set philosophies, policies, and practices for students and parents as a whole. Sometimes, this creates problems in dealing with individual families. This social organizational perspective proposes that the most effective families and schools have overlapping, shared goals and missions concerning children, and that they conduct some work collaboratively.

The model of overlapping spheres of influence includes external and internal structures. The external structure can, by conditions or design, be pushed together or pulled apart by three main forces. These forces are background and practices of families,

background and practices of schools and classrooms, and time. Epstein (1995) proposes that these forces create conditions, space, and opportunities for more or fewer shared activities of schools, families, and communities. According to Epstein, three perspectives influence assumptions of school personnel and parents concerning family-school relations. One perspective assumes that families and schools hold very different and separate responsibilities in the education of their children. In other words, families and schools have separate goals for educating and socializing children. These goals are best achieved when teachers remain professionally distant from parents and maintain a professional approach to working with children. Parents develop the personal relationships with their children while establishing individual expectations. There is little if any overlap of the spheres of influence. The second perspective assumes that the home and school share socialization and educational responsibilities for children. Both teachers and parents have common goals and expectations that are best achieved when they work together. The overlap in this situation is expected. The third perspective, referred to as the sequential perspective, proposes that parents and teachers contribute to children's development at different stages. Parents teach needed skills to children during the preschool years until the time formal education begins. Then, teachers assume primary responsibility for children's education (Epstein, 1987; Christenson, Rounds, Franklin, 1992; Bloom, 1964; Piaget and Inhelder 1969)

With increased interactions among schools, families, and communities, more students are likely to receive common messages from various people about the importance of school, of working hard, of thinking creatively, of helping each other, and on staying in school. The child is at the center of these overlapping spheres of influence. These spheres may draw together or push apart depending on the types of practices the schools, families, and communities conduct and how well they work together in conducting those activities

(Epstein, 1995).

Three Philosophies of Parent Involvement

Susan Swap (1992) proposes three different philosophies of parent involvement with the third being the one yielding the highest gains in student achievement. The school-to-home transmission philosophy encourages parents to adopt and actively support the values and behaviors that have traditionally led to children's success in school. In this model, educators specify what parents should do to help their children's education. Parents will respond in two ways. First, parents will support the school and its practices, and they will communicate the importance of education to their children. Second, parents will spend time with their children to teach and reinforce the "ways of being" or the knowing, writing, talking, and thinking that characterize those who succeed in this culture. Clark's (1983) research found that parents of achieving students strongly encouraged academic pursuits, expected their children to continue their education, set clear and consistent limits, had frequent conversations and nurturant interactions with their child, and monitored the student's use of time. In addition, parents of achieving students were involved with the school and visited the school periodically. Parents of the non-achieving students did not exhibit these behaviors. The school-to-home orientation strikes a responsive chord in many families who hope that educational achievement will be the route to economic success for their children. Parents are a critical resource for a child's success in this model. School programs using this approach often contain elements that indicate an unwillingness to consider parents as equal partners who have strengths that they can bring to the relationship. Four limitations need to be considered. Parents may not have the time and energy to devote to parent involvement activities if they are faced with meeting other basic needs for survival. A second limitation may be the parents' belief that placing faith in

education and hard work as avenues to equal opportunity is false. Another limitation is that it may be difficult to draw clear boundaries between the roles of school and home in formal education. The school-to-home transmission model assumes that all families have sufficient amounts of time, skills, and values to teach their children whatever skills and values that are not being acquired at school. This may be a false assumption. The fourth limitation is the danger of devaluing and negating the importance of the child's culture in the effort to transmit the values and goals of society.

The second philosophy espoused by Swap (1992) is one of interactive learning. Programs based on this model are built on a premise of mutual respect and collaboration between parents and educators. Two expected outcomes of parent involvement are students' successful achievement and the valuing of the goals and beliefs of diverse populations. Parents and/or educators recognize the importance of continuity in learning between home and school. The richness and desperateness of the cultures of their pupils and the importance of understanding these cultures are brought into the classroom. Often, parents who are politically aware and express much pride in their culture insist on the conveyance of information about their culture and the development of appreciation for it in the school.

Solutions for bridging this gap between the school and the home in terms of transmission of cultural values are threefold. One is to recruit into the school more teachers who reflect and value the child's culture. Another is to bring more parents into the school, thus building an informal relationship between them and the teachers. The third is to learn the points of difference in their cultures and be able to communicate respect and appreciation for each other's values and goals.

This philosophy has problems when used as a premise for parent involvement programs in schools. Learning about a culture requires time, school support and a

willingness on the part of the teacher to prepare. Another problem is the increasing numbers of students from diverse backgrounds who may be in a single classroom. Using the interactive model might create fragmentation for teachers and the instructional program. An additional concern is the on-going belief of some educators and families that it is in the best interests of all if students are homogenized by teaching the values and goals of mainstream society. Swap contends that teaching understanding and appreciation for diverse cultures is unrealistic and ultimately unethical, for it continues to maintain separateness.

The third philosophy that Swap proposes is partnership for school success. Schools which have adopted this model view parent-school partnership as a fundamental component of children's school success. Educators welcome parents as assets and resources while striving to provide opportunities for academic success. Mutual respect and shared power are prerequisites to the partnership. This empowerment process represents a paradigm shift in the way parents and schools operate. The essential characteristics of this model are clarity and consensus about goals; a revised curriculum; local autonomy and control, and partnership among educators, parents, and community members.

In describing clarity and consensus about goals, the schools, parents and community must have a shared sense of mission about creating success for all children. In successful schools, this sense of mission is embedded in a climate of collegiality, caring, and experimentation. All the stakeholders agree upon standards and expectations for success. These indicators of success are crucial because they give direction and excitement to teaching and learning efforts, increase accountability of all participants, and serve as an evaluation measure for educational programs and instructional strategies.

Three of four models of parent involvement described by Susan Swap (1993) parallel her philosophies of parent involvement and have already been discussed.

However, the protective model is the dominant model for home-school relationships in many schools and deserves attention. The goal of this model is to reduce conflict between parents and educators by establishing a separation of functions and protecting the school from interference by parents. The advantage of this model is that it is usually very effective in accomplishing its goal of separation. The disadvantages are that home-school conflicts are exacerbated, that a partnership to increase student achievement is ignored, and that family resources are not available to the school.

Three Models of Parent Involvement by Kellaghan, Alvarez, Sloane, and Bloom

Kellaghan et al. (1993) identify three models that have evolved during the last thirty years. The deficit model began in the 1960s as an effort to provide early intervention to overcome the cycle of poverty experienced by children from low income families. One example of a deficit model is the early Head Start program. Most deficit programs include parent or home training components for parents to learn specific parenting skills to deal with parent-child behaviors and interactions leading to increased cognitive and social development. The base of the model is that the school or agency is the expert and parents need help to do parenting effectively. Schools and programs do little to recognize strengths in families to enable them to counteract the effects of poverty on their children's development.

The second model developed by Kellaghan et al. (1993) is the difference model. This program approach recognizes the strengths, experiences, and knowledge base of parents, especially those of diverse backgrounds and cultures. One of the major changes from the deficit model is the collaboration between the parent and the program provider.

The third model provides the theoretical foundation for many programs operating today. The empowerment model emphasizes partner relationships between parents and the

school. Power and control are central elements in enabling parents to take charge of their own lives and make lasting changes. This process occurs in an atmosphere of respect where people's belief in themselves is affirmed and their abilities to make decisions for themselves is developed through opportunities (Paz cited in Kellaghan et al., 1993).

Barriers to Parent Involvement

Although many educators agree that parent involvement is important for increasing student achievement, and research supports that belief, many barriers prevent parent involvement in public schools. In her research, Epstein (1989) found that almost all parents, even those from the most economically depressed communities, are committed to their children's education. She states, "Parents say they want their children to succeed; they want to help them; and they need the school's and teacher's help to know what to do with their children at each grade level" (in Brandt, 1989). Parents would like to be involved but find obstacles preventing that involvement.

Despite the urgent need for partnerships and the weight of supportive evidence, parents continue to be kept at a distance in most schools. Swap (1993) identifies several barriers which affect the relationships between parents and schools. One of the main barriers is the changing demographics of families. Changes in family structure, divorce rate, diversity of populations of students in terms of race and ethnicity, culture and language, increasing numbers of families in the lower socio-economic status, early parenthood, and employment outside the home have impacted the ways teachers relate to parents. Many teachers assume that parents do not care when traditional forms of outreach do not work. Another factor is the increasing demands that have been placed upon teachers in environments which have become more complex in a time of declining resources. The diversity of families has outdistanced the diversity of the teaching force.

A second barrier identified by Swap (1993) is the set of school norms that do not support partnership. The structure of the school inhibits partnership. Collaboration among adults is rare in schools. Team teaching, collaborative problem-solving, and a strong teachers' voice in site-based management practices are the exception. Strong connections between parents and educators would run contrary to the normative value of individual self-sufficiency and the dominant practice of administrative decision-making (Seeley, 1985; Lightfoot, 1978).

A third obstacle that Swap (1993) noted is limited resources to support parent involvement. The allocation of scheduled, compensated time seldom supports connections to parents. Changing demographics have made time more precious and fragmented for both parents and teachers. Parents frequently report having little or no communication with school personnel. When they do connect, parents report that the communication is often negative relating to problems that the child is having (Davies, 1989 cited in Christenson and Conoley, 1992). When there is little or no communication between parents and teachers, both tend to interpret the others' lack of availability as a signal of their lack of concern for the child, and they see each other as the enemy. Declining resources have compounded this problem. Most schools have chosen to concentrate their remaining resources on essential personnel, programs, and supplies. These decisions make it difficult to implement or maintain programs for parent involvement. These decisions may also signal that schools do not consider home-school partnerships important to their mission (Swap, 1993).

Swap (1993) identifies a fourth barrier as the teachers' lack of information about how to establish partnerships. Teachers enter the field without much training or skill in the area of working with a diverse parent population. Other researchers have contributed to this idea. A study by Becker and Epstein (1982) reported that most teachers agreed that

parent involvement contributed to student achievement. They also reported that they did not know how to establish parent involvement programs. There was little correlation between teachers' attitudes toward parent involvement and their actual practices. Epstein (1985) offers that relatively few teachers make frequent or systematic use of parent involvement activities because preservice and in-service training "result in attitudes and practices designed to keep parents out of the learning process and even out of the classroom" (p.23). Leitch and Tangri (in Christenson and Conoley, 1992) found that teachers primarily attribute low parent involvement to beliefs that parents do not hold or communicate essential educational values. Teachers identified feeling hopeless and overwhelmed by problems that students and families bring to school and held low expectations regarding parent follow-up. Leitch and Tangri concluded that the lack of knowledge about how teachers and parents can collaborate more effectively is a major barrier in developing home-school partnerships.

Results from the Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher by Olson (1990) found that 70 percent of parents and teachers rated relations between parents and teachers in their schools as good or excellent. Parents rated teachers' availability and responsiveness much higher (76%) than teachers rated parents in those areas (54%). This survey indicated a more positive than negative parent-teacher relationship; however, it also indicated that a proportion of parents and teachers have poor connections with each other.

Christenson et al (1992) set forth several issues related to parent-professional interaction. Those issues are parent-professional communication, perceptions of each other in the relationship, structural differences between home and school, and the concept of professional dominance.

Effective communication between the home and school is a necessary link to establishing collaboration. Communication between the two happens formally through

conferences, open houses, and informally through notes, phone calls, and newsletters. The customary parent-teacher conference format does not generally allow open two-way dialogue. These conferences most often are scheduled for short blocks of time, one right after another, and consist of a rushed report by the teacher. This format is hardly conducive to building communication links or problem-solving.

Frequent and consistent school-to-home communications by teachers can increase parent involvement in their children's learning. This process is not always understood. School-to-home communications affect parental perceptions and attitudes about the school and perhaps teachers' views of themselves as being effective in working with parents. The research of Carole Ames at Michigan State University (1995) reported several significant findings in her study of the effects of school-home communications.

> Parents' level of involvement in their children's learning was higher when they received frequent and effective communications from the school. Children's motivation to learn, attitudes toward parental involvement, and perceptions of their parents' level of involvement were more positive when their parents received frequent and effective communication. Teachers who believed in their ability to involve parents initiated more communications with parents than did teachers who believed in their ability to teach well. However, teachers were significantly less confident about their ability to involve parents than about their teaching ability. Parents who believed in their ability to influence their child's success reported greater involvement in their children's learning. School-to-home communications had a significant impact on parents' overall evaluations of the teacher and their feelings of comfort with the school (Research & Development Report, 1995, Sept.).

Perceptions that parents and teachers have of each other suggest that blaming exists between the two (Christenson, Conoley, 1992). Parents blame teachers for children's problems in school. Teachers blame parents and home factors for children problem. A criticism of parent involvement efforts that consistently surface from educators is that even when parents are afforded opportunities to become involved in children's education, some

parents choose not to participate. School personnel perceive these absent parents as being too lazy, incompetent, or too preoccupied to participate in school programs. Teachers believe that low-income parents do not value or have little to offer to the education of their children (Davies, 1989). As a result, these parents often receive little encouragement to become involved.

Structural differences between home and school make parent involvement difficult (Seligman and Darling, 1989; Lightfoot, 1975; Litwak and Meyer, 1974). Parents have individual relationships with their children and hold particularistic expectations of the child. Teachers are more concerned with how the child fits in with the group and hold universalistic expectations of the child (Christenson and Conoley, 1992). Litwak and Meyer (1974) describe the family's structure as diffuse, noninstrumental, face-to-face contact, and relatively permanent relations. They describe the school as a bureaucracy characterized by a hierarchy of authority, impersonal relations, a set of duties and privileges, separation of policy and administrative decisions, and rule-guided behavior. Litwak and Meyer (1974) maintain that as a solution to these antipathetical characteristics, families and educators need to develop complementary, collaborative relationships.

Professional dominance refers to the type of relationship that parents want with teachers and the type of relationship that teachers want with parents. Lindle (1989) showed that parents want a person-to-person relationship, not a professional-client relationship with teachers and administrators. She also found that parents indicated a dissatisfaction with school personnel who were too business-like or patronizing. Parents believed that a personal touch from a teacher was the most important factor in encouraging their involvement with and support of schools.

Mendoza and Cegelka (cited by Chrisapeels, 1987) identified differences in perception between parents and professionals that interfere with communication:

> ...the professional role is achieved rather than ascribed;
> ...the professional chose to teach children, whereas parents are given and accept the child as he/she is;
> ...the professional role is universalistic;
> ...the professional is expected to be fair to all children, whereas parents adopt an individualized perspective, wanting what is best for their child;
> ...professionals become specialized experts, noting one aspect of a child's development, whereas parents adopt a more diffuse orientation, focusing on the child's ongoing development;
> ...professionals are expected to be affectively neutral, to be able to distance themselves from the child, whereas, the parent role is the antithesis of the professional role--emotional involvement is expected.
>
> These differences in perceptions between parents and teachers can cause conflict and impede the parent-professional interaction process (p.14-15).

Another source of conflict falling under the professional dominance construct is the idea of academic freedom. Arnold Fege, 1990 Director of the National Parent Teacher Association, advocates maintaining a balance between academic freedom of teachers and rights and obligations of the parents to be involved (in Ochoa, 1990). Society is currently weaving its way through constitutional, legal, social, and moral questions. Fege poses several questions relating to parent involvement:

1. How do we frame educational policies so that meaningful parental involvement in education for all is not exploited by the few parents for special interest ends?
2. How can academic freedom be maintained while still addressing unique parental needs?
3. How does a school district encourage academic freedom while a group of parents are badgering the school board and threatening to restrict educational opportunities?
4. How can a public school deal with "moral convictions" that make for good education without, by that very fact, offending the consciences of some parents compelled by law to enroll their children? (pp. 50-51)

Fege states that parents should not control, but should have the right to be involved. He advocates that every school system have a comprehensive written policy in the selection

of all instructional and library materials to address attempts by special interest groups to control the curriculum (in Ochoa, 1990).

Teachers' failure to hold high expectations for students may be another barrier. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) in *Pygmalion in the Classroom* suggest that when teachers expect high levels of achievement from individual students, those students achieve at higher levels. Research on effective teachers indicates that students tend to live up to expectations, however high or low they might be (Weinstein, 1985). Teacher efficacy is defined as the teacher's confidence in their ability to influence student learning and motivation. Teachers with a high sense of efficacy are more likely to view low-achieving students as reachable, teachable, and worthy of their attention and effort thereby holding higher expectations for those students (Alderman, 1990).

This section has described various barriers to school-home connections that researchers have identified. These factors interact differently with teacher characteristics and family characteristics. According to Seeley (1985), successful educational partnerships do exist in some classrooms and schools. However, partnership for education is limited. Partnership occurs when parents, educators, and students think of their relationship differently or when individuals engage in a paradigm shift--one which moves from the concept of relationships in terms of service delivery--of provider and client; of professional and target populations--to one of complementary efforts toward common goals (Seely, 1985).

Typologies of Parent Involvement

Susan Swap's Typology

Susan Swap (1993) developed a four-part typology and created a framework that outlines the most important elements of a partnership between home and school. Her

Partnership model stresses the mutuality of interaction between home and school and lists four elements.

1. *Creating two-way communication.* Parents and educators both have vital information to share. Educators share information with parents about children's progress in school: their expectations and hopes for the school and the children; and their curriculum, policies, and programs. Parents share information with educators about their child's needs, strengths, and background; and their expectations and hopes for the school and their child. Educators and parents listen to each other. Ideally, the result is parents and educators who are informed, who have created a negotiated set of joint expectations for children and the school, and who work together to create a school environment in which all can learn and feel successful.

2. *Enhancing learning at home and at school.* Parents contribute to children's learning by having high expectations, providing a setting that allows concentrated work, supporting and nurturing learning that occurs in school and elsewhere, and offering love, discipline, guidance, and encouragement. Educators develop curriculum and instructional practices and strong relationships with children that create conditions for optimal learning. Parents and educators develop an array of ways in which parents can be involved in and out of the classroom to enrich children's learning. Parents understand what is occurring in the curriculum and ways in which they can monitor, assist, or extend children's homework. Parents might function in the school as paid aides or volunteers, participants in educational activities offered at school for the family, or contributors to curriculum selection and enrichment.

3. *Providing mutual support.* Educators support parents by offering educational programs for them that are responsive to their interests and needs. Parents support educators in many ways, such as volunteering in schools, organizing and planning activities, raising money, and attending functions (plays, sports events). Educators and parents build trusting relationships and arrange occasions to acknowledge and celebrate each other's contributions to children's growth. Increasingly, the school becomes the critical institution in the community for linking parents with useful health, education, and social services.

4. *Making joint decisions.* Parents and educators work together to improve the school through participation on councils, committees, and in joint problem solving at every level: individual child, classroom, school, and district.

The Comer process based on this typology is in use in 16 schools in Prince

George's County in Maryland. These schools do not meet desegregation guidelines and are eligible for district funds to support additional resources and staff. Each school is training teachers and administrators, hiring additional support staff, extending the school day, offering enrichment programs (including transportation), and providing a full computer lab (including some computers that can be taken home). Parents of students are not hesitant to participate and their views are specifically sought. They help to shape decisions and their voices add new and important perspectives. The cultures in these schools have changed to one valuing relationships and supporting the development of the whole child. These sixteen Comer schools have received extensive national recognition because of the achievement of their students "against the odds." Children's scores in math on the California Achievement Test were at the 96th percentile level in 1990, and average reading achievement scores were above the 50th percentile (Swap, 1993). Much of the credit for this increased student achievement is given to the collaborative efforts between parents and teachers.

Epstein's Typology

Epstein, other researchers, and practitioners have conducted surveys and field studies with teachers, parents, and students at the elementary, middle, and high school levels to assess which practices of partnership fall in the area of overlap or shared responsibility, and what can be learned about the range and the results of the activities and interactions between families and schools.

Current research has helped to identify and modify Epstein's framework of major types of involvement. Each type of involvement may be operationalized by hundreds of practices the schools may choose to develop for their program. The six types explain how schools can work with families and communities to assist them to become or stay

informed and involved in children's education at home and at school (Epstein, 1992). The six types are:

> Type 1--*Parenting*: Assist families with parenting and childrearing skills, family support, understanding child and adolescent development, and setting home conditions to support learning at each age and grade level.
>
> Type 2--*Communicating:* Communicate with families about school programs and student progress with school-to-home and home-to-school communications.
>
> Type 3--*Volunteering:* Improve recruitment, training, work, and schedules to involve families as volunteers and audiences at the school or in other locations to support students and school programs.
>
> Type 4--*Learning at Home:* Involve families with their children in learning activities at home, including homework and other curricular-linked activities and decisions.
>
> Type 5--*Decision Making:* Include families as participants in school decisions, governance, and advocacy activities through PTA, committees, councils, and other parent organizations.
>
> Type 6--*Collaborating With Community:* Coordinate the work and resources of community businesses, agencies, colleges, or universities, and other groups to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning and development.

Each of the six types offers specific challenges for its successful design and implementation and should be viewed separately. Each type moves toward different results for students, parents, and teachers. Each group benefits from investments and commitments by the various members of the school--family--community partnership (Epstein and Connors, 1995). This framework helps researchers locate measures of involvement and report results of their studies in language that is useful to educators (Epstein and Dauber, 1995).

Research is moving from questioning the importance of parental involvement to how schools can help all families conduct the activities that will benefit their children. Epstein (1995) sees the main goal of partnerships as developing and conducting better communications with families across the grades in order to assist students to succeed in school. She encourages research that will question, elaborate, or clarify ways to develop and conduct better communications by determining which connections, interactions, and exchanges are promoted by different types of involvement.

Studies Relating to Parent Involvement

Beyond learning about the process of involving parents in schools, researchers have conducted studies regarding the effects of parent involvement. In the 1970s, studies were reporting that children whose parents spend time with them in educational activities or are involved in school activities achieve more in school, regardless of socioeconomic status. The data indicates that different types of activities have different effects on low-, middle- or high-income children (Benson et al, 1980). Matuszek (1977) found a number of studies show that parent involvement can be effective in improving the academic achievement of low-income and minority children. Herman and Yen (1980), in a study of 250 California schools, found that parent involvement at the elementary level had a positive relationship to student achievement and to parent satisfaction with the school. In spite of these promising results, these research studies do not identify a single strategy or model of parent involvement that is related to higher achievement, but rather suggest that the greater the general involvement, the higher the performance level of students (Henderson and Berla, 1994).

Yale University child psychiatrist James P. Comer and his staff developed the Comer School Development Program which incorporates a high degree of parent

involvement. In Comer's program, students improve in a whole range of areas--self-efficacy, peer and adult relationships, general mental health, standardized test achievement, and classroom grades (Squires and Kranyik, 1995/1996). In the School Development Program, the key stakeholders of parents, teachers, administrators, and community people come together to coordinate school activities. These teams can be described as the parents' program, the mental health team, and the school planning and management team. Three basic principles underly the program: no-fault problem solving, consensus decision-making, and collaboration among all stakeholders. The Comer School Development Program implemented in over 120 inner city schools is reporting success. Student achievement scores have reached or surpassed the national average (Swap, 1993). School systems in other parts of the country are currently replicating the Comer Program (Squires and Kranyik, 1995/1996; Becker and Hedges, 1992; Henderson and Berla, 1994; Comer, 1988).

Professor Henry Levin of Stanford University developed the Accelerated Schools Project. In 1987, Daniel Webster Elementary School in San Francisco and in Hoover Elementary School in Redwood, California implemented the Project (Seeley, 1991). Within three years, Webster students showed an average increase in math scores on the California Test of Basic Skills of 19 percentile points, with all grades performing above grade level. Some grades gained as much as 20 percentile points in language, and most classes improved over 10 percentile points in reading and language (Swap, 1993). The active cooperation and support of parents are integral components of this program.

Henderson and Berla (1994) in their review of 66 studies, reviews, reports, analyses and books centered on family involvement report:

> The evidence is now beyond dispute. When schools work together with families to support learning, children tend to succeed not just in school, but throughout life. In fact, the most accurate predictor of a

student's achievement in school is not income or social status, but the extent to which that student's family is able to:

1. Create a home environment that encourages learning
2. Express high (but not unrealistic) expectations for their children's achievement and future careers
3. Become involved in their children's education at school and in the community (from *A New Generation of Evidence: The Family is Critical to Student Achievement*)

Henderson and Berla (1994), document many benefits for students:

Higher grades and test scores
Better attendance and more homework done
Fewer placements in special education
More positive attitudes and behavior
Higher graduation rates
Greater enrollment in postsecondary education.

These studies also document benefits for families and for schools and communities:

Parents have more confidence in the school
Parents are more respected by their children's teachers and the teachers have higher expectations for the children
Parents as a result of the positive contact develop more confidence in their own abilities as learners
Improved teacher morale
Higher ratings of teachers by parents
More support from families
Higher student achievement
Better reputations for teachers and the school in the community

When parents are involved in their children's education at home, their children do better in school. When parents are involved at school, their children go further in school, and the schools they go to are better (Henderson; Berla, 1994).

The Research and Development Report (1995, Sept.) highlights eight case studies describing schools which have participated in the Parent-Teacher Action Research Project conducted by the Institute for Responsive Education. Researchers Palanki, Burch, and Davies present evidence about children in these eight schools achieving better, behaving better, and feeling better about themselves. These success stories are attributed to families

and their schools working together and acting in their common interest in the well-being and academic success of children.

Not all the evidence emanating from studies of parent involvement has been positive. White et al. (1992) analyzed the evidence from previous research regarding the alleged benefits of parent involvement used in early intervention. Although his focus is on early intervention programs occurring before formal schooling, some of his points may apply to current parent involvement programs since many of these programs evolved from early intervention efforts. His analysis shows that there is no convincing evidence that the ways in which parents have been involved result in more positive outcomes. He argues that the emphasis on involving parents in the education of their children has existed since the turn of the century and that it is nothing new. He also criticizes the use of terms like "parent involvement" or "parent education" as being so broad that they can refer to very different types of activities. In spite of the widespread view that early intervention programs are more effective if parents are involved, it is unclear whether the available research evidence is consistent with such claims or whether opinions concerning the value of involving parents in early intervention programs have taken on a life of their own. As a result, those claims have grown in intensity and breadth as a result of sociopolitical factors instead of from defensible, consistent, scientific evidence regarding the benefits of parent involvement (White et al, 1992).

In his report, White et al (1992) identified two types of programs using parent involvement activities. The most frequent type was using parents as intervenors in which parents were engaged in activities with their child, or parents and families were offered resources and assistance as a function of parent involvement. The second dimension of parent involvement had to do with the attitude and context in which those activities were

presented or the sense of empowerment. His study focused on the first type of parent involvement--that of parents as intervenors.

White et al found that none of the authors of the research summarized in his review even claimed that their results demonstrated that early intervention would be more cost-efficient or results would be better maintained if parents were involved. Therefore, claims that parent involvement in early intervention leads to benefits being maintained longer, or being more cost-efficient to achieve, are without foundation and should be disregarded until defensible research is available to support such a position. White attacks claims that early intervention programs which involve parents are more beneficial for participating children and families, stating that there is remarkably little evidence for this position. The data reported by prominent reviewers of the early intervention research literature are mostly contradictory or irrelevant to such a hypothesis. In addition, average effect sizes of treatment versus no-treatment studies in which parents are involved are about the same as the average effect sizes of treatment versus no-treatment studies in which parents are not involved (White et al, 1992).

More studies on parent involvement need to be conducted for three reasons (White et al., 1992). First, past research focused on parent involvement using parents primarily as supplemental intervenors with their children. This may be the wrong approach, and researchers should be examining types of involvement in which parents are empowered. Second, little previous research has verified that the intended parent involvement program was well implemented or that parents participated at the anticipated levels. Third, research is just beginning to measure the effects of parent involvement activities on parents and family members. Current measurement techniques assess only general dimensions of family functioning and are not well established in terms of psychometric properties. He

ends with the statement, "Finally, much of the perception that parent involvement is beneficial has been based on anecdotal reports and poorly designed research. In our enthusiasm to find solutions for children in need, it is possible that we have expected more from parent involvement than was realistic" (p. 119).

Another example of parent involvement efforts having a negative influence is the situation in Kentucky where 800 hundred school districts have implemented the Kentucky Educational Reform Act (KERA) with varying degrees of success. In a descriptive study and review of Kentucky schools implementing KERA, Jane Lindle (1995/1996) makes several observations about what she terms rituals, regulations, and rule making. According to Lindle, rituals are the political enclaves of political parties, religious affiliations or influential families who exert power in an attempt to control and dominate educational decisions. The exclusion of various groups of parents from participation is contrary to the purpose of providing benefits to all students through parent involvement activities. Lindle continues by stating that educators in some schools are dominated by outside groups having more status based upon familial, political, or religious standing in the community. This tends to have a negative effect on educational reform.

Lindle identifies regulations in some schools as a second reason why schools have experienced less success in educational reform. Regulations in those districts have become the outcome of parent involvement. Collaboration efforts that focus on following regulations and making bylaws have resulted in less attention being given to school decisions.

The third reason for variations in the success of schools in Kentucky is the emphasis on rule making. The school councils consisting of teachers, administrators, and parents spend most of their time on legalism and very little on substantive discussion about the school and students. Lindle indicates that the councils making the most progress are

those sharing three characteristics: supportive leadership, a collegial climate, and a respect for the foibles of the democratic process. Gaining a better understanding of parent involvement perceptions by teachers and parents and of involvement practices may be one facet in the restructuring of schools for the improvement of the learning environment both at home and at school.

Need for Additional Research

Today's changing demographics have dramatically altered the makeup of student populations. Increasing rates of poverty, divorce, single parenting, teen pregnancy, family mobility and instability, and employment outside the home by women with children have placed many families under great stress (Flaxman; Inger, 1992). Conventional school-parent involvement efforts aimed at the traditional family are largely ineffective for most families of today. Ecological theories of human development (Bronfenfrenner, 1979, Garbarino, 1982, Werner, 1990) are widely accepted in developmental psychology, but may not always be implemented when intervening for children. Home and school make up the two most powerful contexts in children's lives. Partnerships that move adults in the home and the school toward common goals of competence are critically needed (Seely, 1985).

The concept of shared responsibility removes part of the burden from parents to determine on their own how to get involved and stay involved in their children's education from year to year and puts part of that burden on schools to create programs to inform and involve all families. Researchers began collecting data to identify and sort separable components of involvement for students, parents, and for educators. This research needs to be continued (Epstein, 1987a, 1987b, 1992).

Comer (quoted in Schorr, 1988, p.234) believes that the most current attempts at

school reform are not sufficiently comprehensive. He emphasizes the importance of addressing the entire social system of the school because of the way the many variables interact and because attitudes, morale, and hope all affect school performance by students. Comer's philosophy of school improvement makes parent involvement in schools indispensable; the goal of school reform is to improve the quality of relationships among children and teachers, and parents and educators.

The results of the early studies raise many new questions. One addresses the issue of teachers having very different views of parents than parents have of themselves (Dauber and Epstein, 1993). Most parents do not know what most teachers are trying to do each year in school nor about school improvement activities. Most teachers do not know parents' goals for their children, nor do they understand the information parents would like to have to be more effective at home. The studies show why it is important to measure teachers' and parents' views to identify discrepancies in knowledge that each has about the other and to identify their common interest in good communications and in children's success in school (Epstein, 1995).

The parent involvement practices used by teachers have more influence than race or ethnicity, social class, marital status, or mother's work status for determining whether and how parents become involved in their children's education (Henderson and Berla, 1994; Brandt, 1989). Family practices of involvement are as or more important than family background variables for determining whether and how student progress and succeed in school (Epstein, 1995).

Particular types of involvement may have different effects varying by level of schooling. For example, in the middle school, many types of school practices of partnership appear to boost student attendance (Epstein and Lee, 1993). At the high school level, one type of involvement--family discussions about school, courses, and the future--

appears to have positive effects on student attitudes, behaviors, and grades (Lee, 1994).

Ongoing research calls for additional studies in several areas. One area is the patterns and changes in partnerships across the grades that raise new questions about family involvement at points of transition from one school to the next and across the years of high school. As students progress through the grade levels, the contexts in which they operate become more complex. Schools change programs and implement improvement plans. Teachers change as they gain more experience and training. Community demographics change as people and resources come and go. The theory of overlapping spheres encourages the measurement of concepts of change (Epstein, 1995).

A second area is the identification and interaction of both negative and positive results with a particular type of involvement at all levels for students, for families, and for teaching practice. One of the most persistent perceptions of many researchers, policy leaders and educators is that any family involvement is a good thing for all students, parents, teachers, and schools. The major types of involvement in the framework for research and practice are expected to cause different results for students, parents, and educators (Becker and Epstein, 1982; Epstein, 1982, 1992). Not all parent involvement activities immediately have an impact on student learning and achievement, and practices of the different types of involvement are expected to affect different results in the short term as compared to longer time periods (Comer, 1988; Epstein in Booth and Dunn, 1995).

Early studies document positive connections between family involvement and student achievement. However, relatively little is known about which practices, how, when, for whom, and why particular practices produce positive student outcomes (Epstein and Dauber, 1991). Some evidence points to negative connections of family involvement with student behaviors. Illustrative of a negative result are the data reported in several studies that link parent and teacher contacts with students' academic problems and bad

behavior (Lee, 1994). In addition, a high number of parent-teacher communications about student behavior are linked to parents' low ratings of the school and to parents' reports that their students like school less, receive lower grades, miss more days of school, and have other negative attitudes and behaviors (Epstein and Jacobsen, 1994). These studies show that school and family partnerships produce a variety of results for families, for teachers, and for students (Epstein, 1995).

Other influences that affect parent involvement have also been studied and must be considered when designing intervention. Epstein (1985) found three factors that influence parent involvement: the grade level of the students, the teacher's commitment of time and energy, and whether the parent is active in the school or with teacher-guided activities at home. In 1983, Johns Hopkins University published a report that identified grade level, teacher beliefs, and the education of parents as factors influencing parent involvement (cited in Holden, 1990).

This section discusses the recommendations for more study by researchers currently examining the effect of parent involvement. Their questions have provided guidance in the design of this project.

Current Impetus Toward Parent Involvement

The National Education Goals, as set out in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, focus on the need for improvement in education over the next decade based upon six which were developed by the nation's governors and president in 1989. The U.S. Congress added two new goals which were endorsed by President Clinton. The goals have been exhorted by almost every major group of parents, educators, and businesses in the nation. The goals state that by the year 2000:

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.

2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
3. All students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our Nation's modern economy.
4. The Nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.
5. United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement.
6. Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
7. Every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.
8. Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children. (Strong Families, Strong Schools, 1994)

The first and eighth goals directly identify the role of parents in the education of their children. The remaining goals could be considered as related to the family as a unit of

society. The three objectives under Goal 8 that emphasize that states, schools, and families bear joint responsibility for ensuring students' school success.

> Every state will develop policies to assist local schools and local educational agencies to establish programs for increasing partnerships that repsond to the varying needs of parents and the home, including parents of children who are disadvantaged or bilingual, or parents of children with disabilities.
>
> Every school will actively engage parents and families in a partnership which supports the academic work of children at home and shared educational decisionmaking at school.
>
> Parents and families will help to ensure that schools are adequately supported and will hold schools and teachers to high standards of accountability (Strong Families, Strong Schools, 1994, p. 63).

Many efforts are underway throughout this country to encourage and promote parent involvement in schools. Some programs are the result of state mandates. Federal grant dollars and private initiatives encourage and support other programs. Examples are the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) and Oregon Reform Act which includes the Salem-Keiser School District's "Learning for a Lifetime." Districts in California, Texas, and Florida have parent involvement programs which are reporting success. The Parents as Teachers (PAT) program which began in Missouri in the 1960s works with parents of children from birth to age five training parents about child development and ways to help children be more prepared for school. A spin-off from the PAT program, Practical Parenting Partnerships, was created in 1992 to include school-aged children. Early reports indicate positive results. The Head Start Literacy Program for children and parents, and the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) are home-based, early intervention programs that help parents create experiences for their preschoolers to lay the foundation for success in school and later life. Programs involving parents at targeted high schools in the United States have strengthened high

school completion rates, increased student achievement, improved children's self-esteem, and promoted citizenship (National Education Goals Report, 1995).

Montana Focus

Montana State Accreditation Standards, adopted in 1989, require schools to involve parents in the education process. "The Montana public school is a positive partnership of school trustees, staff, students, parents, and the community. Its central purpose is the intellectual development of its students." Two standards directly refer to parent involvement.

> Rule 10.55.603 Curriculum Development and Assessment, 2(a): Establish curriculum and assessment development processes as a cooperative effort of personnel certified in the program area, trustees, administrators, other teachers, students, specialists, parents, community and, when appropriate, state resource people.
>
> Rule 10.55.801 School Climate, (I): Encourage the active involvement of parents in their children's education and in their schools and (j): Provide opportunities for parents, educators, and members of the community to take active roles in developing and reviewing educational goals.

Montana schools need more research to determine effective methods for involving parents. Study of parent involvement practices in a rural state such as Montana where population density and size of communities become factors is also a need.

Summary

More research to learn about school, family, and community interactions is needed. More effective ways to help youth and families survive and thrive in a complex and often conflicting environment need to be found. Further research should proceed with clearer

questions and better data. Measurement models should be more specific and analyses more useful for policy and practice (Epstein, 1995).

Schools are challenged with making many decisions about how best to prepare students for a changing world. Families are faced with changing demographics, adjustments to different kinds of lifestyles, and changing societal expectations. As schools strive to reduce the uncertainty in a climate of reform, attention must be given to the function of the total environment that influences a child. The literature suggests that although schools are in a prime position to be leaders in this area, they have not always effectively utilized their resources to promote successful collaboration and partnerships between the school and the home.

The purpose of this study is to contribute to research about parent involvement practices in Montana public schools. This study provides data on whether certain teacher and parent demographic variables contribute to variations in and predictions of the six types of parent involvement practices.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

The problem of this study was to determine what proportion of the variability in six types of parent involvement was explained by a set of independent variables. The parent independent variables were three perception variables: parent views of the school, parent perception of their child's success in school, parent perceptions of the school's effort to involve them, and four demographic variables of gender, adults in household, level of education, and level of income. To add to the information on parent involvement, teacher perceptions of the school's program for six types of parent involvement were analyzed to determine what proportion of the variability in teacher perceptions was explained by a set of independent variables. Those independent variables were: teacher view of parent strengths, teacher perception of importance of parent involvement, teacher perception of support from others, education level, years of experience, and number of students taught per day or structure of the classroom.

The study used the database generated from the 1994 Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools conducted at Montana State University. For this study, analysis was performed on four files existing in that database. Those files are the elementary and middle school parent data file, the high school parent data file, the elementary and middle school teacher data file, and the high school teacher data file.

Population Description and Sampling Procedures

Two random sample groups were drawn from the population of parents who had a child enrolled in a public school in Montana. One group consisted of parents with a child in a public elementary or middle school; the other consisted of parents with a child enrolled in a high school. The random sample teacher groups came from the population of Montana public school teachers who were also Montana Education Association members at the time of the study. One teacher group consisted of teachers who taught public elementary or middle school students; the other group was made up of teachers who taught public high school students.

For the parent group, a list of 1,000 was purchased from Donnelley Marketing, Inc. As per directions from the researchers, the company produced a list of names that would be a random sampling of households with school-aged children. The list also reflected the distribution of youth according to the 1993-1994 total public school enrollment in various geographic sections of the state and according to a proportional ratio of elementary and middle to high school students. During that year, public schools statewide enrolled 159,760 students. Of these, 44,608 were in high school and 115,152 were in elementary school. Donnelley Marketing included in the list households with two age groups--children ages 5 - 13 (elementary and middle school levels) and children ages 14-18 (high school level). Twenty percent of the list was to represent low-income families. The twenty percent figure is based upon the 1990 U.S. Census Report data for Montana that indicated that 20 percent of children under the age of 18 lived in low income families (A Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools, 1994). The following table shows the population size and sample size used to generate the parent mailing list.

Table 1. Parent Population Sample Sizes

	Population and SampleSize
Total 1993-94 School Enrollment	159,760
Total Households in Sample	1,000
Total Households with High School Age Children	280
Total Households with Elementary School Age Children	720
Number of Households Below the Poverty Level	200

Source: Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools, 1994

The selection of the 750 teachers in grades kindergarten through secondary level was more complex. In 1994, the Office of Public Instruction in Montana did not maintain a list of all Montana teachers currently teaching in a public school. The only available list contained individuals teaching in private schools as well as certified teachers who were not teaching at the present time. The Montana Education Association (MEA) maintained a membership list of 8,073 teachers currently teaching in Montana public schools. Contact with the Montana Federation of Teachers yielded that their membership list did not differentiate between elementary and secondary and included members who were not teachers. The best option was to use the MEA membership list to randomly select a sample. The Montana Education Association agreed to help with the study by mailing out the questionnaire packets from their office in Helena. A confidentiality clause in the MEA bylaws prohibited them from releasing a membership list to outside groups.

Based upon the ratio of teachers who were teaching at the two levels, a list of 505 randomly selected elementary and middle school teachers and 245 high school teachers were chosen to participate in the study. The MEA-NEA Association produced the list and labels for the questionnaire (See correspondence in Appendix A). Table 2 shows the number of teachers teaching in the state during the 1994-1995 school year and the number

of teachers belonging to MEA at the elementary or middle school level and at the high school level.

Sources of Evidence and Authority

From the literature review and an examination of the questionnaires used in the Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools, the researcher identified twenty-two investigative categories for parents. These categories are described in the following section.

Table 2. Number of Teachers and Montana Education Association Membership

	Population and Sample Size
Total Number of Teachers in Public Schools in Montana, 1994	11,947
Total Number of Teachers who were members in Montana Education Association (MEA) in 1994	8,766
Number of MEA teachers who indicated no level	693
Number of MEA High School Teachers	2,638
Number of MEA Elementary and Middle School Teachers (K-8)	5,435
Number of Teachers Not Members of MEA	3,181

Sources: Montana Education Association, Montana Federation of Teachers, Montana Office of Public Instruction

Investigative Categories and Definitions

The variables of the parent group were:

1. Gender of parent responding to the questionnaire (male, female)
2. Income levels of the family (under $13,000, $13,001-$25,000, $25,001-$35,000, $35,001-$50,000, Over $50,000)
3. Number of adults in household

4. Education level of parent responding to the questionnaire (did not complete high school, high school diploma, some college or training, college degree, advanced degree)

5. Parent perceptions of school practices to involve parents (not important, school should start, school could do better, school does very well now)

6. Parent perceptions of child's success in school (Elementary and Middle School -- TOP student, GOOD student, OK AVERAGE student, FAIR student, POOR student; Elementary and Middle School -- Likes school a lot, Likes school a little, Does not like school much, Does not like school at all; High School - mostly A's - - Excellent student, mostly B's -- Good student, mostly C's -- Average student, mostly D's -- Fair student, mostly F's -- Poor student; Very satisfied -- great year at school, Mostly satisfied -- good year, Pretty satisfied -- OK year, Mostly dissatisfied -- disappointing year, Very dissatisfied -- bad year at school; High School - Likes it a lot, Likes it some, Likes it a little, Does not like it much, Does not like it at all)

8. Parent view of school as good for teachers, parents, and students (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree)

9. Perception of School's Program in Type I activities (Parenting)

10. Perception of School's Program in Type II activities (Communicating)

11. Perception of School's Program in Type III activities (Volunteering)

12. Perception of School's Program in Type IV activities (Homework)

13. Perception of School's Program in Type V activities (Leadership)

14. Perception of School's Program in Type VI activities (Community)

15. Perception of School's Program in All Types of Parent Involvement (All Types)

16. Parent Self-reported Practices in Type I activities (PracParenting)
17. Parent Self-reported Practices in Type II activities (PracCommunicating)
18. Parent Self-reported Practices in Type III activities (PracHomework)
20. Parent Self-reported Practices in Type V activities (PracLeadership)
21. Parent Self-reported Practices in Type VI activities (PracCommunity)
22. Parent Self-reported Practices in All Types activities (PracAll Types)

The researcher identified fourteen investigative categories for the teacher group. A description of the investigative categories of the teacher sampling group were listed as follows:

1. Gender of teacher responding (male, female)
2. Education level of teacher responding (bachelor's, bachelor's plus credit, master's, master's plus credits, education specialist, doctorate, other)
3. Years of experience in teaching
4. Classroom structure (self-contained, semi-departmentalized, departmentalized at the elementary level, and number of students taught at the high school level)
5. Teacher perceptions of support for parent involvement (strong support, some support, weak support, no support) from other teachers, from administration, and from parents
6. Teacher perceptions of parents' strengths in helping their child (strongly agree, disagree, agree, strongly agree)
7. Teacher perception of school practices of Type I activities (assistance with parenting and supervising)

10. Teacher perception of school practices of Type II activities (communicating with the home)
11. Teacher perception of school practices of Type III activities (using parent volunteers)
12. Teacher perception of school practices of Type IV activities (providing assistance to parents so they can help their child with homework activities)
13. Teacher perception of school practices of Type V activities (decision making and leadership opportunities for parents in the school)
14. Teacher perception of school practices of Type VI activities (collaborating with community agencies, organizations, businesses)

Statistical Hypotheses

Tables 3 through 6 offer an explanation of the coding for the names and type of variables used in the following hypotheses.

Table 3. Coding for variables for high school parent data entry and analysis

Variable Code	Name of Variable	Type of Variable
$HSPY_1$ = Parenting Information	Parenting	Dependent
$HSPY_2$ = Communicating	Communicating	Dependent
$HSPY_3$ = Volunteering	Volunteering	Dependent
$HSPY_4$ = Homework Help	Homework	Dependent
$HSPY_5$ = Decision-making; Leadership	Leadership	Dependent
$HSPY_6$ = Community Resources and Services	Community	Dependent
$HSPY_7$ = All Types of Parent Involvement	All Types	Dependent
x_1 = Parent Percepton of School	View	Independent
x_2 = Parent Perception of Child's Success in School	Success	Independent
x_3 = Parent Perception of School's Effort to Involve Parents	Effort	Independent
x_4 = Number of Adults in Household	Adults	Independent
x_5 = Education Level of Parent	Education Level	Independent
x_6 = Income Level of Parent	Income Level	Independent
x_7 = Gender of Parent Respondent	Gender	Independent

Table 4. Coding for variables for elementary and middle school parent data entry and analysis

Variable Code	Name of Variable	Type of Variable
$ELPY_1$ = Parenting Information	Parenting	Dependent
$ELPY_2$ = Communicating	Communicating	Dependent
$ELPY_3$ = Volunteering	Volunteering	Dependent
$ELPY_4$ = Homework Help	Homework	Dependent
$ELPY_5$ = Decision-making; Leadership	Leadership	Dependent
$ELPY_6$ = Community Resources and Services	Community	Dependent
$ELPY_7$ = All Types of Parent Involvement	All Types	Dependent
x_1 = Parent Percepton of School	View	Independent
x_2 = Parent Perception of Child's Success in School	Success	Independent
x_3 = Parent Perception of School's Effort to Involve Parents	Effort	Independent
x_4 = Number of Adults in Household	Adults	Independent
x_5 = Education Level of Parent	Education Level	Independent
x_6 = Income Level of Parent	Income Level	Independent
x_7 = Gender of Parent Respondent	Gender	Independent

Table 5. Coding for variables for high school teacher data entry and analysis

Variable Code	Name of Variable	Type of Variable
$HSTY_1$ = Parenting Information	Parenting	Dependent
$HSTY_2$ = Communicating	Communicating	Dependent
$HSTY_3$ = Volunteering	Volunteering	Dependent
$HSTY_4$ = Homework Help	Homework	Dependent
$HSTY_5$ = Decision-making; Leadership	Leadership	Dependent
$HSTY_6$ = Community Resources and Services	Community	Dependent
$HSTY_7$ = All Types of Parent Involvement	All Types	Dependent
x_1 = Perceptions of Parent Strengths	Strengths	Independent
x_2 = Importance of Parent Involvement	Importance	Independent
x_3 = Support for Parent Involvement From Other Teachers	Teacher Support	Independent
x_4 = Support for Parent Involvement From Administration	Administrative Support	Independent
x_5 = Support for Parent Involvement From Parents	Parent Support	Independent
x_6 = Education Level of Teacher	Education Level	Independent
x_7 = Years of Experience	Experience	Independent
x_8 = Number of Students Taught Per Day	Number	Independent

Table 6. Coding for variables for elementary and middle school teacher data entry and analysis

Variable Code	Name of Variable	Type of Variable
$ELTY_1$ = Parenting Information	Parenting	Dependent
$ELTY_2$ = Communicating	Communicating	Dependent
$ELTY_3$ = Volunteering	Volunteering	Dependent
$ELTY_4$ = Homework Help	Homework	Dependent
$ELTY_5$ = Decision-making; Leadership	Leadership	Dependent
$ELTY_6$ = Community Resources and Services	Community	Dependent
$ELTY_7$ = All Types of Parent Involvement	All Types	Dependent
x_1= Perceptions of Parent Strengths	Strengths	Independent
x_2= Importance of Parent Involvement	Importance	Independent
x_3= Support for Parent Involvement From Other Teachers	Teacher Support	Independent
x_4= Support for Parent Involvement From Administration	Administrative Support	Independent
x_5= Support for Parent Involvement From Parents	Parent Support	Independent
x_6= Education Level of Teacher	Education Level	Independent
x_7= Years of Experience	Experience	Independent
x_8= Classroom Structure	Structure	Independent

Hypothesis 1. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_1$ and $ELPY_1$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender is zero.

Hypothesis 2. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_2$ and $ELPY_2$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

Hypothesis 3. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_3$ and $ELPY_3$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

Hypothesis 4. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_4$ and $ELPY_4$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

Hypothesis 5. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_5$ and $ELPY_5$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

Hypothesis 6. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_6$ and $ELPY_6$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

Hypothesis 7. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_7$ and $ELPY_7$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

Hypothesis 8. H_0: There is no relationship between parent perception of school's program to involve parents in a type of involvement and parent self-reported practice of that type of involvement.

Hypothesis 9. H_0: Each independent parent variable does not provide a significant and unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent parent variable after all other independent variables were taken into account.

Hypothesis 10. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_1$ and $ELTY_1$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

Hypothesis 11. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_2$ and $ELTY_2$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

Hypothesis 12. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_3$ and $ELTY_3$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-

Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

Hypothesis 13. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_4$ and $ELTY_4$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

Hypothesis 14. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_5$ and $ELTY_5$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

Hypothesis 15. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_6$ and $ELTY_6$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

Hypothesis 16. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_7$ and $ELTY_7$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The null hypotheses were tested against nondirectional alternative hypotheses. The level of significance chosen to test the hypotheses is a combination of levels suggested by Guilford (1956). Guilford posits that research on important theoretical issues, a higher-than-usual level of confidence may well be demanded. The potential impact of such conclusions about this research justifies such a practice. The argument is that if the null hypotheses is rejected and the null is true then a Type I (α) error has occurred. This could result in school districts redirecting portions of limited budgets to expend funds to increase

parent involvement practices. If a Type I error has occurred, the argument could be made that those monies could have been better spent on other projects to help students. In an era of tight spending and budget cuts, this would be a costly investment. If however, the level of significance is set at .01 or higher, then the possibility of a Type II (β) error increases. If a Type II error occurs, the null hypotheses is retained when the decision to reject should have been made. The consequences then lead to a moral and social dilemma --that of not involving the primary stakeholders in a child's future--the family. Guilford suggests a third option. In setting the level of significance in certain cases, the research should allow for suspended judgment. If the deviation is significant at the .01 level or better, H_o is rejected. If the deviation is smaller than the boundary of the critical region at the .10 level, H_o is retained. Between the two levels, .10 and .01, judgment is suspended (Guilford, 1956, p. 207). All hypotheses were tested at the .10 and the .01 levels of significance. This type of decision then calls for additional research in order to determine whether the data with suspended judgment is significant.

Method of Data Collection

The study used the*School and Family Partnership Questionnaires*, developed by the Johns Hopkins University Center on Family, Community, School, and Children's Learning. These questionnaires ask for information about perceptions of parent involvement from students, parents, and teachers (1993). Originally developed for use in the Baltimore Public School System, the 1994 Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools Study adapted these surveys. A letter from Joyce Epstein, Co-Director and Principal Research Scientist from the Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, granting permission to use the questionnaires was included in the original study. The four questionnaires used in the study were the elementary and middle

school parent questionnaire which is designed for parents of a student enrolled in kindergarten through eighth grade; the high school questionnaire which is designed for parents of a high school student; the elementary and middle school teacher questionnaire for teachers who teach in the kindergarten through eighth grade levels; the high school teacher questionnaire for teachers who teach in the ninth through twelfth grade levels. Copies of the questionnaires are located in Appendix B.

Changes to the parent questionnaires were few and did not alter the content of the instrument. One modification was to have parents of high school students address the focus of the high school parent questionnaire on their relationship to the school based upon contacts made regarding "their oldest child in high school," instead of "your ninth grader." Categories added in the demographics section were size of school district, and Native American under the question "How do you describe yourself?"

The parent questionnaire included ten questions with over 80 items of information on family attitudes about the school, family practices of involvement in their child's education, school practices to inform and involve families and information desired by families about children, classes, schools, community services, homework patterns, family background and experiences (Epstein, Salinas and Horsey, 1994). The parent questionnaire also contained open-ended questions which were not part of this study.

The parent questionnaire items addressed the six major types of parent involvement: parenting and supervising at home, communicating with the school, volunteering at the school, conducting learning activities at home, participating in parent-school organizations or parent -leadership activities, and collaborating with the community. Tables with the variable names, the questionnaire items forming that variable, and the hypothesis are located in Appendix C .

Dillman's total design method (TDM) served as a guideline for conducting the mail surveys to parents (Dillman, 1978). This method involved the mailing of a questionnaire, a follow-up postcard two weeks later thanking individuals who had completed the questionnaire and returned it, as well as reminding those who had not returned the questionnaire that their response was still needed. Two weeks after the postcard mailing, researchers mailed a second questionnaire to those who had not responded. The Dillman design has proven effective in other research efforts, and the Dillman guidelines helped to ensure that the response rate from the sample population would be adequate.

The Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools reported a return rate of 56.3 percent for elementary and middle school parents, 42.5 percent for high school parents, 46.7 for elementary and middle school teachers, and 38.8 percent for high school teachers. While this rate is low, the Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools Advisory Team comprised of one university administrator, three professors, a statistician, and a graduate student felt that the numbers were sufficient to run data analysis.

For the mailing, the parent questionnaire packets consisted of a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and assurances of confidentiality, directions for completing and returning the questionnaire by a specified date, the questionnaire and a self-addressed, postage paid return envelope. Each parent questionnaire envelope was coded so that responses could be tracked as they were returned. Using TDM guidelines, a follow-up postcard was sent two weeks later. Non-respondents received a second questionnaire two weeks after the postcard was sent.

To facilitate the mailing of the teacher questionnaires, the researchers met with the MEA staff in Helena to explain the procedure for mailing and coding. Through this meeting, a series of telephone contacts, and letters, researchers and the MEA staff successfully completed the mailing. The questionnaires were returned directly to the

Center for Community School Development and Testing Services at Montana State University in Bozeman. Two weeks later, a follow-up postcard was sent. Due to the complexity of mailing the teacher questionnaires and the time frame of school being released for the summer break, nonrespondents did not receive a second questionnaire.

Validity

A commonly used definition of validity is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure (Borg and Gall, 1989). The question of validity for any measuring instrument has many facets and requires clear thinking not to be confused by them (Guilford, 1956). In the development of the questionnaires used in this study, Joyce Epstein and her associates at Johns Hopkins University called upon groups of parents and teachers in the Baltimore area in 1990 to design questionnaires for teachers and parents (Epstein and Becker, 1990). Teachers received small planning grants to help them distribute and collect the completed questionnaires. The data helped the schools develop action plans for improving parent-involvement programs and practices. In 1993, the Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning at Johns Hopkins revised the questionnaires. The surveys were written, rewritten, and tested for use with low-literate populations (Dauber and Epstein, 1993). However, the Center did not establish validity scales for the set of questionnaires. In the absence of extensive validity, data in a new measurement do not mean the measure lacks validity, but the lack of it definitely limits the interpretations that one can make. The questionnaire does appear to measure a high degree of what it purports to measure (Borg and Gall, 1989). This is important because most people react more favorably to tests having high face validity (Nevo, 1985). Nevo suggests that tests having face validity are more likely to:

Bring about higher levels of cooperation and motivation while subjects are taking the test.
Reduce feelings of dissatisfaction or injustice among low scorers.
Help convince potential users (e.g., teachers and school administrators) to implement the test.

Improve public relations, as laypeople can more easily see the relationship between the test and the performance or characteristic it purportedly measures (Nevo, 1985, p. 291).

Reliability

The reliability of a scale was reported in terms of the internal consistency of scores on items that purport to measure the same concept. Epstein used the Cronbach alpha formula because the survey includes many Likert-type items (Mueller, 1986). The alpha reliability formula reflects the intercorrelation of a set of items, accounting for variations in responses to the items.

Reliable scales that combine items that measure similar concepts permit efficient analyses of survey data. *The School and Family Partnership Questionnaires* include scales for teachers' and parents' general attitudes, overall school programs, overall family practices, and subscales of some of the major types of involvement that create a comprehensive program of partnership (Epstein, 1992). The reliabilities of the teacher and parent scales range from alpha = .44 to alpha = .91, indicating their usefulness for research (Epstein et al, 1994). The reliability coefficient scales for the four questionnaires are presented in Tables 3 through 6.

Table 7. Summary of Scales from Surveys of Parents of Elementary and Middle School Students

Title	N Items	Reliability
Parent Perceptions about Child's School	5	.81
Parent Reports of School Program of All Types of Activities	10	.83
Parent Reports of School Program of Type II Activities	4	.66
Parent Reports of School Program of Type III Activities	2	.56
Parent Reports of School Program of Type IV Activities	3	.71
Parents' Involvement on All Types of Activities	16	.77
Parents' Type I Activities	2	.44
Parents' Type III Activities	2	.49
Parents' Type IV Activities	9	.73

Source: The Johns Hopkins University Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning

Table 8. Summary of Scales from Surveys of Parents of High School Students

Title	N Items	Reliability
Parent Perceptions about High School (Full Scale)	14	.86
Parent Perceptions About Family Involvement	8	.78
Parent Perceptions About the Community	2	.57
Parent Reports of Student Attitude Toward School	2	.62
Parent Type I Activities	6	.63
Parent Type II Activities	4	.59
Parent Type III Activities	3	.67
Parent Type IV Activities	6	.63
Parent Type V Activities	3	.66
Parent Involvement at Home	14	.82
Parent Involvement at School	8	.81
Parent Reports of School Type I Activities	4	.71
Parent Reports of School Type II Activities	6	.77
Parent Reports of School Type IV Activities	4	.78
Parent Reports of School Type V Activities	2	.65
Parent Reports of School Program of Involvement (Total)	17	.91
Parent Reports of Frequency of Communications from School	8	.73
Parent Reports of Frequency of Requests From School to Volunteer	3	.75
Parent Reports of Frequency of All Contacts From School	14	.82
Parent Reports of Student Need for Direction	4	.70

Source: The Johns Hopkins University Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning

Table 9. Summary of Scales from Surveys of Elementary and Middle School Teachers.

Title	N Items	Reliability
Teacher Perceptions about Family Involvement	11	.72
Teacher Views Family Strengths	2	.69
Importance to Teachers of Type 2 Activities	6	.75
Importance to Teachers of Type 4 Activities	7	.74
Importance to Teacher of All Practices to Involve Families	17	.89
Teacher Reports of School Program of Type I Activities	2	.85
Teacher Reports of School Program of Type II Activities	4	.78
Teacher Reports of School Program of Type III Activities	2	.79
Teacher Reports of School Program of Type IV Activities	2	.86
Teacher Estimates of Parents' Involvement	8	.89
Teacher Estimates of Parents' Type 4 Activities	5	.90
Teacher Views of Support for Parent Involvement	8	.91

Source: The Johns Hopkins University Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning

Table 10. Summary of Scales from Surveys of High School Teachers

Title	N Items	Reliability
Teacher Perception of Importance of Parent Involvement	9	.81
Teacher Ratings of the High School	3	.70
Teacher ratings of Community Support	2	.73
Teacher Reports of School Type II Activities	3	.65
Teacher Reports of School Type IV Activities	4	.65
Teacher Reports of School Type V Activities	3	.66
Teacher Reports of Total School Activities of Involvement	13	.78
Importance to Teacher of Type II Activities	5	.68
Importance to Teacher of Type IV Activities	4	.75
Importance to Teacher of Type VI Activities	2	.77
Importance to Teacher of All Activities	15	.90
Ways Teachers Contact Families	8	.66
Teacher Reports of Parent Responsibility for Type I Activities	3	.53
Teacher Reports of Parent Responsibility for Type IV Activities	7	.80
Teacher Reports of Parent Responsibility for All Types	13	.84
Teacher Perception of Support For Parent Involvement	10	.85
Teacher Perception of Community Problems	7	.73

Source: The Johns Hopkins University Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning

Methods of Analysis

According to Fred Kerlinger and Elazar Pedhazur (1973), "multiple regression is a method of analyzing the collective and separate contributions of two or more independent variables, *Xi*, to the variation of a dependent variable, Y." The multiple regression statistical tool tested hypotheses one through seven and nine through sixteen.

The statistical tool for hypothesis eight was a Pearson correlation. A correlation coefficient indexes two properties of a relationship. The first is the magnitude of the relationship, that is, the degree to which the variables vary together. The second is the direction of the relationship (Williams, 1979).

Method of Organizing Data

For the parent data, the items corresponding to each of the six independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Gender, Education Level, Income Level and Adults were entered into the SPSS program along with the dependent variables of the six types of parent involvement of Parenting, Communicating, Volunteering, Homework, Leadership, Community, and All Types. The multiple regression tool was used to analyze the data. The analyses are presented in matrices.

The items corresponding to each of the eight teacher independent variables of Strengths, Importance, Teacher Support, Administrative Support, Parent Support, Gender, Experience, Education Level, and Structure were entered into the SPSS Program along with the dependent variables of school's program for each of the six types of parent involvement. A multiple regression analyzed the teacher variables. Matrices display the data analyses.

The statistical tools used to analyze the data were:

1. A Pearson correlation
2. multiple regression analysis

Precautions Taken for Accuracy

Precautions taken for accuracy included the following:

a.) The researcher entered the data into the Montana State University Computer System through a terminal, under the guidance of Dr. Eric Strohmeyer, Professor, and Dr. Larry Baker, Administrative Assistant.

b.) The SPSS package was employed for the Pearson correlations and the multiple regression analyses.

c.) Accuracy of the information entered was verified by another party.

Delimitations

This study was limited to self-reported data from parents with children enrolled in public schools in Montana and self-reported data from teachers who were employed in public schools in Montana and who were members of the Montana Education Association.

Epstein's social organizational perspective of overlapping spheres of influence which emphasizes the importance of family-school-community developmental contexts for students' education, and the overlap in these contexts was the basis for this study. However, this research focuses on the family-school relationship and does not address the community-school aspect.

The data came from an existing database drawn from randomly selected groups of parents with children in a public school in Montana and of teachers who work in a public school system in Montana. This database was created in 1994. The researcher and reader

school system in Montana. This database was created in 1994. The researcher and reader should not assume that Montana parents and teachers are typical of parents and teachers in other Rocky Mountain states or of parents and teachers in private schools or home schools.

Summary

The database for this study came from an existing database derived from random samples of parents of children enrolled in public schools in Montana and teachers working in public elementary, middle, and high schools in Montana. The study analyzed parent perceptions of the school's program of the six types of parent involvement to determine if these dependent variables could be explained by the independent variables of parent perceptions of their child's success in school, the parents' perception of the school's effort to involve parents, and their view of the school plus the demographic variables of gender, education level, income level, and adults in the household. An analysis of parent practices of each of the six types of parent involvement determined whether parent perception of the school program of that type contributed to the variability in the practice.

The data from teachers provided additional information about parent involvement. Teacher perceptions of the six types of parent involvement were analyzed to determine whether any of the variability was explained by teacher perception variables of parent strengths, importance of parent involvement, support for parent involvement, and the demographic variables of years of experience, education level, gender, and number of students taught per day or classroom structure.

Statistical hypotheses were presented in the null form and were tested at the .01 and the .10 levels of significance against nondirectional alternative hypotheses. The statistical tools used for analyses were the Pearson correlation and multiple regression.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The problem of this study was to determine whether type of parent involvement in Montana public schools varied with identified demographic variables and perceptions held by parents toward the school. The analysis involved two levels: data for parents of elementary through middle school level and data for parents at the high school level. The demographic independent variables were gender, income level, education level, and number of adults in household. The independent perception variables were parent view of child's school, parent perception of child's success in school, and parent perception of schools' effort to involve parents.

A second task was to determine whether Montana teachers' perception of school practices of type of parent involvement varied with identified demographic variables and teacher perceptions about parent involvement. The teacher independent demographic variables were gender, education level, classroom structure or number of students taught, and years of experience. Independent perception variables were teacher perception of importance of parent involvement, teacher perception of parent strengths, and teacher perception of support for parent involvement from others. This analysis also involved two levels: for teachers of elementary through middle school students and for teachers of high school students.

Return Rates

This study included two randomly sampled groups. Researchers mailed one thousand questionnaires to parents with children enrolled in public schools in Montana and 750 questionnaires to Montana public school teachers of grades kindergarten through twelve. The parent subjects were proportionally chosen according to county population, economic level, and their children's educational grade level to represent Montana Public School enrollment figures (Office of Public Instruction, 1994). The teacher subjects were proportionally chosen according to grade level taught to represent Montana overall figures for public schools.

The data collection process involved two separate mailings of the questionnaire with an accompanying cover letter to each of the study's participants. All participants received a postcard reminder/thank you two weeks after the initial mailing. A total of 344 elementary/middle school parent respondents and a total of 90 high school parent respondents participated in the study. Table 7 illustrates response figures for the parent and teacher groups. Although the percentage rate of response was lower than desired, the researchers determined that the number of participants was adequate to address the hypotheses of the study.

Returns indicated a proportionately distributed population according to geographical areas of Montana. However, the study was not proportionately representted by households income levels which were at or below the poverty level identified in the 1990 U.S. Census Report .

Table 11. Parent and Teacher Participants in Study by Percentage of Sample Size.

Group	Sample Size	Adjusted Sample Size*	Number Returned	Percentage Returned of Adjusted Sample Size
Parents with Elementary/Middle School Age Children	720	608	342	56.3
Parents with High School Age Children	280	212	88	41.5
Total Parent Sample	1000	820	430	52.4
Teachers of Elementary/Middle School Children	505	503	235	46.7
Teachers of High School Age Children	245	242	94	38.8
Total Teacher Sample	750	745	329	44.2

*minus number of returned surveys not meeting population parameters

The response rate provided demographic characteristics which helped to describe the sample populations. For parents, a higher proportion of women than men participated in the study. The data indicated a disproportionate number of well-educated respondents compared to respondents with a high school diploma. Respondents on the average belonged to higher income level groups. The return for the lowest income families was 10.4% which was not consistent with the 1990 U.S. Census Report of 20% of all families in Montana belonging to the lowest income group.

The teacher group consisted of more females than males especially at the elementary and middle school levels. Most teachers had earned extra credits beyond a bachelor's degree and nearly twenty-seven percent had earned a master's or beyond. Appendix D contains Tables further describing the sample populations.

Multiple Linear Regression

A multiple regression analysis estimated the relationship between the dependent variables of parent involvement attitudes and practices and the independent variables of perceptions and demographic characteristics of parents. The dependent variable, ELP1 through ELP7 represented the perceptions of parents toward the school's program to involve parents and ELP8 through ELP14 were self-reported practices in the six types and all types of parent involvement in their local schools. Labels for the variables for this multiple regression analysis are listed as follows:

$ELPY_1$ and $HSPY_1$= Type I parent involvement activities

$ELPY_2$ and $HSPY_2$ = Type II parent involvement activities

$ELPY_3$ and $HSPY_3$ = Type II parent involvement activities

$ELPY_4$ and $HSPY_4$ = Type IV parent involvement activities

$ELPY_5$ and $HSPY_5$ = Type V parent involvement activities

$ELPY_6$ and $HSPY_6$ = Type VI parent involvement activities

$ELPY_7$ and $HSPY_7$ = All Types of parent involvement activities

Parents' self-reported practices of involvement with school variable labels are:

$ELPY_8$ and $HSPY_8$ = Type I parent involvement activities

$ELPY_9$ and $HSPY_9$ = Type II parent involvement activities

$ELPY_{10}$ and $HSPY_{10}$ = Type III parent involvement activities

$ELPY_{11}$ and $HSPY_{11}$ = Type IV parent involvement activities

$ELPY_{12}$ and $HSPY_{12}$ = Type VI parent involvement activities

$ELPY_{13}$ and $HSPY_{13}$ = Type VII parent involvement activities

$ELPY_{14}$ and $HSPY_{14}$ = All Types of parent involvement activities

Labels for the teacher dependent variables are listed below:

$ELTY_1$ and $HSTY_1$= Type I parent involvement activities

$ELTY_2$ and $HSTY_2$ = Type II parent involvement activities

$ELTY_3$ and $HSTY_3$ = Type II parent involvement activities

$ELTY_4$ and $HSTY_4$ = Type IV parent involvement activities

$ELTY_5$ and $HSTY_5$ = Type V parent involvement activities

$ELTY_6$ and $HSTY_6$ = Type VI parent involvement activities

$ELTY_7$ and $HSTY_7$ = All Types of parent involvement activities

Multiple Regression Findings

The relationship between the perception of type of parent involvement and the combination of seven independent variables was conducted with a multiple regression. The first dependent variable for perception of Type I parent involvement ($HSPY_1$ and $ELPY_1$) was entered into the analysis along with the nine independent variables.

Hypothesis 1. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_1$ (R^2) and $ELPY_1$ (R^2) accounted for by the set of independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Gender, Income Level, Adults, and education level is zero.

The first hypothesis at the high school level ($HSPY_1$) tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of parent perception of school program to provide parenting information. The null hypothesis was neither retained nor rejected. The R^2 of .1795 is not statistically significant at the .01 level but would be if alpha were set at .10. Between .01 and .10, judgment is suspended. The set of independent variables accounted for 17.95 % of the variation in parent perception. The coefficient of alienation (1-.1795) equaled .8205 meaning that 82.05% of the variation was not explained by this set of independent variables.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELPY_1$), the hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability in the dependent variable of perception of a school program to provide parenting information. The null hypothesis was rejected. The R^2 of .2621 was statistically significant at .01. The set of independent variables explained 26.21% of the variability in parent perception of school's program of providing parenting information. See Table 10 for ANOVA results of Hypotheses 1 - 7.

Hypothesis 2. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_2$ (R^2) and $ELPY_2$ (R^2) accounted for by the set of independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Gender, Income Level, Adults, and education level is zero.

The second hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the independent variable of parent perception of the school program of school-home communication. At the high school level ($HSPY_2$), R^2 was .1733 which has a significance level between .01 and .1 or the area of suspended judgment. The set of independent variables explained 17.33% of the variability. The coefficient of alienation (1-.1733) was .8667. Eighty-six and sixty-sevenths percent of the variation was not explained.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELPY_2$), R_2 was .3523. The set of independent variables explained 35.23% of the variability of parent perception of school program of school-home communication. R_2 of .3523 is statistically significant at the .01 level of significance. The null hypothesis was rejected. The coefficient of alienation was (1-.3523) .6477 indicating that 64.77 percent was accounted for by other factors.

Hypothesis 3. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_3$ and $ELPY_3$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

The third hypothesis at the high school level ($HSPY_3$) tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of parent perception of school program to use parent volunteers. The R^2 of .1446 was not statistically significant at the .01 level. However, the level of significance fell in the area between .01 and .10; therefore, judgment was suspended. The set of independent variables accounted for 14.46% of the variation in parent perception. The coefficient of alienation (1-.1446) was .8554 meaning that 85.54% of the variability was not explained by this set of variables.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELPY_3$), the set of independent variables explained .2058 of the variability of the dependent variable of parent perception of school program to use parent volunteers. The R^2 of .2058 is statistically significant at .01 level. The null hypothesis was rejected. The set of independent variables accounted for 20.58% of the variation in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation (1-.2058) equaled .7942. Seventy-nine and forty-two hundredths of the variation in $ELPY_3$ was not explained by these factors.

Hypothesis 4. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_4$ and $ELPY_4$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

The fourth hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable, $HSPY_4$, of parent perception of high school program to help parents help their teen with homework. The null hypothesis was retained at an alpha of .01. The R^2 of .1092 was not statistically significant. The set of independent variables accounted for 10.92% of the variation in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation, .8908, indicated that 89.08% was explained by other factors for this sample.

The R^2 at the elementary and middle school level was .2757. The set of independent variables explained 27.57% of the variation in the dependent variable of parent perception of school program to help parents help their child with homework. This R^2 was statistically significant at the .01 level and the null hypothesis was rejected. The coefficient of alienation allowed that 72.43% of the variation was accounted for by something other than the set of independent variables.

Hypothesis 5. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_5$ and $ELPY_5$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

The fifth hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of parent perception of the school program to involve parents in leadership and decision-making. At the high school level, $HSPY_5$, the null hypothesis was retained. The R^2 of .1100 was not statistically significant at either .01 or .10. The set of independent variables accounted for 11% of the variation in the dependent variable. Eighty-nine percent of the variation was not attributed to the set of independent variables.

At the elementary and middle school level, $ELPY_5$, the hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability in the dependent variable of perception of the school program to involve parents in leadership and decision-making. The R^2 of .2471 was statistically significant at .01. The null hypothesis

was rejected. The set of independent variables accounted for 24.71% of the variation in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation was .7529 meaning that 75.29% of the variation was not explained.

Hypothesis 6. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_6$ and $ELPY_6$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

The sixth hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables accounted for a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of parent perception of the school program to provide information about community services and resources. At the high school level, R^2 was .09304. The set of independent variables explained 9.3% of the variation of the dependent variable. R^2 was not statistically significant and the null was retained. Ninety and seventy hundredths of the variation was explained by factors other than the set of independent variables for this sample.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELPY_6$), R^2 for the set of independent variables was .2169. The null hypothesis was rejected at an alpha of .01. Twenty-one and sixth-nine hundredths of the variation in the dependent variable of parent perception of the school program to inform parents about community services and resources was explained

by the set of independent variables. The coefficient of alienation was .7831 indicating that 78.31% of the variation was not explained.

Hypothesis 7. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSPY_7$ and $ELPY_7$ accounted for by the independent variables of View, Success, Effort, Adults in Household, Education Level, Income Level, and Gender respondent is zero.

The seventh hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of parent perception of the school program of all types of parent involvement. At the high school level ($HSPY_7$), R^2 was .25239 which was statistically significant at alpha .01. The null hypothesis was rejected. The set of independent variables accounted for 25.24% of the variability in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation was .7476 meaning that 74.76% of the variability was attributed to other factors than the set of independent variables for this sample.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELPY_7$), R^2 was .4036. The null hypothesis was rejected at alpha .01. The set of independent variables accounted for 40.36% of the variability in the dependent variable of parent perception of the school program of all types of parent involvement. The coefficient of alienation indicated that 59.64% of the variation was not explained by other factors.

Table 12. Analyses of Variance for Hypotheses 1 - 7.

		R^2	Adj R^2	Shrinkage	Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Signif F
Hypothesis 1	HSPY	.1795	.1095	.0700	Reg	7	8.271	1.182	2.563	.0194
					Res	82	37.809	.461		
	ELPY	.2621	.2466	.01556	Reg	7	45.438	6.491	16.851	.0000
					Res	332	127.889	.385		
Hypothesis 2	HSPY	.1733	.1027	.0706	Reg	7	4.218	.603	2.456	.0245
					Res	82	37.809	.245		
	ELPY	.3523	.3387	.0136	Reg	7	28.820	4.117	25.800	.0000
					Res	332	52.979	.160		
Hypothesis 3	HSPY	.1446	.0716	.0730	Reg	7	12.481	1.783	1.980	.0677
					Res	82	73.841	.901		
	ELPY	.2058	.1890	.0167	Reg	7	22.920	3.274	12.286	.0000
					Res	332	88.475	.267		
Hypothesis 4	HSPY	.1029	.0263	.0766	Reg	7	5.586	.798	1.344	.2405
					Res	82	48.687	.594		
	ELPY	.2757	.2604	.0153	Reg	7	37.439	5.348	18.054	.0000
					Res	332	98.355	.296		

Table 12. Analyses of Variance for Hypotheses 1 - 7 Continued.

		R^2	Adj R^2	Shrinkage	Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Signif F
	HSPY	.1100	.0340	.0660	Reg	7	8.840	1.263	1.447	.1980
					Res	82	71.560	.873		
Hypothesis 5										
					Reg	7	44.143	6.306	15.568	.0000
	ELPY	.2471	.2310	.0159	Res	332	134.48	.405		
	HSPY	.0930	.0156	.0774	Reg	7	8.569	1.224	1.202	.3113
Hypothesis 6					Res	82	83.531	1.019		
					Reg	7	54.698	7.814	13.139	.0000
	ELPY	.2169	.2004	.0165	Res	332	197.452	.595		
	HSPY	.2524	.1886	.0638	Reg	7	4.018	.574	3.955	.0009
Hypothesis 7					Res	82	11.901	.145		
					Reg	7	30.706	4.387	32.093	.0000
	ELPY	.4036	.3910	.0126	Res	332	45.379	.137		

Table 8. Analyses of Variance for Hypotheses 1 - 7 Continued.

Hypothesis 8. H_0: There is no relationship between parent perception of school program to involve parents in a type of involvement and parent self-reported practice of that type of involvement.

A Pearson Product Moment determined if the independent variables of parent perception of school program of a type of involvement was related to the dependent variables of parent self-reported practice of that type of involvement. In other words, if parents perceived a good school program of one type of involvement, they would be more likely to participate in that type of involvement. The Pearson coefficients are displayed in Tables 13 and 14.

The analysis showed that the relationship between perception (HSP1) and practice (HSPY8) was .1171. This R was not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. Parent perception of school program of providing parenting information did not vary significantly with parent reported practice of that type.

The R between high school parent perception (HSP2) and high school parent practice (HSPY9) was .3238. This relationship was significant at the .01 level and the null hypothesis was rejected. Parent perception of the high school program to use school-home communication did vary 32.38% of the time with high school parent reported practice of school-home communication.

The relationship between high school parent perception (HSP3) and practice (HSPY10) was -.0684. This R was not significant and the null was retained. The variables of the high school parent perception of school program to use volunteers and reported practice of that type did not vary together significantly.

The R between high school parent perception (HSP4) and practice (HSPY11) was .2289. This was significant at the .05 level and lies in the area of suspended judgment.

The null hypothesis was neither retained or rejected. The evidence regarding the relationship between high school parent perception of school program to help parents help with teen's homework and parent reported practice of that type is inconclusive.

The relationship between high school parent perception (HSP5) and practice (HSPY12) was .2195. This R is not significant at .01 or .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. Parent perception of the high school program to involve parents in leadership and decision-making did not vary significantly with reported practices of that type.

The relationship between high school parent perception (HSP6) and practice (HSPY13) was .0179. This was not significant at .01 or .05 and the null hypothesis was retained. Parent perception of the high school program to inform parents of community services and resources did not vary significantly with reported parent practices of that type.

The R between high school parent perception (HSP7) and practice (HSPY14) was .2453. This R was significant at the .05 level. Judgment on retaining or rejecting the null hypothesis was suspended. The relationship between parent perception of all types of the high school program to involve parents varied 24.53% of the time with reported practices of all types of parent involvement. This amount of variation was not enough to cast judgment upon the null hypothesis.

The analysis at the elementary and middle school level showed that the relationship between perception (ELP_1) and practice ($ELPY_8$) was .0777. This relationship was not significant at the .01 level. The elementary and middle school parent perception of the school program to provide parenting information did not vary with self-reported parent practice of that type of involvement. The null hypothesis was retained.

The relationship between perception (ELP_2) and practice ($ELPY_9$) was .1974. This relationship was significant at the .01 level. Parent perception of the school program to provide parenting information and practice of that type did vary together 19.74% of the time. The null hypothesis was rejected.

The relationship between perception (ELP_3) and practice ($ELPY_{10}$) was .3633. This was significant at the .01 level and the null hypothesis was rejected. The elementary and middle school parent perception of the school program for volunteering did vary 36.33% of the time with parent reported practices of volunteering.

The relationship between perception (ELP_4) and practice ($ELPY_{11}$) was .2631. This R was statistically significant at .01. The null hypothesis was rejected. The elementary and middle school parent perception of the school program for helping parents to help with homework did vary 26.31% of the time with reported practices of using that program.

The relationship between perception (ELP_5) and practice ($ELPY_{12}$) was .2368. This was significant at the .01 level and the null hypothesis was rejected. The elementary and middle school parent perception of the school program for involving parents in leadership and decision-making did vary 23.68% of the time with practices of that type reported by parents.

The relationship between perception (ELP_6) and practice ($ELPY_{13}$) was .0687. This R was not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. The two variables regarding parent perception of the school program of providing information about community services and resources and reported practices of that program did not vary together significantly.

The relationship between perception (ELP_7) and practice ($ELPY_{14}$) was .3378. The R was significant at the .01 level and the null hypothesis was rejected. Elementary

and middle school parent perception of the school program of all types of involvement did vary 33.78% of the time with parent reported practices of all types of involvement.

Table 13. Pearson Product Moment Correlations between Perception of School Program of Type of Involvement and Practice of that Type for Parents of Elementary and Middle School Students

	ELP8	ELP9	ELP10	ELP11	ELP12	ELP13	ELP14
ELP1	.0777						
ELP2		.1974**					
ELP3			.3633**				
ELP4				.2631**			
ELP5					.2368**		
ELP6						.0687	
ELP7							.3378**

*p = .05
**p = .01 (two-tailed)

Table 14. Pearson Product Moment Correlations between Perception of School Program of Type of Involvement and Practice of that Type for Parents of High School Students

	HSP8	HSP9	HSP10	HSP11	HSP12	HSP13	HSP14
HSP1	.1171						
HSP2		.3238**					
HSP3			-.0684				
HSP4				.2289*			
HSP5					.2195		
HSP6						.0179	
HSP7							.2453*

*p = .05
**p = .01 (two-tailed)

Hypothesis Nine tested whether the regression of parent perceptions ($HSPY_{1-7}$) on each of the independent variables after controlling the effects of the remaining six provided a significant and unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable or whether $b_1 = 0$ (or $by_{1 \cdot 234567}$) is statistically significant.

X_1 = View

X_2 = Success

X_3 = Effort

X_4 = Gender

X_5 = Adults in Household

X_6 = Education Level

X_7 = Income Level

To determine if b is statistically significant, the t value for X_{ij} must be tested. Kerlinger (1973) describes the interpretation of the t ratios as "a bit complex" (p.68). He states:

> These t tests...are tests of the b's, which are partial regression coefficients. They indicate the slope of the regression of Y on X_j, after controlling the effect of the other independent variables (p. 69).

Tables15 through 28 display the multiple regression data analyses for Hypothesis Nine.

Hypothesis 9. H_0: Each independent parent variable does not provide a significant and unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent parent variable after all other independent variables were taken into account.

The results of the multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 15 - HSP1. An analysis of the data indicated that there were no significant independent variables. The null was retained for five of the seven variables. Gender ($t = -1.903$, $df = 7, 82$, $p < .01$ and $p < .10$) and Income ($t = -1.97$, $df = 7, 82$, $p < .01$ and $p > .10$) had levels of significance which fell in the area of suspended judgment. The resulting regression of this model accounted for only 17.95% of the variability in the dependent variable. This may indicate that female parents perceived the school program of parenting information was viewed more favorably than males and that as income level decreased, parent perception of school program of this type of involvement improved. However, since both of these variables fall in the area of suspended judgment, the reader is cautioned regarding data interpretation.

Table 15. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($HSPY_1$) - Parents of High School Children (N=88)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $HSPY_1$				7, 82	.4237	.1795
View	-.1643	-1.311	.1935			
Success	.1143	1.109	.2705			
Effort	-.0272	-.226	.8216			
Gender	-.1954	-1.903	.0605*			
Adults in Household	-.0884	-.776	.4402			
Education Level	.0340	.268	.7895			
Income Level	-.2106	-1.970	.0522*			

Note. *p > .01 and < .10 or the area of suspended judgment

The results of the multiple regression analysis in Table 16 for $HSPY_2$ indicated that six out of the seven variables accounted for little of the variation in the dependent variable. The variable of Income Level (t = -1.892, df = 7, 82, p < .01 and p > .10) fell in the area of suspended judgment. The resulting regression accounted for 17.33% of the variability in the dependent variable. b was not significantly different from zero for six of the seven variables and did not provide a significant and unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable after the other variables have been taken into account. The direction of the relationship and the t for the variable of Income may indicate that as income level decreases, parents perceived the high school program of school-home communication as very satisfactory.

Table 16. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($HSPY_2$) Parents of High School Children (N=88)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $HSPY_2$				7, 82	.4163	.1733
View	-.1934	-1.538	.1280			
Success	.0396	.382	.7031			
Effort	-.0274	-.227	.8211			
Gender	-.1624	-1.576	.1189			
Adults in Household	.0293	.256	.7989			
Education Level	.1065	.835	.4063			
Income Level	-.2030	-1.892	.0620*			

Note. *p > .01 and < .10 or the area of suspended judgment

The results of the multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 17 - $HSPY_3$. An analysis of the data indicated that there were no significant independent variables at an alpha of .01. The null was retained for five of the seven variables. Success ($t = 1.719$, $df = 7, 82$, $p < .01$ and $p < .10$) and Adults in Household ($t = 2.291$, $df = 7, 82$, $p < .01$ and $p > .10$) had levels of significance which fell in the area of suspended judgment. The resulting regression of this model accounted for only 14.46% of the variability in the dependent variable. This may indicate that as parent perception of their child's success in school improved then parent perception of the school program of using parent volunteers was higher. When the number of adults in the household increased, parent perception of school program of volunteerism also increased. However, since both of these variables fall in the area of suspended judgment, the reader is cautioned about data interpretation.

Table 17. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($HSPY_3$) Parents of High School Children (N=88)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $HSPY_3$				7, 82	.3803	.1446
View	.0493	.386	.7007			
Success	.1809	1.719	.0894*			
Effort	-.1713	-1.397	.1663			
Gender	-.0198	-.189	.8503			
Adults in Household	.2666	2.291	.0245*			
Education Level	.0390	.301	.7643			
Income Level	-.0512	-.514	.6085			

Note. *p > .01 and < .10 or the area of suspended judgment

Table 18 displays the results of the multiple regression analysis for $HSPY_4$. An analysis of the data indicated that there were no significant independent variables or b was not significantly different from zero. The null was retained for all seven variables. The resulting regression of this model accounted for only 10.29% of the variability in the dependent variable.

Table 18. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($HSPY_4$) Parents of High School Children (N=88)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $HSPY_4$				7, 82	.3208	.1029
View	.0324	.248	.8051			
Success	.1651	1.532	.1294			
Effort	-.1917	-1.526	.1309			
Gender	-.0901	-.839	.4039			
Adults in Household	.0510	.428	.6699			
Education Level	.03359	.253	.8011			
Income Level	-.1469	-1.314	.1924			

An analysis of the data for high school parent perception of the high school program to involve parents in decision-making and leadership (Table 19 - $HSPY_5$) indicated that there were no significant independent variables. The null was retained for six of the seven variables. Gender ($t = -.2373$, $df = 7, 82$, $p < .01$ and $p < .10$) had a level of significance which fell in the area of suspended judgment. The resulting regression of this model accounted for only 11% of the variability in the dependent variable. This may indicate that female parents viewed the school program of involving parents in decision-making and leadership more favorably than males did.

Table 19. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($HSPY_5$) Parents of High School Children (N=88)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $HSPY_5$				7, 82	.3319	.1100
View	-.0494	-.379	.7060			
Success	-.0432	-.403	.6882			
Effort	-.0854	-.682	.4969			
Gender	-.2373	-2.219	.0293*			
Adults in Household	-.0051	-.043	.9658			
Education Level	.1343	1.015	.3132			
Income Level	-.0857	-.770	.4435			

Note. *p > .01 and < .10 or the area of suspended judgment

An analysis of the data for high school parent perception of the school program to inform parents about community services and resources (Table 20 - $HSPY_6$) indicated that there were no significant independent variables. The null was retained for six of the

seven variables. Gender ($\underline{t}$ = -2.182, df = 7, 82, p < .01 and p < .10) had a level of significance which fell in the area of suspended judgment. The resulting regression of this model accounted for only 9.3% of the variability in the dependent variable. This may indicate that female parents viewed the school program of informing parents of community services and resources more favorably than males.

Table 20. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($HSPY_6$) Parents of High School Children (N=88)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $HSPY_6$				7, 82	.3050	.0930
View	-.0836	-.634	.5276			
Success	.0849	.784	.4354			
Effort	-.1228	-.972	.3337			
Gender	-.2355	-2.182	.0320*			
Adults in Household	.0458	.382	.7035			
Education Level	-.0089	-.067	.9471			
Income Level	.0251	.223	.8241			

Note. *p > .01 and < .10 or the area of suspended judgment

An analysis of the data for high school parent perception of school program to inform parents about community services and resources (Table 21 - $HSPY_7$) indicated that there were no significant independent variables. The null was retained for six of the seven variables. Gender ($\underline{t}$ = -2.57, df = 7, 82, p < .01 and p < .10) and Income ($\underline{t}$ = -2.033, df = 7, 82, p < .01 and p < .10) had a levels of significance which fell in the area of suspended judgment. The resulting regression of this model accounted for only 25.24% of the variability in the dependent variable. This may indicate that parent perception of all types of the school program of involving parents was viewed more favorably by females than males and that as income level decreased, high school parent perception of school program of all types of involvement was perceived more favorably.

Table 21. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($HSPY_7$) Parents of High School Children (N=88)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $HSPY_7$				7, 82	.5024	.2524
View	-.1915	-1.60	.1132			
Success	.0657	.668	.5062			
Effort	-.0635	-.554	.5814			
Gender	-.2515	-2.57	.0121*			
Adults in Household	-.0130	-.119	.9054			
Education Level	.1521	1.254	.2133			
Income Level	-.2074	-2.033	.0453*			

Note. *p > .01 and < .10 or the area of suspended judgment

Multiple Regression Data Analysis for Parents of Elementary and Middle School Students

Table 22 illustrates the results of the multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 9 (ELTY1). An analysis of the data indicated that there were two independent variables which were significant at an alpha of .01 ($b \neq 0$) and one variable which fell in the area of suspended judgment. The null was retained for four of the seven variables. View ($t = -6.089$, $df = 7, 332$, $p < .01$) and Education Level ($t = -3.314$, $df = 7, 332$, $p < .01$) were statistically significant. The variable Effort ($t = -2.313$, $df = 7, 332$, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgment. The resulting regression of this model accounted for 26.22% of the variability in the dependent variable. The relationship for each of the variables of Success and Education Level was inverse. This indicates that as parent view of the school as being good for parents, teachers, and students improved, their perception of the school program in providing parenting information decreased. In addition, the higher the level of education of the parent the less likely the parent was to perceive the school program as not providing parenting information. The variable of Effort may indicate that as parents perceived a greater effort by the school in providing parenting information the more favorably they perceived the school program of providing parenting information. However, since the variable of Effort falls in the area of suspended judgment, the reader needs to interpret the data cautiously.

Table 22. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_1$) - Parents of Elementary and Middle School Children (N=342)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $ELPY_1$				7, 332	.5120	.2622
View	-.3632	-6.089	.0000**			
Success	-.0462	-.933	.3515			
Effort	-.1326	-2.313	.0213*			
Gender	-.0071	-.148	.8828			
Adults in Household	-.0163	-.335	.7377			
Education Level	-.1681	-3.314	.0010**			
Income Level	-.0143	-.271	.7865			

Note. * the area of suspended judgment between .01 and .10
**p >.01

Table 23 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_2$). An analysis of the data indicated that the null was retained for three of the seven variables and the null for one variable fell in the area of suspended judgment. View ($t = -7.974$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$) and Success ($t = -3.085$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$) were statistically significant or $bx_{1 \cdot 234567} \neq 0$ and $bx_{2 \cdot 134567} \neq 0$. There was a confidence level greater than 99% that the resulting regression could have happened by chance alone. This indicates that the more favorable the parent view of the school the higher the parent perceived the school program of school-home communication. An inverse relationship occurred between parent perception of their child's success and parent perception of school program of school-home communication. The higher parents rated their child's success in school the lower they rated their perception of the school communication program. Effort ($t = -2.072$, df = 7, 332, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) and Income Level ($t = -2.284$, df = 7, 332, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgement. This may indicate that the more effort that the school had toward parent involvement the higher the perception of school-home communication. Additionally, the regression may indicate that as parent income level decreased, the higher the perception of school-home

communication. The resulting regression of this model accounted for 35.23% of the variability in the dependent variable.

Table 23. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_2$) - Parents of Elementary and Middle School Children (N=342)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $ELPY_2$				7, 332	.5936	.3523
View	-.4455	-7.974	.0000**			
Success	-.1431	-3.085	.0022**			
Effort	-.1113	-2.072	.0391*			
Gender	-.0501	-1.108	.2687			
Adults in Household	.0263	.577	.5642			
Education Level	.0289	.608	.5433			
Income Level	-.1127	-2.284	.0230*			

Note. * the area of suspended judgement between .01 and .10
**p >.01

Table 24 displays the results of the multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 9 ($ELTY_3$). An analysis of the data indicated that the null was retained for two of the seven variables and the null for one variable fell in the area of suspended judgement. View ($t = -2.628$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$), Success ($t = -.3174$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$), Effort ($t = -4.096$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$), and Gender ($t = -2.879$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$) were statistically significant or $b_3x_{1\cdot234567} \neq 0$, $b_3x_{2\cdot134567} \neq 0$, $b_3x_{3\cdot124567} \neq 0$, and $b_3x_{4\cdot123567} \neq 0$. There was a confidence level greater than 99% that the resulting regression could have happened by chance alone. This indicates that the more favorable the parent view of the school the higher the parent perceived the school program of using parent volunteers. An inverse relationship occurred between parents' perception of child's success and parent perception of school program of using parent volunteers. The higher parents rated their child's success in school the lower they rated their perception of the school program of using volunteers. The higher parents perceived school's effort in involving parents, the

more positive their perception of the school program of using volunteers. Gender contributed to the variation in that females perceived school program of using volunteers more favorably than did males. Adults in Household ($t = 1.216$, df = 7, 332, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgement. This may indicate that the more adults there were in the household, the more likely parents were to perceive the school volunteer program as being very satisfactory. The resulting regression of this model accounted for 20.58% of the variability in the dependent variable.

Table 24. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_3$) - Parents of Elementary and Middle School Children (N=342)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $ELPY_3$				7, 332	.4536	.2058
View	-.1626	-2.628	.0090**			
Success	-.1630	-.3174	.0016**			
Effort	-.2437	-4.096	.0001**			
Gender	-.1442	-2.879	.0043**			
Adults in Household	.0615	1.216	.2247*			
Education Level	.0620	1.178	.2396			
Income Level	.0326	.597	.5511			

Note. * the area of suspended judgement between .01 and .10
**p >.01

The results of the multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 9 ($ELTY_4$) are presented in Table 25 - $ELPY_4$. An analysis of the data indicated that the null was retained for two of the seven variables; the null for three variables fell in the area of suspended judgement, and the null for two variables was rejected. View ($t = -5.1$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$) and Effort ($t = -2.851$, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$) were statistically significant or $b_4x_{1 \cdot 234567} \neq 0$ and $b_4x_{3 \cdot 124567} \neq 0$. There was a confidence level greater than 99% that the resulting regression (b) could have happened by chance alone. This indicates that the more favorable the parent view of the school the higher the parent perceived the school program of helping

parents help their child with homework. The higher the rating that parents perceived the school's effort in involving parents, the higher was the parent perception of the school program of helping parents to help their child with homework. Adults in Household (t = -.663, df = 7, 332, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgment. This may indicate that the more adults there were in the household, the more likely parents were to perceive school program of helping them to assist their child with homework as being very satisfactory. Income Level (t = -2.381, df = 7, 332, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgement. This may indicate an inverse relationship meaning that the lower the income level the more parents perceived the school program of helping them help their child with homework as being very satisfactory. The resulting regression of this model accounted for 27.57% of the variability in the dependent variable.

Table 25. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_4$) - Parents of Elementary and Middle School Children (N=342)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $ELPY_4$				7, 332	.5251	.2757
View	-.3545	-5.100	.0000**			
Success	-.8516	-1.736	.0834*			
Effort	-.1620	-2.851	.0046**			
Gender	-.0043	-.089	.9290			
Adults in Household	-.0320	-.663	.5076*			
Education Level	-.0133	-.264	.7917			
Income Level	-.1242	-2.381	.0178*			

Note. * the area of suspended judgement between .01 and .10
**p >.01

Table 25 illustrates the results of the multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 9 ($ELTY_5$). An analysis of the data indicated that the null was rejected for one of the seven variables, retained for five of the seven, and the null for one variable fell in the area of suspended judgement. Effort (t = -7.092, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$) was statistically significant or $b_5 x_{3 \cdot 124567} \neq 0$. There was a confidence level greater than 99% that the resulting regression could have happened by chance alone. This indicates that the more

positively parents perceived the school effort in involving parents, the more positively the parent perceived the school program of involving parents in decision-making and leadership activities. Success ($t = -2.191$, $df = 7, 332$, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgement. This may indicate that the more successful that parents perceived their child to be in school, the more positively parents were to perceive school program of involving parents in decision-making and leadership. The resulting regression of this model accounted for 24.71% of the variability in the dependent variable.

Table 26. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_5$) - Parents of Elementary and Middle School Children (N=342)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $ELPY_5$				7, 332	..4971	.2471
View	-.0845	-1.403	.1617			
Success	-.1095	-2.191	.0292*			
Effort	-.4108	-7.092	.0000**			
Gender	-.0723	-1.482	.1394			
Adults in Household	.0254	.516	.6063			
Education Level	.0494	.965	.3353			
Income Level	.0725	1.362	.1741			

Note. * the area of suspended judgement between .01 and .10
**p >.01

The results of the multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_6$) are presented in Table 27 - ELPY6. An analysis of the data indicated that the null was rejected for three of the seven independent variables, retained for three of the seven, and the null for one variable fell in the area of suspended judgment. View ($t = -3.697$, $df = 7$, 332, $p < .01$), Effort ($t = -4.229$, $df = 7, 332$, $p < .01$) and Gender ($t = -3.663$, $df = 7$, 332, $p < .01$) were statistically significant or $b_6x_{1 \cdot 234567} \neq 0$, $b_6x_{3 \cdot 124567} \neq 0$, and $b_6x_{4 \cdot 123567} \neq 0$. View, Effort and Gender did provide a unique and significant contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable of school program of informing parents about

community services and resources. This indicates that the more favorable the parent view of the school, the more positively the parent perceived the school program of providing information about community services and resources. Effort indicated that the more positively parents perceived the school's effort to involve parents the more likely they were to perceive the school program of offering information about community services and resources as very satisfactory. Gender contributed to the variation in that females were more likely to perceive school program of providing information about community services and resources more favorably than did males. Education Level ($t = 1.247$, $df = 7, 332$, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgment. This may indicate that the higher the education level of the parent, the more likely parents were to perceive the school program of informing about community services and resources favorably. The resulting regression of this model accounted for 21.69% of the variability in the dependent variable of the school program to inform parents about community services and resources.

Table 27. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_6$) - Parents of Elementary and Middle School Children (N=342)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $ELPY_6$				7, 332	.4658	.2169
View	-.2271	-3.697	.0003**			
Success	-.0198	-.388	.6984			
Effort	-.2498	-4.229	.0000**			
Gender	-.1822	-3.663	.0003**			
Adults in Household	.0251	.500	.6173			
Education Level	.0652	1.247	.2133*			
Income Level	.0110	.203	.8395			

Note. * the area of suspended judgment between .01 and .10
**p >.01

Table 28 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_7$). An analysis of the data indicated that the null was rejected for three of the seven

variables, retained for two, and the null for two variables fell in the area of suspended judgment. View ($\underline{t}$ = -7.019, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$), Success ($\underline{t}$ = -3.150, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$), and Effort ($\underline{t}$ = -5.237, df = 7, 332, $p < .01$) were statistically significant or $b_7x_{1 \cdot 234567} \neq 0$, $b_7x_{2 \cdot 134567} \neq 0$, and $b_7x_{3 \cdot 124567} \neq 0$. There is a confidence level greater than 99% that the resulting regressions ($\underline{b}$) could have happened by chance alone. This indicates that the more favorable the parent view of the school the higher the parent perceived the school program of all types of parent involvement. An inverse relationship occurred between parent perception of their child's success and parent perception of school program of all types of parent involvement. The higher that parents rated their child's success in school the lower they rated their perception of the school program of all types of parent involvement. The higher that parents perceived the school's effort to involve parents, the higher they rated their perception of the school program of all types of parent involvement. Gender ($\underline{t}$ = -1.903, df = 7, 332, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) and Income Level ($\underline{t}$ = -1.125, df = 7, 332, $p > .01$ and $p < .10$) fell in the area of suspended judgement. This may indicate that females were more positive toward the school program of involving parents than were males. The resulting regression of this model accounted for 40.36% of the variability in the dependent variable of All Types of Parent Involvement. Again, the reader should interpret the data carefully regarding predictability when the $\underline{t}$ falls in the area of suspended judgment.

Table 28. Multiple Regression Findings for Hypothesis 9 ($ELPY_7$) - Parents of Elementary and Middle School Children (N=342)

Scale	b	t	Signif t	df	R	R^2
Total Model - $ELPY_7$				7, 332	.6353	.4036
View	-.3764	-7.019	.0000**			
Success	-.1402	-3.150	.0018**			
Effort	-.270	-5.237	.0000**			
Gender	-.0826	-1.903	.0579*			
Adults in Household	.0205	.469	.6392			
Education Level	.0235	.514	.6073			
Income Level	-.0533	-1.125	.2615*			

Note. * the area of suspended judgment between .01 and .10
**p >.01

Multiple Regression Data Analysis for Teacher Perception and Demographic Variables

In order to estimate the relationship between teacher perception of type of parent involvement and the combination of nine independent variables, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. The first dependent variable for teacher perception of Type I parent involvement ($HSTY_1$ and $ELTY_1$) was entered into the analysis along with the nine independent variables.

Hypothesis 10. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_1$ and $ELTY_1$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The tenth hypothesis at the high school level ($HSTY_1$) tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of teacher perception of school program to provide parenting information. The null hypothesis was neither retained or rejected. The R^2 of .1731 is not statistically significant at the .01 level but would be if alpha were set at .10. Between .01 and .10,

judgment is suspended. The set of independent variables accounted for 17.31% of the variation in teacher perception. The coefficient of alienation (1-.1731) equaled .8269, meaning that 82.69% of the variation was explained by other factors.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELTY_1$), the hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability in the dependent variable of teacher perception of the school program to provide parenting information. The null hypothesis was rejected. The R^2 of .1111 was statistically significant at .01. The set of independent variables explained 11.11% of the variability in teacher perception of school program to provide parenting information. See Table 29 for ANOVA results of Hypotheses 10 - 16.

Hypothesis 11. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_2$ and $ELTY_2$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The eleventh hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the independent variable of teacher perception of the school program of school-home communication. At the high school level ($HSTY_2$), R^2 was .3165 which had a significance level at .01; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The set of independent variables explained 31.65% of the variability. The coefficient of alienation (1-.3165) was .6835. Sixty-eight and thirty-five hundredths of the variation was explained by other factors not included in this model.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELTY_2$), R_2 was .0561. The set of independent variables accounted for 5.61% of the variability of teacher perception of the

school program of school-home communication. R_2 of .0561 is not statistically significant at the .01 level of significance and the null hypothesis was retained. The coefficient of alienation was (1-.0561) .9439 indicating that 94.39 percent was explained by other factors.

Hypothesis 12. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_3$ and $ELTY_3$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The twelfth hypothesis at the high school level ($HSTY_3$) tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of parent perception of the school program to use parent volunteers. The R^2 of .2172 was statistically significant at the .011 level which falls in the area of suspended judgment. The null was neither retained or rejected. The set of independent variables accounted for 21.72% of the variation in teacher perception. The coefficient of alienation (1-.2172) was .7828, meaning that 78.28% of the variability was explained by other factors.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELTY_3$), the set of independent variables explained .0455 of the variability of the dependent variable of teacher perception of the school program to use parent volunteers. The R^2 of .0455 was not statistically significant at .01 level. The null hypothesis was retained. The set of independent variables accounted for 4.55% of the variation in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation (1-.0455) equaled .9545 meaning that 95.45% of the variation in $ELTY_3$ was explained by other factors.

Hypothesis 13. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_4$ and $ELTY_4$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The next hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable, $HSTY_4$, of teacher perception of the high school program to help parents help their teen with homework. The null hypothesis was rejected at an alpha of .01. The R^2 of .2277 was statistically significant. The set of independent variables accounted for 22.77% of the variation in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation, .7723, indicated that 77.23% of the variation was not explained.

The R^2 at the elementary and middle school level ($ELTY_4$) was .0949. The set of independent variables explained 9.49% of the variation in the dependent variable of teacher perception of the school program to help parents help their child with homework. This R^2 was statistically significant at the .01 level and the null hypothesis was rejected. The coefficient of alienation allowed that 90.51% of the variation was accounted for by something other than the set of independent variables. Although the resulting R^2 was statistically significant, its practical significance is questionable since approximately 90.51% of the variability cannot be explained by the collective influence of all nine variables.

Hypothesis 14. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_5$ and $ELTY_5$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent

Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The fourteenth hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of teacher perception of the school program to involve parents in leadership and decision-making. At the high school level, $HSTY_5$, the null hypothesis was retained. The R^2 of .1437 was not statistically significant at either .01 or .10. The set of independent variables accounted for 14.37% of the variation in the dependent variable while 85.63% was explained by other factors.

At the elementary and middle school level, $ELTY_5$, the hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability in the dependent variable of elementary and middle school teacher perception of the school program to involve parents in leadership and decision-making. The R^2 of .1634 was statistically significant at .01. The null hypothesis was rejected. The set of independent variables accounted for 16.34% of the variation in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation was .8366 meaning that 83.66% of the variation in this dependent variable was not explained by the set of independent variables.

Hypothesis 15. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_6$ and $ELTY_6$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level,

Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The fifteenth hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables accounted for a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of teacher perception of the school program to provide information about community services and resources. At the high school level ($HSTY_6$), R^2 was .1526. The set of independent variables explained 15.26% of the variation of the dependent variable. R^2 was not statistically significant and the null was retained. Eighty-four and seventy-four hundredths of the variation was explained by something other than the set of independent variables.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELTY_6$), R^2 for the set of independent variables was .068. The significance level for R^2 was .0654 level which lies in the area of suspended judgment ($p > .01$ and $p < .10$). Only 6.54% of the variation in the dependent variable of elementary and middle school teacher perception of the school program to inform parents about community services and resources was explained by the set of independent variables. The coefficient of alienation allowed that 93.46% of the variation was explained by other factors.

Hypothesis 16. H_0: The proportion of variability in $HSTY_7$ and $ELTY_7$ accounted for by the independent variables of Parent Strengths, Importance, Support-Teachers, Support-Administrators, Support-Parents, Education Level, Experience, and Number Taught per Day or Classroom Structure is zero.

The last hypothesis tested whether the set of independent variables explained a significant proportion of the variability of the dependent variable of teacher perception of the school program of all types of parent involvement. At the high school level ($HSTY_7$), R^2 was .3475 which was statistically significant at alpha .01. The null hypothesis was rejected. The set of independent variables accounted for 34.75% of the variability in the dependent variable. The coefficient of alienation was .6525 meaning that 65.25% of the variability was attributed to other factors.

At the elementary and middle school level ($ELTY_7$), R^2 was .1114. The null hypothesis was rejected at alpha .01. The set of independent variables accounted for 11.14% of the variability in the dependent variable of elementary and middle school teacher perception of the school program of all types of parent involvement. The coefficient of alienation indicated that 88.86% of the variation was accounted for by other factors.

Table 29. Analyses of Variance for Hypotheses 10 - 16.

		R^2	Adj R^2	Shrinkage	Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Signif F
Hypothesis 10	HSTY	.1731	.0845	.0886	Reg	9	8.950	.994	1.953	.0552
					Res	84	42.763	.509		
	ELTY	.1111	.0755	.0356	Reg	9	13.245	1.472	3.124	.0015
					Res	225	105.996	.471		
Hypothesis 11	HSTY	.3165	.2432	.0733	Reg	9	8.915	.991	4.321	.0001
					Res	84	19.256	.229		
	ELTY	.0561	.0184	.0377	Reg	9	4.314	.479	1.486	.1541
					Res	225	72.578	.323		
Hypothesis 12	HSTY	.2172	.1333	.0839	Reg	9	13.703	1.523	2.589	.0110
					Res	84	49.403	.588		
	ELTY	.0455	.0073	.0382	Reg	9	5.230	.581	1.192	.3013
					Res	225	109.731	.488		
Hypothesis 13	HSTY	.2277	.1450	.0827	Reg	9	5.562	.618	2.752	.0072
					Res	84	18.864	.225		
	ELTY	.0949	.0587	.0362	Reg	9	10.911	1.212	2.620	.0067
					Res	225	104.101	.463		

Table 29. Analyses of Variance for Hypotheses 10 - 16 Continued.

		R^2	Adj R^2	Shrinkage	Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Signif F
	HSTY	.1437	.0520	.0917	Reg	9	6.950	.7722	1.567	.1387
					Res	84	41.405	.493		
Hypothesis 14										
					Reg	9	28.525	3.169	4.884	.0000
	ELTY	.1632	.1300	.0334	Res	225	146.024	.649		
	HSTY	.1526	.0619	.0907	Reg	9	10.262	1.140	1.681	.1063
					Res	84	56.972	.678		
Hypothesis 15										
					Reg	9	12.153	1.350	1.822	.0654
	ELTY	.0679	.0307	.0372	Res	225	166.745	.741		
	HSTY	.3475	.2776	.0699	Reg	9	6.451	.717	4.970	.0000
					Res	84	12.114	.144		
Hypothesis 16										
					Reg	9	9.453	1.050	3.134	.0014
	ELTY	.1114	.0759	.0355	Res	225	75.396	.335		

Summary of Findings

The findings in this chapter have been summarized under the six types of parent involvement investigated. Many findings did meet the high confidence level set by the researcher and those results are strongly presented. However, the reader is reminded that the study uses Guilford's theory of suspended judgment for findings that were not conclusive. In those cases, the researcher has used terms which are less definite in describing the results, i.e. there was some indication...the evidence pointed to...some evidence as to a relationship. These results offer clues and information about possible factors which may relate to how parents and teachers perceive types of parent involvement and should not be ignored. These findings are presented in Tables 30 through 34.

Parenting. For high school parents, there was some indication that the combined effect of the way parents viewed the school, their perception of their child's success in school, the amount of effort that the school put forth in trying to involve parents plus gender, income, number of adults in the home and the level of education does impact whether or not and to what degree that parents positively perceived and participated in high school parenting programs. Female parents were more positive about the school's program of parenting information than male parents. Families with lower income levels also had a more favorable attitude about the school's current program of parenting information than high income level families. Higher income level families tended to perceive the school's program of providing parenting information and activities as needing improvement.

The same factors for elementary and middle school parents clearly influenced the way many elementary and middle school parents perceived the school program of providing parenting information and activities. When parents viewed the school as a "good place for students, parents, and teachers," and when parents felt that their child was learning in school and liking school, then those parents indicated a positive

perception of the school providing a satisfactory program of parenting information and activities.

The factors investigated for high school teachers offered some indication that the school program of parenting information about adolescent development and behavior was currently strong and did not need to be improved or developed. Many elementary and middle school teachers perceived their current school programs of offering parenting information as being strong.

Communicating. There is some evidence though not conclusive that the investigated factors overall did affect high school parent perceptions of their school program of communicating with them. The evidence pointed to a relationship that as parent income level decreased, parents perceived the school-home communication link being done very well whereas families with higher incomes perceived the program of communication as needing to be improved.

The evidence was strong that parental view of the school and the success of their child in school and family background factors strongly influenced the way elementary and middle school parents perceived the school program of communicating with them. If parents viewed the school as a caring, learning environment for their child and welcoming for them, then they were more likely to perceive the school program of communicating as being satisfactory. There was some evidence that the amount of school effort extended in communicating with parents played a role in parent communication with the school. There was some indication of a pattern that the lower the income level of families, the more likely parents were to view communication as being satisfactory whereas parents with higher income levels tended to want improved communication with the school.

Based upon the investigative factors of teacher perception of parents' ability to help their child, the importance of parent involvement, support from others (other teachers, administrators, and parents), education level, experience, and number taught per

day or classroom structure, many high school teachers perceived the school program of communicating with parents as being a strong program and not needing development or improvement. Using the same factors for elementary and middle school teachers, no pattern emerged indicating that these teachers perceived the school program of communication to be strong or needing to be developed or strengthened.

Volunteering. There was some indication for high school parents that the factors of view of the school, whether their child received good grades and liked school, the amount of effort extended by the school in seeking volunteers, and the factors of gender, income level, education level, and number of adults in the household did influence whether parents thought the school sought and utilized volunteers in the school program. Parents who perceived their child as a successful student liking school and households with two or more adults were more likely to view the school program of utilizing volunteers as being satisfactory.

The investigative factors for elementary and middle school parents did indicate whether or not parents perceived the school program of using volunteers as being strong. Parents who viewed the school as a positive environment for children and adults, parents who felt that their child was a successful student and liked school, parents who thought the school extended effort to involve parents as volunteers, and female parents were more likely to perceive the school program of volunteerism as being very strong. There was also some indication that as the number of adults in the household increased that this played a part in determining how parents perceived the school program of volunteerism.

Evidence pointed to high school teachers perceiving the current school program as being strong and not needing to be developed or improved. The elementary and middle school teacher perceptions toward the school program of volunteerism exhibited no pattern according to the investigative factors.

Helping with Homework. The investigative factors did not offer any patterns as to how parents of high school students perceived the school program of helping parents help their child with homework.

For parents at the elementary and middle school level, patterns emerged based upon the identified factors as to how parents perceived the school program of assisting with homework. The more favorably they felt about the school being a positive place for children and adults and the more parents thought the school was doing a good job of working with parents, the better they perceived the school program of helping parents help with homework. The evidence indicated that if parents perceived their child to be achieving in school and liking school, and if there was more than one adult in the house, and if family income level was lower, parents were more likely to perceive the school program to be satisfactory.

For teachers of both high school, and elementary and middle school levels, the investigative factors did indicate that each group perceived the current school program of helping parents to help with their child's homework to be strong and not needing development or improvement.

Involving Parents in Decision-making or Leadership. At the high school parent level, the investigative factors did not explain whether or not parents perceived the school program of involving parents in decision-making and leadership to be strong or needing to be developed or improved.

Parent perception of the elementary and middle school program of involvement of parents in decision-making and leadership was influenced by the investigative factors. If parents thought the school made a positive effort to involve them in decision-making and leadership, then they perceived the school program more favorably. There was some indication that if parents perceived their child as being successful and liking school, then

they were more likely to view the school program of involving parents in leadership more positively.

For high school teachers, the investigative factors did not offer any explanation of the how high school teachers perceived the school program of involving parents in decision-making and leadership. The same factors did influence how elementary and middle school teachers perceived the school program of involving parents in decision-making. Believing that parents had strengths that could be utilized, that involving parents was important, that others (teachers, administrators, and parents) supported parent involvement, education level, years of experience, and classroom structure were important factors influencing how elementary and middle school teachers perceived the school program of involving parents in decision-making and leadership.

Informing Parents about Community Services and Resources. The factors investigated in this study did not offer any explanation regarding how high school parents perceived the school program to inform them about services and resources for families in the community.

At the elementary and middle school level, viewing the school as a positive place for children and adults, viewing their child as a successful student liking school, feeling that the school was trying to involve them, and the factors of gender, number of adults in household, income level, and education did indicate a pattern for a positive parent perception of a strong school program to inform them about community services and resources.

There was no pattern created by the investigative factors for high school teachers in how they perceived the school program to inform parents about community services and resources. There was some indication for teachers at the elementary and middle school levels that the factors were important in explaining how teachers perceived the school program of informing parents about community services and resources.

Table 30 . Summary of Findings for Multiple Regression Analyses of Combined Effect of Variables

Type of Involvement	Group	Independent Variable	Decision at $\alpha = .01$	Signif. Variation
	High School Parents	Combined effect of Variables		
Parenting			Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
Communicating			Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
Volunteering			Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
Help with Hmwork			Retain Null	No
Decision-making			Retain Null	No
Community Services			Retain Null	No
All Types			Reject Null	Yes
	Elem/Middle Sch Parents	Combined Effect of Variables		
Parenting			Reject Null	Yes
Communicating			Reject Null	Yes
Volunteering			Reject Null	Yes
Help with Hmwork			Reject Null	Yes
Decision-making			Reject Null	Yes
Community Services			Reject Null	Yes
All Types			Reject Null	Yes
	High School Teachers	Combined Effect of Variables		
Parenting			Suspend Judgment	Maybe
Communicating			Reject Null	Yes
Volunteering			Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
Help with Hmwork			Reject Null	Yes
Decision-making			Retain Null	No
Community Services			Retain Null	No
All Types			Reject Null	Yes
	Elem/Middle SchTeachers	Combined Effect of Variables		
Parenting			Reject Null	Yes
Communicating			Retain Null	No
Volunteering			Retain Null	No
Help with Hmwork			Reject Null	Yes
Decision-making			Reject Null	Yes
Community Services			Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
All Types			Reject Null	Yes

Table 31. Summary of Results from Multiple Regression Predictive Analysis of Each Independent Variable for High School Parents

Type of Involvement	Name of Variable	Decision at $\alpha = .01$	Signif. Variation
Parenting	View of School	Retain Null	No
	Child's Success	Retain Null	No
	School Effort	Retain Null	No
	Gender	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
	Adults in Hshld	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
Communicating	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Reject Null	Yes
	School Effort	Reject Null	Yes
	Gender	Reject Null	Yes
	Adults in Hshld	Reject Null	Yes
	Education Level	Reject Null	Yes
	Income Level	Suspend Judgement	Maybe
Volunteering	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
	School Effort	Reject Null	Yes
	Gender	Reject Null	Yes
	Adults in Hshld	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
	Education Level	Reject Null	Yes
	Income Level	Reject Null	Yes
Help with Homework	View of School	Retain Null	No
	Child's Success	Retain Null	No
	School Effort	Retain Null	No
	Gender	Retain Null	No
	Adults in Hshld	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Retain Null	No
Decision-making	View of School	Retain Null	No
	Child's Success	Retain Null	No
	School Effort	Retain Null	No
	Gender	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
	Adults in Hshld	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Retain Null	No

Table 31. Summary of Results from Multiple Regression Predictive Analysis of Each Independent Variable for High School Parents (Cont.)

Type of Involvement	Name of Variable	Decision at $\alpha = .01$	Signif. Contribution
Community Services	View of School	Retain Null	No
	Child's Success	Retain Null	No
	School Effort	Retain Null	No
	Gender	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
	Adults in Household	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Retain Null	No
All Types	View of School	Retain Null	No
	Child's Success	Retain Null	No
	School Effort	Retain Null	No
	Gender	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe
	Adults in Household	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Suspend Judgmnt	Maybe

Table 32. Summary of Results from Multiple Regression Predictive Analysis of Each Independent Variable for Elementary and Middle School Parents

Type of Involvement	Name of Variable	Decision at $\alpha = .01$	Signif. Contribution
Parenting	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Retain Null	No
	School Effort	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
	Gender	Retain Null	No
	Adults in Household	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Reject Null	Yes
	Income Level	Retain Null	No
Communicating	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Reject Null	Yes
	School Effort	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
	Gender	Retain Null	No
	Adults in Household	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Suspend Judgement	Maybe
Volunteering	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Reject Null	Yes
	School Effort	Reject Null	Yes
	Gender	Reject Null	Yes
	Adults in Household	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Retain Null	No
Help with Homework	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
	School Effort	Reject Null	Yes
	Gender	Retain Null	No
	Adults in Household	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
Decision-making	View of School	Retain Null	No
	Child's Success	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
	School Effort	Reject Null	Yes
	Gender	Retain Null	No
	Adults in Household	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Retain Null	No

Table 32. Summary of Results from Multiple Regression Predictive Analysis of Each Independent Variable for Elementary and Middle School Parents (Cont.)

Type of Involvement	Name of Variable	Decision at $\alpha = .01$	Signif. Contribution
Community Services	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Retain Null	No
	School Effort	Reject Null	Yes
	Gender	Reject Null	Yes
	Adults in Household	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
	Income Level	Retain Null	No
All Types	View of School	Reject Null	Yes
	Child's Success	Reject Null	Yes
	School Effort	Reject Null	Yes
	Gender	Suspend Judgement	Maybe
	Adults in Household	Retain Null	No
	Education Level	Retain Null	No
	Income Level	Suspend Judgement	Maybe

Table 33. Pearson Product Moment Correlations for High School Parent Perceptions and Practices

Type of Involvement	Correlation with Practice of that Type	Decision at α=.01	Signif. Correlation
Parenting	.1171	Retain	No
Communicating	.3238	Reject	Yes
Volunteering	-.0684	Retain	No
Help with Homework	.2289	Suspend Judgment	Maybe
Decision-making	.2195	Reject	Yes
Community Services	.0179	Reject	Yes
All Types	.2453	Suspend Judgment	Maybe

Table 34. Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Elementary/Middle School Parent Perceptions and Practices

Type of Involvement	Correlation with Practice of that Type	Decision at α=.01	Signif. Correlation
Parenting	.0777	Retain	No
Communicating	.1974	Reject	Yes
Volunteering	.3633	Reject	Yes
Help with Homework	.2631	Reject	Yes
Decision-making	.2368	Reject	Yes
Community Services	.0687	Retain	No
All Types	.3378	Reject	Yes

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research and school involvement practices based upon the data gathered during the study.

Summary

Historically, collaboration between the home and school has not been the dominant model for the education of youth. In spite of the trend of schools recognizing the differences in background and environmental factors for children, the effort to involve parents has been painstakingly minimal. Early sociological theories emphasized the importance of separating the home and the school. However, recent theories emphasize the inter-relatedness of families and schools. The family unit has become a permeable unit no longer defined as it once was. Families nowadays face increasing demands and threats that fifty years ago were not even imagined. Some of those demands and threats are Aids, single-parent households, family break-down, low income and poverty, inadequate health care, family mobility, television and movie violence, crime and violence in the home and in the neighborhood, and mental pressures caused by a fast-paced society (Swick and Graves, 1993; Cowan and Cowan, 1992; Bennett, 1993; Capuzzi and Cross, 1989; Finnery, 1993). Coleman (1990) outlined the conditions in the home and in the community that he considers to be necessary to meet children's educational and developmental needs and has described how the conditions are being eroded in

contemporary society. Coleman postulates that it is important for children's development that "social capital" in the form of norms and social networks, involving relationships between adults and children, be available in the child's home and community, since it is in such networks that people develop shared aspirations, provide mutual aid and support, especially in time of need, exchange information, define and uphold standards, and learn how to make use of community resources. Coleman continues by asserting that these conditions contribute to the development in children of basic attachments, attitudes, a willingness to make certain efforts, and concepts of self-esteem, all of which work to children's advantage when they go to school (1990).

Outside the family, schools are another primary ecological context in which children learn. Schools have tried to keep pace with the changes and demands that this country has exerted upon its education system. Today's schools need families and today's families need the schools; this mutual need may be the greatest hope for change (Rich, 1987).

Joyce Epstein, 1991, developed an ecological emphatic theory of overlapping spheres in which the contexts of home, school, and community create an environment that directly affects how well a child learns in school and how successful he/she is in life. The social organizational perspective posited that the most effective relationship for families and schools contains overlapping shared goals and missions concerning children. She developed a typology of six types of parent involvement and collaboration with the school. Those types are school programs of parenting information and activities, school-home two-way communication, recruiting parent volunteers, helping parents help their children with homework, involving parents in decision-making and leadership activities, and informing parents about community services and resources.

The focus of this study was to determine if certain identified factors influenced the perceptions that parents have of a school program of parent involvement. The identified variables were perception of view of school as being good for parents, students, and teachers; perception of success that parent(s) have of their child; perception of effort that the school extends to parents; and demographic variables of gender, adults in household, education level, and income level. The study was designed to see whether parents with different backgrounds perceived the types of parent involvement in different ways and if those perceptions were related to backgrounds. The perceptions of view of school, success of child in school, and effort of the school determined whether or not these factors influenced the type of involvement that parents used. The independent variables were also examined to determine whether each would offer a unique and significant contribution to the predictability of each of the dependent variables. This study also offers strength to and applicability of Epstein's theory of overlapping spheres of influence relating to the context of homes of families with children attending public schools in Montana and to the context of Montana public schools.

Joyce Epstein and her associates at Johns Hopkins Center on Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning developed and then in 1993, revised the questionnaires. The data from responses to those surveys were generated in the original *Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public School s*. The instrument for parents has ten questions with over 125 items of information on family attitudes about the school, family practices of involvement in their child's education, school practices to inform and involve families, information desired by families about their child's classes, schools, and community services, homework patterns, family background and experiences, and open-ended comments. The instrument for teachers included twelve questions with over 125 items of information on teacher attitudes about involvement, estimates of support for

involvement by other educators, parents, and the community, teaching experiences, background, and open-ended comments.

Four hundred and thirty parents with children in high school or elementary and middle school responded, and 329 teachers at the high school level and the elementary/middle school level participated in the survey. A Pearson Product Moment and multiple regression techniques analyzed the participants' responses to determine the collective and separate influence of the independent variables.

The dependent variables were the six types of parent involvement with a seventh variable comprised of all six types of parent involvement. The dependent variables identified for parents and teachers in this investigation were:

1) Type I - Parenting
2) Type II - Communicating
3) Type III - Volunteering
4) Type IV - Helping with Homework
5) Type V - Decision-making and Leadership
6) Type VI - Informing about Community Services and Resources
7) Type VII - All Types

The independent variables for parents included:

8) View
9) Success
10) Effort
11) Gender
12) Adults in Household
13) Education Level
14) Income Level

The independent variables for teachers included:

15) Strengths
16) Importance
17) Support-Teachers
18) Support-Administrators
19) Support-Parents
20) Gender
21) Experience
22) Number of Students or Classroom Structure
23) Education Level

Data for the original study was descriptive. The Center for Community School Development and Testing Services at Montana State University-Bozeman conducted the study in the spring and fall of 1994.

Validity

The survey instruments used in this study were developed by a group of teachers and parents in inner city schools in Baltimore, Maryland. The Baltimore group and the sample in this study may not be comparable. Therefore, the questionnaires may or may not measure parent and teacher responses from the two groups similarly. Comparisons of the two groups based upon the findings may not be accurate.

Validity scales for the surveys were not established by the Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning at Johns Hopkins University. Numerous studies on parent involvement in schools in various parts of this country have been conducted using these surveys and instructions on the use, organization of data, and interpretation of the data are provided with the survey forms. Researchers at Johns

Hopkins, other researchers, and this researcher have relied on face validity in that the instrument appears to measure what it was designed to measure.

Conclusions

1. Comparing the results at elementary and middle school level with the high school level in this study showed that overall, elementary and middle school parents perceived a stronger, more positive school program of parent involvement than high school parents did. Historically, parent involvement programs at the elementary and middle school level have been more defined and involved larger numbers of parents. Parents find it easier to communicate with one teacher or a team of teachers at the elementary and middle school level than with six or seven teachers in six or seven disciplines at the high school level. Parents may also feel more confident in understanding the learning and behavior that is expected of children at earlier ages. Children at earlier ages may be more eager to share and they are expected to talk about school happenings at home. Gotts and Purnell (1986) note, there have been few studies of parent involvement at the secondary level but those studies indicate that parents at the secondary level should participate in schools in much the same way as do parents at the elementary level. While evidence in this study showed that high school parents tended toward a favorable perception of the school program, the evidence was stronger for parents of the younger level. This in itself is a good sign because according to a study done by Ramirez and Douglas, the earlier that parents become involved with the schooling of their children, the more comprehensive and the longer lasting their involvement, the stronger and more positive will be the effects upon their children (1989).

2. In this study, female parents perceived school programs of parenting information and activities, of volunteering, and of informing parents about community services and

resources to help families more favorably than male parents did. These types of involvement may be of greater interest to women or women may have a greater need for these programs than men because in the past, female parents have had more time and have been more involved in their children's schooling particularly at younger ages. Mothers are often considered to be the primary care-givers in the family in spite of the increasing number of women now working outside the home part- or full-time (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). This study indicates that many male parents did not perceive programs of involvement as strongly as females as explained by the identified variables. It may be that males have not viewed themselves as participants in their child's schooling. Levine postulates that schools may not expect men to be involved and therefore, make little effort to involve them (1993). Levine reports benefits to children, fathers, and families when early childcare programs and kindergarten through high schools programs involve male parents. When the schools make an effort to welcome males and expect them to be involved, then fathers become much more active participants.

3. Parents who perceive the school program of parent involvement favorably and are more involved with the school view the school more positively at both the high school and elementary and middle school levels. This finding concurs with the findings of other researchers. In one study, involved parents found how hard teachers work; they understood what was being taught and rated the teacher as a better teacher (Epstein, 1985). Becher (1984) reported that parent involvement programs led to parents developing a positive attitude about school personnel and that these programs also increased the parent's self confidence. Epstein (1992) states "the research suggests that students at all levels do better academic work and have more positive school attitudes, higher aspirations, and other positive behaviors if they have parents who are aware, knowledgeable, encouraging, and involved. The summaries of research on parent

involvement by Henderson and Berla (1994) reported that parents have more confidence in the school, parents receive more respect from their child's teachers and teachers have higher expectations for children, parents offer more support to the school, student achievement is higher, and teachers are rated higher by parents.

4. When schools make an concerted effort to involve parents, then parents perceive the school program of involvement more favorably and are more likely to participate. Other research supports this finding. Schools that help families feel welcome and show them how to improve learning at home are likely to have more support from parents and motivated students (Bempechat 1992: Epstein 1991). Studies show that school practices to encourage parents to participate in their children's education are more important than family characteristics like parental education, family size, marital status, socioeconomic level, or student grade level in determining whether parents get involved (Dauber; Epstein 1993).

5. Parents with higher income levels perceived a need for more parent involvement; parents with lower income levels generally perceived the school program of parent involvement as being strong. Parents with higher income levels may have higher-paying jobs which require higher levels of self-confidence or functioning and therefore, have higher expectations of teachers and schools. Low income families may be more inclined to not expect as much contact with the school. Some of Bandura's work on personal efficacy considers the influence of beliefs that one is capable of achieving specific outcomes on behavior choices. His work suggests that persons higher in efficacy will be more likely be more persistent in the face of obstacles than will persons with a lower sense of efficacy (cited in Hoover-Dempsey et al, 1992). Hoover-Dempsey et al found in their study a link between parent education level and this sense of efficacy while gender, marital status, employment status, or family income did not correlate. The findings in this

Montana study did not strongly align with the Hoover-Dempsey findings regarding parent income. Income level not education level played a significant role in how some Montana parents perceived the school program of involvement. An effort to involve lower income families is critical because they often remain distant from the school waiting for the school to contact them. Such families may have increasing difficulty in helping their children with academics as the children progress through the grade levels (Lee; Croninger, 1994).

6. Education level of the parent did not play a significant role in explaining or predicting many of the types of parent involvement. High school parents with lower education levels perceived the school program of parent involvement in communicating and volunteering as being strong whereas parents with higher education levels perceived a need to improve communication and volunteerism. The previously discussed reasoning on self-efficacy may help to explain this finding.

7. Based upon the findings in this study, when elementary and middle school level parents thought that their child was achieving in school and liking school, they perceived the school program of involvement in communicating, volunteering, helping with homework, and decision-making as being strong. High school parents had similar perceptions about school programs of communicating and volunteering. Research has found that there is a positive connection between student achievements and parent satisfaction with the school (Henderson and Berla, 1994; Herman and Yeh, 1980).

8. For the most part, the evidence in this study showed that the eight identified factors for high school teachers and elementary and middle school teachers did offer some explanation of how the teacher groups perceived the school program of parent involvement. High school teachers perceived the school programs of communicating, helping with homework and volunteering as being strong and not needing to be changed. This may occur because parents tend to be involved in fewer more limited ways in high

school programs than elementary and middle school programs which may offer a variety of ways to involve parents. For example, high school teachers may perceive midterm reports, quarter reports, and one parent-teacher conference a year as being a satisfactory program of communication whereas elementary teachers may not feel that kind and amount of contact is sufficient. Teachers of younger children may have stronger philosophical beliefs about the need to involve parents and how it should be done than high school teachers have. Secondary school teachers sometimes interpret the lack of parent presence in high schools as indicating a lack of parent concern for education (Henderson, 1986). In other words, parents that teachers in self-contained classrooms develop with the parents of their students.

Recommendations

This section of the final chapter will offer recommendations to the educational researcher and to the field practitioner as a result of this study.

Recommendations for the Educational Researcher

First, another study utilizing a simplified survey form might garner a higher return rate from parents from lower income groups and lower education levels. This might provide a more representative sampling of parents with children enrolled in public schools in Montana.

Second, a study which uses other variables might better explain parent perception of types of involvement. Factors such as age of parent, number of children, position of child in the family unit, parent perception of self efficacy, parent perception of the school's role in teaching values and societal expectations are factors that could be examined.

Third, a study using actual indicators of student success such as earned grades, aptitude test scores in mathematics or language skills or another discipline, rate of school attendance, student attitude scales toward school, follow-up of student enrollment in post-secondary education, and parent/community support of the school in terms of numbers of volunteers in the system or passing of school mill levies would provide valuable data to decision-makers.

Fourth, a study employing other teacher variables may offer more explanation and/or prediction of parent involvement. Factors like undergraduate training and amount of postgraduate training relating to parent involvement should be investigated.

Fifth, a study is needed to analyze the teacher variables used in this study individually to determine which of the variables can predict a pattern of teacher perception and practice.

Sixth, a study examining parent perceptions and practices and student achievement before and after a concerted program of parent involvement was enacted by the school would be beneficial to decision-makers.

Recommendations for the Field Practitioner

First, schools need to evaluate their present programs of parent involvement by determining what they are presently doing, asking which parents are involved, how many are not involved and try to identify reasons for non-involvement. Input should be gathered from teachers and a representative cross section of the parents if not all parents. This is very important at both levels but especially at the high school level because of the findings in the study. When gaps are identified and needs assessed, then the various groups can decide on ways that would fill the gaps and address needs. The very act of doing this shows parents that the school is willing to involve parents as partners in the

schooling of their children which according to the research will lead to other positive ramifications for the school.

Second, based on the results of this study, schools should continue programs which emphasize activities for mothers or related females in the areas of communicating and volunteering at the high school level, and informing mothers about community services at the elementary and middle school level. Schools should consider an effort to get fathers or related males more involved in schools may improve male perception of the school program of parent involvement. This might include looking at flexible time schedules for communication or involvement activities, building partnerships with businesses and organizations in the community to arrange release time for parents, providing school activities other than sports events on Saturdays, and inviting parents to be involved.

Third, schools should involve parents in the school program at all levels because as parents become more familiar with the school and its personnel, they understand the program and reasons for changes; then they view the school more favorably. This has implications for schools having difficulty garnering support from the community. Parents could serve as liaisons between the school and the community talking about the school and its personnel in positive, assertive ways to build support for mill levies and fund-raising, attendance at functions, and a general sense of pride in the community.

Fourth, when parents perceive the school effort in involving parents as being strong whether they participate or not, then parents are more likely to view the school as a good place for children and adults and a productive place for learning. Therefore, even if the rate of visible participation does not appear to be high, schools should continue efforts to involve parents because parents are more likely to support the school because of the welcoming nature of the program.

Fifth, although this recommendation ties closely with the first recommendation, it is important to list it separately. It appears that there is a need for more communication between some parents and the school. While lower income level parents perceived a strong program of parent involvement, many parents at higher income levels felt that the program of communication needed to be strengthened. Parents with higher income levels indicated that they felt a need to connect more closely with the school. Identifying the kinds of feedback and input that these parents desire would help a school meet those needs. By creating better lines of communication, this may open doors for parents who perceive the school program of communication as being satisfactory. Single parents indicated a strong need for schools to improve communication. These parents may be in situations with work and/or providing childcare that keep them from becoming involved; therefore, communication becomes very important to them.

Sixth, school curriculums that keep children achieving in and liking school portend positive parental attitudes toward the school. Parents are more likely to be positively involved in communicating with the school, volunteering, decision-making, and helping their child with homework.

Seventh, based upon the findings from this study, teachers tended to perceive many aspects of the school program as being strong and not needing to be changed. This finding was not always supported by parents who perceived a need to improve a type of involvement. Inservice training or conferences might be one way for schools to emphasize the importance of parent involvement, to build understanding, and to help teachers develop strategies to positively involve parents.

Creating school programs of parent involvement offers a way to build a partnership that will benefit families and schools. What children learn at school can be reinforced at home and what children learn at home can be reinforced at school. When

these two spheres of influence overlap and partnerships are formed, then children, families, and the school do better academically, socially, and personally. This in turn benefits both the community and society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderman, M. K. (1990). Motivation for at-risk students. *Educational Leadership,* 48 (1) pp. 27-30.

Becker, H. J., and Epstein, J. L. (1982). Influences on teachers' use of parent involvement at home (Report No., 324). Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Becker, B. J., and Hedges, L. V. (1992). A review of the literature on the effectiveness of Comer's School development program. Michigan State University and the University of Chicago. (Available through the Comer school Development Program.)

Bempechat, J. (1992). The role of parent involvement in children's academic achievement. *School Community Journal,* 2(2), 31-4.

Benson, C. S., Buckley, S. and Medrich, E. (1980) Families as educators: Time use contributions to school achievement, J. Cuthrie, (ed.), *School Finance Policy in the 1980's: A Decade of Conflict.* Cambridge: Ballinger.

Berger, E. H. (1991). Parent involvement: Yesterday and today. *The Elementary School Journal,* 91 (3), 209-220.

Bloom, B. S. (1964). *Stability and change in human characteristics.* New York: Wiley.

Bogenschneider, K., Small, S., and Riley, D. (1990). *An ecological risk-focused approach for addressing youth-at-risk issues.* Chevy Chase, MD: National 4-H Center.

Borg, W.R. and Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research.* New York: Longman.

Brandt, R. (1989). On parents and schools: A conversation with Joyce Epstein. *Educational Leadership,* October, pp. 24-27.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). *Is early intervention effective? A report on longitudinal evaluations of preschool programs.* Vol. II. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Bronfenfrenner, U. (1979). *The ecolcogy of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caterall, J. S. (1986). Dropping out of school: The dollar impact on society. *Education,* 4(1), 8-13.

Capuzzi, D. and Cross, D. R. (1989). *Youth at risk: A resource for counselors, teachers, and parents.* Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Chavkin, N. F. and Williams, D. L. (1987). Enhancing parent involvement: Guidelines for access to an important resource for school administrators. *Education and Urban Society* 19, pp.164-184.

Children's Defense Fund, (1991). *The state of America's children 1991.* Washington, D.C.

Chrisapeels, J. A. (1987). The family as an educational resource. *Community Educational Journal,* 14, pp. 10-17.

Christenson, S. L. and Conoley, J. C. (1992). *Home-school Collaboration: Enhancing children's academic and social competence,* The National Association of School Psychologists: Silver Spring, Maryland.

Clark, R. (1983). *Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed or fail.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Comer, J. P. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American,* 259(5), 42-48.

Comer, J. P. (1986). Parent participation in the schools. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 67, 442-446.

Coontz, S. (1989). America's families: Rhetoric and reality. Seattle P.I., A Hearst Newspaper, D4.

Cowan, C. and Cowan, P. (1992). *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples.* New York: Basic Books.

Dauber, S. L. and Epstein, J. L. (1993). Parents' attitudes and practices of involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. In N. F. Chavkin (Ed.). *Families and Schools in a Pluralistic Society* (pp. 53-71). Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Earls, F. (1986). A developmental perspective on psychosocial stress in childhood. In M. W. Yogman and T. B. Brazelton (Eds.). *In Support of Families.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective school for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership,* 37(3), pp.15-18.

Elkind, D. (1995). School and family in the postmodern world. *Phi Delta Kappan,* September, 77 (1), pp. 8-14.

Epstein, J. L. (1995). Perspectives and previews on research and policy for school, family, and community partnerships. In A. Booth and J. Dunn, (Eds.)., *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes?* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Epstein, J. L., Salinas, K. C., and Horsey, C. S. (1994). Reliabilities and summaries of scales: School and family partnership surveys of teachers and parents in the elementary and middle grades. Report P-85, , Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, and Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Epstein, J. L. (1991). Effects on student achievement of teacher practices of parent involvement. In S. Silvern (Ed.), *Advances in reading/language research, Vol. 5. Literacy through family, community and school interaction.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Epstein, J. L., and Salinas, K. (1988). Evaluation report forms: Summaries of school-level data from surveys of teachers and surveys of parents. Parent Involvement Report series P-82. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Epstein, J. L. (1987). What principals should know about parent involvement. *Principal,* 66 (3), 6-9.

Epstein, J. L. (1987). Parent involvement: What research says to administrators. *Education and Urban Society,* 19, 119-36.

Epstein, J. L. (1986). Parents' reactions to teacher practices of parent involvement. *Elementary School Journal,* 86, pp. 277-294.

Epstein, J. L. (1985). A question of merit: Principals' and parents' evaluations of teachers. *Educational Researcher,* 14, (7), pp. 3-10.

Epstein, J. L., and Becker, H.J. (1990). Hopkins Surveys of School and Family Connections: Questionnaires for Teachers, Parents, and Students. Parent Involvement Series, Report P-81. In J. Touliatos, B. Perlmutter, and M. Straus (Eds.), *Handbook of Family Measurement Techniques.*

Epstein, J. L., and Dauber, S. (1991). School programs and teacher practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. *Elementary School Journal,* 91, 289-303.

Ferguson, G. A., and Takane, O. (1989). *Statistical analysis in psychology and education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Finnery, P. (1993). The PTA/Newsweek national education survey. *Newsweek.* May 17.

Flaxman, E. and Inger, M. (1991). Parents and schooling in the 1990s. *The ERIC Review.* 1(3), pp. 2-6.

Ford, D. and Lerner, R. (1992). *Developmental theory: An inegrative approach.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Garbarino, J. (1982). *Children and families in the social environment.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine deGruyter.

Gibbs, T. (1990, October 8). Shameful bequests to the next generation. *Time,* pp. 42-46.

Guilford, J. P. (1956). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hamburg, D. (1992). *Today's children: Creating a future for a generation in crisis.* New York: Basic Books.

Hamby, J. V. (1992). The school-family link: A key to dropout prevention. In L. Kaplan (Ed.), *Education and the family.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Henderson, A. T. and Berla, N. Eds. (1994). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement.* Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Herman, J. and Yen, J. (1980). *Some effects of parent involvement in schools.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April.

Hewlitt, S. (1991). *When the bough breaks: The cost of neglecting our children.* New York: Basic Books.

Holden, M. L. (1990). Recommendations for increasing parent involvement at Ryan Primary in Nelson County, Virginia. (Report No. PS019721). Virginia: University of Virginia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 334 014)

Kagan, S. L. and Schraft, C. M. (1983). Developing parent commitment to public education: New directions for the 1980's. In R. L. Sinclair (Ed.), *For every School A Community.* Boston University: Institute for Responsive Education.

Kaufman, P., and Frase, M. J. (1990). *Dropout rates in the United States: 1989.* Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Kellaghan, T., Sloane, K., Alvarez, B., and Bloom, B. S. (1993). *The home environment and school learning: Promoting parental involvement in the education of children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kerlinger, F. N. and Pedhazur, E. J. (1973). *Multiple regression in behavioral research.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Kidder, T. (1989). *Among school children.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kilbourne, L., Decker, L. E., and Romney, V. A. (1994). *Rebuilding the partnership for public education.* Charlottesville, VA: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education.

Lee, V. E., and Croninger, R. G. (1994). The relative importance of home and school in the development of literacy skills for middle-grade students. *American Journal of Education,* 102 (3), 286-329.

Lewis, A. C. (1991). Coordinating services: Do we have the will? *Phi Delta Kappan,* 72(5), 376-382.

Levin, H. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership,* 44(6), 19-21.

Levine, J. A., Murphy, D. T. and Wilson, S. W. (1993). *Getting men involved: Strategies for early childhood programs.* New York: Scholastic Inc.

Levine, K. (1982). Functional literacy: Fond illusions and false economies. *Harvard Educational Review.* 52(3), pp. 249-267.

Lindle, J. C. (1995/1996). Lessons from Kentucky about school-based decision making. *Educational Leadership.* 53(4), pp. 20-23.

Lindle, J. C. (1989). What do parents want from principals and teachers? *Educational Leadership,* 47 (2), pp. 8-10.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). *Worlds apart: Relationships between families and schools.* New York: Basic Books.

Litwak, E., and Meyer, H. J. (1974). *School, family, and neighborhood: The theory and practice of school--community relations.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Matuszek, P. (1977). Review of research in parent involvement in education, interim report: Low socio-economic status and minority student achievement study. Texas: Austin Independent School District. ERIC No. ED 161 980.

Meyers, J. and Monson, L. (1992). *Involving families in middle school education.* Columbus: National Middle School Association.

Montana State Accreditation Standards and Procedures Manual, (July, 1992). Helena, Montana: Office of Public Instruction.

Moles, O. (1982). Synthesis of recent research on parent participation in children's education. *Educational Leadership,* 40, pp. 44-47.

Moles, O. C. (1987). Who wants parent involvement? Interests, skills, and opportunities among parents and educators. *Education and Urban Society,* 19(2) pp. 137-145.

Mueller, D. J. (1986). *Measuring social attitudes.* New York: Teachers College Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation At Risk . The Imperative for Educational Reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

Nevo, B., (1985). Face validity revisited. *Journal of Educational Measurement,* 22(4) pp.287-293.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of care and its implications for instructional arrangements. *American Journal of Education,* 96(2), 219-230.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis 1990 update. *School Improvement Research Series.* pp. 18-19, 1990.

Ochoa, A. S. (Ed.)., (1990). *Academic Freedom to teach and to learn: Every teacher's issue.* Washington, DC: NEA Professional Library.

Olson, L. (1990). Parents as partners: Redefining the social contract between parents and schools. [Special Issue]. *Education Week,* 9 (28) pp. 17-24.

Peck, N., Law, A., and Mills, R. C. (1989). *Dropout prevention: What we have learned.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan, ERIC Counseling and Personnel Services Clearinghouse.

Perry, W. and Tannenbaum, M. D. (1992). Parents, power, and the public schools. In L. Kaplan (Ed.), *Education and the family.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Piaget, J. and Inhelder, B. (1969). *The psychology of the child.* New York: Basic Books.

Puma, M. J., Jones, C. C., Rock, D., and Fernandez, R. (1993). in *Strong Families, Strong Schools: Building Community Partnerships for Learning.* p.9. U.S. Department of Education, September, 1994.

Ramirez, J. D. and Douglas, D. (1989). Language minority parents and the school: Can home-school partnerships increase student success? ERIC No. ED 349 349.

Research and Development Report (1995, Sept.). Schools, families, and students get stronger when parents and teachers take collaboration into their own hands, Vol. 6. pp. 1-4. Baltimore: Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning.

Rich, D. (1987). Schools and families: Issues and Actions. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Seeley, D. S. (1985). *Education through partnership.* Washington, DS: National Education Association.

Seeley, D. S. (1989). A new paradigm for parent involvement. *Educational Leadership,* 47(2), pp. 21-23.

Seligman, M., and Darling, R. B. (1989). *Ordinary families, special children.* New York: Guilford Press.

Sinclair, R. (Ed.). (1983). For every school a community: Expanding environments for learning. Boston University: The Institute for Responsive Education.

Skolnick, A. (1991). *Embattled paradise: The American family in an age of uncertainty.* New York: Basic Books.

Squires, D. A. and Kranyik, R. D. (1995/1996). The Comer program: Changing school culture. *Educational Leadership,* 53(4) pp. 29-33.

Stevens, J. (1986). *Applied multivariate statistics of the social sciences.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Storer, J. (1995). Increasing parent and community involvement in schools: The importance of educators' beliefs. *Community Education Journal,* 22(2) Winter.

Swap, S. M. (1993). *Developing Home-school partnerships: From concepts to practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Swap, S.M. (1992). Parent involvement and success for all children: What we know now. In S. L. Christenson and J. C. Conoley (Eds.), *Home-school collaboration: Enhancing children's academic and social competence* . (pp. 53-80) Silver Spring, Maryland: The National Association of School Psychologists.

Swick, K. (1987). Student stress: A classroom management system. *NEA Professional Library.* Washington, DC.

Swick, K. and Graves, S. (1993). *Empowering at-risk families during the early childhood years.* Washington, DC: NEA Publications.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1994). *Educational attainment in the United States: March 1993 and 1992.* Current population reports, P20-476. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1992). Studies in family and household formation. *Current Population Reports,* Series P23-179, Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, p.13.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1988). *Family summit chart.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. Department of Education. (1994). Strong families, strong schools: Building community partnerships for learning. A Research Base for Family Involvement in Learning, September.

Wagstaff, L. and Gallagher, K. (1990). School, families and communities: Idealized images and new realities. In B. Mitchell and L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership and changing contexts--Families, communities and schools.* Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education. 1990.

Waller, K. (1932). *The sociology of teaching.* New York: Russell and Russell.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Weinstein, R. S. (1985). Student mediation of classroom expectancy effects. In J. B. Dusek (Ed.), *Teacher Expectancies*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Werner, E. E. (1990). Protective factors and individuals resilience. In S. J. Meisels & J. P. Shonkoff (Eds.). *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 97-116). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, H. D. (1986). *Students at risk: A review of conditions*. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Wilson, R. (1995). Great things that Gengrich could do. *The Washington Post*, January 10, p. A17.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO MONTANA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Center for Community-School Development and Testing Services
244 Reid Hall
MSU • Bozeman
Bozeman, MT 59717-0296
Telephone (406) 994-6984
Fax (406) 994-1854

February 8, 1994

Montana Education Association
Eric Feaver, President
1232 E. 6th Avenue
Helena. MT 59601

Dear Eric:

Pursuant to our conversation on Monday, February 7, I am forwarding information regarding the Study of Parent Involvement in Montana Public Schools funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Dr. Gloria Gregg of the Center for Community School Development and Field Services at Montana State University will be facilitator for conducting the study.

The purpose of the study is twofold. The first will be to determine perceptions of parents, classroom teachers, and school administrators about the status of and the need for parental involvement in the education of their children. The second goal will be to utilize the information to develop a set of recommendations for various state and local policy makers which would strengthen, increase, and support parent and community involvement in the education of children.

The study is descriptive and uses questionnaires that will be sent to parents, teachers, and administrators. the teacher group needs to be randomly selected classroom teachers based on the following criteria: K-8 and high school grade levels, variations in size of school district, different geographic locations in the state. We will provide you with specific details on criteria and the number of mailings later.

There will be two mailings. The first will be the questionnaire. The second will be a follow-up postcard to all those people to whom the questionnaires were mailed. There may be a possibility of a third follow-up. I will explain this when I visit with you again.

In our conversation, you outlined how this could be accomplished by using a company in Helena that would put labels on our materials and mail them. You indicated that costs would include the production of labels and whatever amount the company would charge plus some miscellaneous costs. You felt that you could determine exact amounts and give those to me in a couple weeks. The target date for mailing the questionnaires to the teachers is the beginning of April.

Your help in expediting this project is greatly appreciated. I will be contacting you by telephone during the week of February 19th. If you have any questions before then, you may contact Dr. Gregg at 994-6984.

Thanks again.

Sincerely,

Cheryl N. Johannes
Graduate Assistant

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
1893 CENTENNIAL 1993

Center for Community-School Development and Field Services

250 Reid Hall
Bozeman, MT 59717-0294

Telephone 406-994-6984
FAX 406-994-2893

April 8, 1994

Montana Education Association
Dave Smith
1232 E. 6th Avenue
Helena, MT 59601

Dear Dave,

This letter is to update you on our return of the parent involvement survey so far. In the first three days of responses coming into our office, we have received 115 of the 750 questionnaires. A large number of the MEA membership have offered additional information on the optional written portion which is exciting.

I am enclosing the postcards that need to be mailed early the week of May 2nd thanking teachers if they have already responded and reminding them to complete and return the questionnaire if they haven't.

There are 255 postcards printed for high school teachers (ten extra have been enclosed). Please affix the high school teacher labels to these postcards and mail. Use the same procedure for the elementary teacher postcards. Five hundred, ten postcards have been enclosed for the elementary/middle school group. There is no need to number these sets.

Thanks to you and your staff for all your cooperation and being so gracious in helping the Center with this study.

Sincerely,

Cheryl N. Johannes

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

May 24, 1994

Dear Parent or Guardian;

Many parents and other community members are interested in finding ways they can be more involved in the public schools in their community. How this might be done in Montana is the focus of a current study being conducted by the Center for Community-School Development and Field Services at MSU. This information will be utilized to develop a set of recommendations for action in Montana. **To do this, we need your help!**

We are seeking information from selected school administrators, school board members, teachers and parents. Input from all of these groups is important so please take about 15-20 minutes to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire.

You will not be identified in any way and the results will only be presented as group data. No one individual or school will be identified. The return envelope is coded but this is only so we can do any necessary follow-up.

A postage paid, pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for you to use in returning the completed questionnaire. If at all possible, we would like the questionnaire back by **May 31, 1994.**

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the results, please print your name and mailing address on the back of the envelope. Do not put it on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for helping us with this important project. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call us at 994-6984.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg
Director

Cheryl Johannes
Research Assistant

SCHOOL AND FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS

Survey of Parents in Elementary and Middle Grades

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING AND RETURNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please read the directions for each section carefully before responding
2. Write all responses **on the questionnaire itself.**
3. All responses are strictly confidential. The number on the return envelope is only for the purpose of follow-up if needed. The results will be reported as group data and no one individual will be identified.
4. When you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the enclosed large, postage paid envelope and drop it in the mail. **PLEASE RETURN NO LATER THAN MAY 31, 1994.**

Again, our sincere thanks for helping us out.

A. **DO YOU HAVE ONE OR MORE CHILDREN BETWEEN THE AGES OF 5 AND 13 ENROLLED IN PUBLIC SCHOOL?** ___ **YES** ___ **NO**

If **NO**, please do **NOT** complete this questionnaire. Return it in the enclosed postage paid envelope.

B. **HOW MANY CHILDREN** ages 5-13 in your family go to public school **THIS YEAR?** (Circle how many.)

1 2 3 4 5 or more

C. What GRADES are they in? CIRCLE ALL of the grades of your children in this school.

PreK Kindergarten Grade 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Other(Specify_____)

D. This booklet should be answered by the **PARENT** or **GUARDIAN** who has the **MOST CONTACT** with the school about your oldest child aged 5 through 13.

Who is filling in the booklet? **PLEASE CHECK IF YOU ARE . . .**

___ mother	___ aunt	___ guardian
___ father	___ uncle	___ other relative
___ stepmother	___ grandmother	___ other (describe)
___ stepfather	___ grandfather	_____

E. If you have more than one child between the ages of 5 and 13 enrolled in public school, please answer the questions in the booklet about your **OLDEST CHILD** at school in that age group.

Is your oldest child in the 5-13 age group a: ___ boy or ___ girl?

This questionnaire was adapted from a series by Epstein and Salinas (1993) titled **School and Family Partnerships: Surveys and Summaries.** Center on Families, Communities, schools and Children's Learning, Johns Hopkins University.

Q-1. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS SCHOOL RIGHT NOW. THIS WILL HELP SCHOOLS PLAN FOR THE FUTURE. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

YES	Means you AGREE STRONGLY with the statement.
yes	Means you AGREE A LITTLE with the statement.
no	Means you DISAGREE A LITTLE with the statement.
NO	Means you DISAGREE STRONGLY with the statement.

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THESE?

a.	This is a very good school.	YES	yes	no	NO
b.	The teachers care about my child.	YES	yes	no	NO
c.	I feel welcome at the school.	YES	yes	no	NO
d.	This school has an active parent organization (e.g., PTA/PTO).	YES	yes	no	NO
e.	My child talks about school at home.	YES	yes	no	NO
f.	My child should get more homework.	YES	yes	no	NO
g.	Many parents I know help out at the school.	YES	yes	no	NO
h.	The school and I have different goals for my child.	YES	yes	no	NO
i.	I feel I can help my child in reading.	YES	yes	no	NO
j.	I feel I can help my child in math.	YES	yes	no	NO
k.	I could help my child more if the teacher gave me more ideas.	YES	yes	no	NO
l.	My child is learning as much as he/she can at this school.	YES	yes	no	NO
m.	Parents at this school get involved more in the younger grades.	YES	yes	no	NO
n.	This school is known for trying new programs.	YES	yes	no	NO
o.	This school views parents as important partners.	YES	yes	no	NO
p.	The community supports this school.	YES	yes	no	NO
q.	This school is one of the best schools for students and for parents.	YES	yes	no	NO

Q-2. SOME FAMILIES WANT MORE INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT THEIR CHILDREN ARE LEARNING IN EACH SUBJECT. CHECK WHICH SUBJECTS YOU WANT TO KNOW MORE ABOUT TO HELP YOUR CHILD.

__ Math skills	__ Social studies	___ Current events
__ Reading skills	__ Science	___ Study skills
__ Writing stories	__ Handwriting	___ Other (describe)
__ Spelling	__ Speaking skills	_____

Q-3. FAMILIES GET INVOLVED IN DIFFERENT WAYS AT SCHOOL OR AT HOME. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING HAVE YOU DONE THIS YEAR WITH THE OLDEST CHILD IN THE 5-13 AGE GROUP YOU HAVE AT THE SCHOOL? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE FOR EACH ITEM.

NEVER	means you do NOT do this or NOT YET this year
1- 2 TIMES	means you have done this ONE or TWO TIMES this year
A FEW TIMES	means you have done this a FEW TIMES this year
MANY TIMES	means you have done this MANY TIMES this year

a.	Talk to my child about school.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
b.	Visit my child's classroom.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
c.	Read to my child.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
d.	Listen to my child read.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
e.	Listen to a story my child wrote.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
f.	Help my child with homework.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
g.	Practice spelling or other skills before a test.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
h.	Talk with my child about a TV show.	NEVER	1- 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
i.	Help my child plan time for homework and chores.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
j.	Talk with my child's teacher at school.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
k.	Talk to my child's teacher on the phone.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
l.	Go to PTA/PTO meetings.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
m.	Check to see that my child has done his/her homework.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
n.	Volunteer at school or in my child's classroom.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
o.	Go to special events at school.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
p.	Take my child to a library.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES
q.	Take my child to special places or events in the community.	NEVER	1 - 2 TIMES	FEW TIMES	MANY TIMES

Q-4. SCHOOLS CONTACT FAMILIES IN DIFFERENT WAYS. <u>CIRCLE ONE CHOICE</u> TO TELL IF THE SCHOOL HAS DONE THESE THINGS THIS YEAR.

DOES NOT DO	means the school DOES NOT DO this
COULD DO BETTER	means the school DOES this but COULD DO BETTER
DOES WELL	means the school DOES this VERY WELL now

	THIS SCHOOL . . .		
a. Help me understand my child's stage of development.	DOES NOT DO	COULD BE BETTER	DOES WELL
b. Tell me how my child is doing in school.	DOES NOT DO	COULD BE BETTER	DOES WELL
c. Tell me what skills my child needs to learn each year.	DOES NOT DO	COULD BE BETTER	DOES WELL
d. Have a parent-teacher conference with me.	DOES NOT DO	COULD BE BETTER	DOES WELL
e. Explain how to check my child's homework.	DOES NOT DO	COULD BE BETTER	DOES WELL
f. Send home news about things happening at school.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
g. Give me information about how report card grades are earned.	DOES NOT DO	COULD BE BETTER	DOES WELL
h. Assign homework that requires my child to talk with me about things learned in class.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
i. Send home clear notices that I can read easily.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
j. Contact me if my child is having problems.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
k. Invite me to programs at the school.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
l. Contact me if my child does something well or improves.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
m. Ask me to volunteer at the school.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
n. Invite me to PTA/PTO meetings.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL
o. Ask me to help with fund raising.	DOES NOT DO	COULD BE BETTER	DOES WELL
p. Include parents on school committees such as curriculum, budgets, and school improvement.	DOES NOT DO	COULD DO BETTER	DOES WELL

Q-5. SOME FAMILIES WANT TO ATTEND WORKSHOPS ON TOPICS THEY WANT TO HEAR MORE ABOUT. CHECK THE ONES THAT INTEREST YOU ... OR SUGGEST A FEW ....

___ How children grow and develop at my child's age
___ How to discipline children
___ Solving school problems and preventing dropping out
___ Preventing health problems
___ How to deal with stress
___ Raising children as a single parent
___ How to help my child develop her/his talents
___ Helping children take tests
___ Understanding middle schools
___ How to serve on a school committee or council
___ Other topics you want?_____

In the past year, did you attend a workshop at the school?

___ No ___ Yes On what topic? _____

Q-6. OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS, HOW MUCH HAS THE SCHOOL INVOLVED YOU AT SCHOOL AND AT HOME?

___ School involved me **less this year** than last
___ School involved me **about the same** in both years
___ School involved me **more this year** than last
___ My child **did not attend** this school last year

Q-7. ALL COMMUNITIES HAVE INFORMATION THAT WOULD HELP FAMILIES. WHICH SERVICES IN YOUR COMMUNITY WOULD YOU LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT? CHECK THE INFORMATION YOU WANT.

___ Health care for children and families
___ Family counseling
___ Job training for parents/adults
___ Adult education
___ Parenting classes
___ Child care
___ After-school tutoring
___ After-school sports activities
___ Other after-school clubs or lessons to develop talents
___ Community service that children can do
___ Summer programs for children
___ Information on museums, shows, and events in the community
___ Other (describe the community information you need)_____ _____
_____

THE LAST QUESTIONS WILL HELP SCHOOLS PLAN NEW PROGRAMS TO MEET FAMILY NEEDS. PLEASE ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR OLDEST CHILD IN THE 5-13 AGE GROUP IN PUBLIC SCHOOL.

Q-8. ABOUT HOMEWORK

a. About how much time DOES your child spend doing homework on most school days?

Minutes my child does homework on most school days: (Circle one.)

none 5-10 25-30 35-45 50-60 over 1 hour

b. How much time do you spend helping your child with homework on an average night?

Minutes of my time: none 5-10 15-20 25-30 35-45 50-60 over 1 hour

c. How much time **could you spend** working with your child if the teacher showed you what to do?

Minutes I could spend: none 5-10 15-20 25-30 35-45 50-60 over 1 hour

d. Do you have time on weekends to work with your child on projects or homework for school?

Yes_____ No_____

Q-9. ABOUT YOUR OLDEST CHILD IN THE 5-13 AGE GROUP AND FAMILY

a. How is your oldest child at this school doing in schoolwork?
- ___ TOP student
- ___ GOOD student
- ___ OK, AVERAGE student
- ___ FAIR student
- ___ POOR student

b. How does your oldest child at this school like school this year?
- ___ Likes school a lot
- ___ Likes school a little
- ___ Does not like school much
- ___ Does not like school at all

c. How often does your oldest child at this school promptly deliver notices home?
- ___ Always
- ___ Usually
- ___ Once in a while
- ___ Never

d. How often does your oldest child at this school complete all homework on time?
- ___ Always
- ___ Usually
- ___ Once in a while
- ___ Never

e. WHEN can you attend conferences, meetings, or workshops at the school? Check all that apply.
- _____ Morning
- _____ Afternoon
- _____ Evening
- _____ Cannot ever attend

f. How many adults live at home?
_____ Adults (include yourself)

g. How many children live at home?
_____ Children

h. What is your highest education? CHECK ONE.
- ___ Did not complete high school
- ___ Completed high school
- ___ Some college or training
- ___ College degree
- ___ Advanced College Degree

i. Are you employed now? CHECK ONE.
- ___ Employed full-time
- ___ Employed part-time
- ___ Not employed now

j. How do you describe yourself?
- ___ African American
- ___ Asian American
- ___ Native American
- ___ Hispanic American
- White

k. What is your yearly income?
- ___ Under $13,000
- ___ $13,001 to $25,000
- ___ $25,001 to $35,000
- ___ $35,001 to $50,000
- ___ Over $50,000

l. (1) Would you be willing to be interviewed by telephone to provide additional information about parent involvement?
____ YES ____ NO

(2) If yes, please provide your name and a telephone number where you can be reached.

Name _____
Work Telephone No. _____
Home Telephone No. _____

Q-10. WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE YOUR IDEAS...

a. What is your greatest concern as a parent?

_____

_____

_____

_____

b. What school practice to involve parents has helped you most, and why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. What is **one thing** that you or your family could do to help this school?

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. What is the best thing that this school could do next year to help you with your child?

_____

_____

_____

_____

e. Any other ideas or suggestions?

_____

HIGH SCHOOL AND FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS
Parent Survey

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING AND RETURNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please read the directions for each section carefully before responding
2. Write all responses **on the questionnaire itself.**
3. All responses are strictly confidential. The number on the return envelope is only for the purpose of follow-up if needed. The results will be reported as group data and no one individual will be identified.
4. When you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the enclosed large, postage paid envelope and drop it in the mail. **PLEASE RETURN NO LATER THAN MAY 31, 1994.**

Again, our sincere thanks for helping us out.

A. **Do you have one or more children between the ages of 14 and 18 enrolled in high school?** __ YES __ NO

If **NO**, please do **NOT** complete this questionnaire. Return it in the enclosed postage paid envelope.

B. **HOW MANY CHILDREN** ages 14-18 in your family go to high school **THIS YEAR?** (Circle how many.)

1 2 3 4 5 or more

C. What GRADES are they in? CIRCLE ALL of the grades of your children in this school.

9 10 11 12 Other (Specific_____)

D. This booklet should be answered by the **PARENT** or **GUARDIAN** who has the **MOST CONTACT** with the school about your oldest child aged 14 through 18.

Who is filling in the booklet? **PLEASE CHECK IF YOU ARE . . .**

__ mother
__ father
__ stepmother
__ stepfather

__ aunt
__ uncle
__ grandmother
__ grandfather

___ guardian
___ other relative
___ other (describe)
_____

This questionnaire was adapted from a series by Epstein and Salinas (1993) titled **School and Family Partnerships: Surveys and Summaries**, Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, Johns Hopkins University.

Q-1. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS HIGH SCHOOL RIGHT NOW. YOUR IDEAS WILL HELP SCHOOLS PLAN FOR THE FUTURE. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a.	This is a very good high school.	SA	A	D	SD
b.	The teachers here care about my teenager.	SA	A	D	SD
c.	I need more information from the school to talk with my teen about schoolwork.	SA	A	D	SD
d.	I feel welcome at this high school.	SA	A	D	SD
e.	My teen should get more homework.	SA	A	D	SD
f.	My teen is learning as much as he/she can this year.	SA	A	D	SD
g.	This school works hard to get parents involved.	SA	A	D	SD
h.	My teen got off to a good start as a ninth grader in this school.	SA	A	D	SD
i.	Parents do not need to be involved much in their teen's education.	SA	A	D	SD
j.	I only hear from the high school when there are problems.	SA	A	D	SD
k.	I often talk with other parents about our teenagers and the high school.	SA	A	D	SD
l.	My teen talks about school at home.	SA	A	D	SD
m.	This school and I have different goals for my teen.	SA	A	D	SD
n.	This school gave me good information about its programs when my child was in the eighth grade.	SA	A	D	SD
o.	I want to be more involved than I am now in my teen's education.	SA	A	D	SD
p.	This school wants to learn what I know about my teen.	SA	A	D	SD
q.	This high school is a good place for students and for parents.	SA	A	D	SD
r.	I almost always know where my teen is, day or night.	SA	A	D	SD
s.	Most days I do not have enough done to talk with my teen about school.	SA	A	D	SD
t.	This is a safe community for my children.	SA	A	D	SD
u.	The community has many good activities for teens.	SA	A	D	SD
v.	The community supports this high school.	SA	A	D	SD

Q-2. PARENTS GET INVOLVED IN DIFFERENT WAYS WITH THEIR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AT HOME. ABOUT HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE THE FOLLOWING WITH YOUR TEENAGER THIS YEAR?

		Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
a.	Talk to my teen about school.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
b.	Listen to my teen read something that he/she wrote.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
c.	Talk about a homework assignment.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
d.	Help my teen with homework.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
e.	Discuss grades on tests and schoolwork.	Never	1-2 tines	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
f.	Check that my teen goes to school.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
g.	Talk about a TV show with my teen.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
h.	Help my teen solve a personal problem.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
i.	Help my teen plan time for homework, chores, and other responsibilities.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
j.	Talk with my teen about next year's courses.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
k.	Talk with my teen about future plans for college or work.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
l.	Tell my teen how important school is.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day
m.	Attend a community event with my teen.	Never	1-2 times	Monthly	Weekly	Every Day

Q-3. PARENTS PARTICIPATE AT HIGH SCHOOLS IN DIFFERENT WAYS. HOW OFTEN HAVE YOU DONE THE FOLLOWING AT YOUR TEEN'S HIGH SCHOOL THIS YEAR?

This year how often did you . . .		Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
a.	Go to a high school PTA/PTO meeting	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
b.	Help with fund raising for the high school	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
c.	Attend open house or back-to-school night	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
d.	Attend a parent-teacher conference	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
e.	Work as a volunteer at the high school	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
f.	Attend a committee meeting at this school	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
g.	Give the school information about special circumstances at home	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
h.	Thank someone at school for something he/she did for my teen	Never	1-2 times	A few times	Many times
i.	Attend a high school sports event, play,				

Q-4. HIGH SCHOOLS HAVE DIFFERENT WAYS TO INVOLVE FAMILIES. CIRCLE ONE CHOICE ON EACH LINE TO TELL HOW YOU THINK YOUR HIGH SCHOOL DOES THE FOLLOWING:

Not Important To Me	School Should Start	School Could Do Better	School Does Very Well Now	
a. Help me understand teen problems and development.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
b. Help me help my teen become independent and self confident.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
c. Give me information on how my teen may qualify for scholarships or loans for college.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
d. Provide me with information about school programs my teen can choose (college prep, vocational, etc.).	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
e. Give me information about how report card grades are earned.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
f. Include my teen in a parent-teacher-student conference each year.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
g. Contact me if my teen is having problems.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
h. Contact me if my teen does something well or improves.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
i. Give information on courses required for graduation from high school.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
j. Provide information on how to help my teen plan for college or for work.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
k. Ask me to volunteer at the school.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
l. Provide ideas on how I could keep track of my teen's homework.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
m. Provide ideas on how to help my teen at home on skills in specific subjects.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
n. Give information on what my teen is required to learn to pass each subject.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
o. Assign homework that requires my teen to share ideas and talk with me.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
p. Invite me to PTA/PTO meetings.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well
q. Include parents on school committees such as budgets, curriculum, and school improvement.	Not Imp	Should Start	Could Do Better	Does Well

Q-5. SINCE THE START OF SCHOOL LAST SEPTEMBER, HOW OFTEN HAS THE SCHOOL CONTACTED YOU ABOUT THE FOLLOWING? CIRCLE ONE CHOICE ON EACH LINE.

This year the high school contacted me about . . .	**Never**	**1 time**	**2-3 times**	**4 or more times**
a. My teen's grades	0	1	2-3	4 or more
b. The courses my teen can choose next year	0	1	2-3	4 or more
c. How I could help with fund raising	0	1	2-3	4 or more
d. How I could volunteer at the school	0	1	2-3	4 or more
e. Asking me to come to a sports event, show, concert, or other event	0	1	2-3	4 or more
f. Asking me for information about my teen	0	1	2-3	4 or more
g. The school's homework policies	0	1	2-3	4 or more

Q-6. HOW OFTEN DID YOUR TEENAGER'S TEACHER CONTACT YOU IN THESE WAYS?

	HOW OFTEN? **Never**	**1 time**	**2-3 times**	**4 or more times**
a. Memos or notices	0	1	2-3	4 or more
b. Phone calls	0	1	2-3	4 or more
c. Open house or back-to-school nights	0	1	2-3	4 or more
d. Informal meetings with teachers	0	1	2-3	4 or more
e. Formal parent-teacher conferences with one teacher	0	1	2-3	4 or more
f. With all of my teen's teachers	0	1	2-3	4 or more
g. Meetings in the community (not at school)	0	1	2-3	4 or more
h. Report card pick-ups by parent	0	1	2-3	4 or more
i. Visits at home by teachers or school staff	0	1	2-3	4 or more

Q-7. SCHOOLS GIVE INFORMATION IN DIFFERENT WAYS. CHECK THE WAYS THAT YOU, PERSONALLY, RECEIVED INFORMATION FROM THE HIGH SCHOOL THIS YEAR.

___ School newspaper (edited and written by students)
___ Newsletters for parents (from the principal)
___ Calendar of events, holidays, tests
___ Advance notice of special deadlines (e.g., for fees, trips, tests)
___ Interim reports about your teen's grades
___ Handbook on high school rules and programs
___ Directory of addresses and phone numbers of families in the school

Q-8 NOW THAT YOUR CHILD IS A TEENAGER, WHAT TOPICS WOULD YOU LIKE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT? CHECK ALL THAT YOU ARE INTERESTED IN.

___ How teenagers grow and develop
___ Peer pressure in adolescence
___ How to discipline teenagers
___ How to talk about teen health and sexual behavior
___ Preventing drug and alcohol use
___ Preventing teen suicide, runaways, and other serious problems
___ Helping teens study for tests
___ Improving report card grades
___ Doing better on homework
___ How to help my teen develop his/her talents
___ Planning for the future -- college or work
___ Preventing failure and dropping out
___ How to deal with stress
___ Adult education (such as GED)
___ Job training for parents
___ Learning more about using computers
___ Raising a teen as a single parent
___ Workshops that parents and students attend together on topics they choose
___ Other topics you want (write in)
_____

Q-9. WHEN CAN YOU ATTEND CONFERENCES, WORKSHOPS, MEETINGS, OR OTHER EVENTS AT SCHOOL? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

___ Early morning
___ Mid morning
___ Lunch time
___ Afternoon
___ Early evening
___ After dinner
___ Weekends
___ Cannot attend ever

Q-10. DO YOU NEED TRANSPORTATION OR CHILD CARE IN ORDER TO ATTEND MEETINGS OR CONFERENCES AT THE HIGH SCHOOL? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

___ No special needs
___ Transportation to and from school
___ Child care for young children at the school
___ Other needs (Describe)_____

Q-11. ALL COMMUNITIES HAVE INFORMATION THAT WOULD HELP FAMILIES. WHICH SERVICES IN YOUR COMMUNITY WOULD YOU LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT? CHECK THE INFORMATION YOU WANT.

___ Health care for teens and for families
___ Social services
___ Job training for teens
___ Family counseling
___ Part-time jobs for teens
___ Summer jobs for teens
___ English language skills
___ Job training for parents/adults
___ Adult education
Parenting classes
___ After-school sports activities
___ Other after-school clubs or lessons to develop talents
___ Community service that teens do
___ Summer programs for teens
___ Information on museums, shows, and events in the community
Other (describe the community

THE LAST FEW QUESTIONS WILL HELP SCHOOLS PLAN NEW PROGRAMS TO BETTER SERVE YOUR FAMILY AND FAMILIES LIKE YOURS AT HIGH SCHOOL.

Q-12. ABOUT YOUR OLDEST CHILD IN HIGH SCHOOL.

A. Is your teenager a boy or girl? ____ boy ____ girl

B. How old is your teenager? Date of birth: month____ day____ year____

C. About how much time does your teen spend on homework on an average night?

My teenager usually does:

___ No homework
___ Less than one hour a night
___ One hour
___ Two hours
___ Three hours
___ Four or more hours a night

D. Which program is your teenager in at school?

___ College prep
___ Vocational or business
___ General
___ Other _____
___ Don't know or not sure

E. How is your teen doing in school this year?

___ mostly As -- Excellent student
___ mostly Bs -- Good student
___ mostly Cs -- Average student
___ mostly Ds -- Fair student
___ mostly Fs -- Poor student

F. How satisfied are you with your teen's progress in high school this year?

___ Very satisfied -- great year at school
___ Mostly satisfied -- good year
___ Pretty satisfied -- OK year
___ Mostly dissatisfied -- disappointing year
___ Very dissatisfied -- bad year at school

G. How much does your teenager like school this year?

___ Likes it **a lot**
___ Likes it **some**
___ Likes it a **little**
___ Does **not like** it **much**
___ Does **not like** it **at all**

H. How do you and your teen make most decisions?

___ As a parent I decide most rules for my teen.
___ We decide most rules together.
___ I leave most rules up to my teen to decide alone.

I. How much time could you spend working with your teen on homework on an average night? Minutes I could spend:
none 5-10 15-20 25-30 35-45 50-60 over 1 hour

J. Do you have time on the weekends to talk with your teen about schoolwork?

yes ____ no ____

K. How would you describe your teenager? Check one on each line.

My teenager . . .	**NOT like my teen**	**A LITTLE like my teen**	**JUST LIKE my teen**
a. Promptly delivers notices home from school.	____	____	____
b. Usually needs someone to tell him/her what to do.	____	____	____
c. Likes to make her/his own decisions.	____	____	____
d. Has many original ideas.	____	____	____
e. Does not like to be different from his/her friends.	____	____	____
f. Cannot get started on things without getting ideas from someone else.	____	____	____
g. Will find it hard to face the "real world" later on.	____	____	____
h. Makes good decisions without a parent's help.	____	____	____
i. Can be trusted on most things.			

L. Right now, how far do you think your teenager will go in school? My teen probably will:

___ Not graduate from high school
___ Graduate from high school
___ Get some college, other training, or enter the military
___ Complete 2-year college degree
___ Complete 4-year college degree
___ Go past college for an advanced degree

Q-13. ABOUT YOUR FAMILY

a. How many adults live at home? ___(include yourself)

b. How many children live at home? ___(include your teenager)

c. What is your education?

___ Did not complete high school
___ High school diploma
___ Some college or training
___ College degree
___ Advanced degree

d. How did you like high school when you were a teen? (Check one.)

___ Did not go to high school
___ Liked it a lot
___ Liked it some
___ Liked it a little
___ Did not like it much
___ Did not like it at all

e. Are you employed now?

___ Employed full-time
___ Employed part-time
___ Not employed now

f. How do you describe yourself?

___ African American
___ Asian American
___ Hispanic American
___ Native American
___ White
___ Other_____

g. What is your annual income?

___ Under $13,000
___ $13,001 to $25,000
___ $25,001 to $35,000
___ $35,001 to $50,000
___ Over $50,000

h. (1) Would you be willing to be interviewed by telephone to provide additional information about parent involvement?

____ YES ____ NO

(2) If yes, please provide your name and a telephone number where you can be reached.

Name _____
Address _____

TO CONCLUDE, WE WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE YOUR OPINIONS ON A FEW QUESTIONS.

a. What are your two greatest concerns as a parent of a teenager?

1._____

2._____

b. What school activity to involve parents has helped you most, and why?

_____

_____

_____

c. Looking back on THIS YEAR, what could the school have done to help you and your teenager?

_____

_____

_____

d. Looking ahead to NEXT YEAR, what is the best thing this high school could do to help you become more involved in your teenager's education?

_____

_____

_____

e. What is one thing your family could do to help this school next year?

_____

_____

_____

f. Any other ideas or suggestions you would like to add?

_____

_____

_____

April 20, 1994

Dear Elementary/Middle School Teacher:

Most educators would agree that finding ways to effectively involve parents and other community members in public schools is a critical issue. How this might be accomplished in Montana is the focus of a current study being conducted by the Center for Community-School Development and Field Services at MSU. This information will be utilized to develop a set of recommendations for action in Montana. **To do this, we need your help!**

Over the next 2-3 months, we will be seeking information from selected school administrators, school board members, teachers and parents. Input from all of these groups is important so please take about 15-20 minutes to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire.

To insure confidentiality, MEA is working with us to mail the questionnaires. Be assured that the results will only be presented as group data. No one individual or school will be identified. The return envelope is coded but this is only so any necessary follow-up.

A postage paid, pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for you to use in returning the completed questionnaire. If at all possible, we would like the questionnaire back by **MAY 1, 1994.**

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the results, please print your name and mailing address on the back of the envelope. Do not put it on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for helping us with this important project. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call us at 994-6984.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg
Director

Cheryl Johannes
Research Assistant

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN MONTANA SCHOOLS

-ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS-

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING AND RETURNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please read the directions for each section carefully before responding.

2. Write all responses **on the questionnaire itself**.

3. All responses are strictly confidential. The code on the return envelopes is only for the purposes of follow-up if needed. The results will be reported as group data and no one individual will be identified.

4. When you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the enclosed large, postage paid envelope and drop it in the mail. **PLEASE RETURN NO LATER THAN MAY 1.**

Again, our sincere thanks for helping us out.

This questionnaire was adapted from a series by Epstein and Salinas (1993) titled **School and Family Partnerships: Surveys and Summaries,** Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, Johns Hopkins University.

Q- 1. THE FIRST QUESTIONS ASK FOR YOUR PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT ABOUT PARENT INVOLVEMENT. PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE CHOICE FOR EACH ITEM THAT BEST REPRESENTS YOUR OPINION AND EXPERIENCE

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Parent involvement is important for a good school.	SD	D	A	SA
b. Most parents know how to help their children on school work at home.	SD	D	A	SA
c. This school has an active and effective parent organization (e.g., PTA or PTO).	SD	D	A	SA
d. Every family has some strengths that could be tapped to increase student success in school.	SD	D	A	SA
e. All parents could learn ways to assist their children on school work at home, if shown how.	SD	D	A	SA
f. Parent involvement can help teachers be more effective with more students.	SD	D	A	SA
g. Teachers should receive recognition for time spent on parent involvement activities.	SD	D	A	SA
h. Parents of children at this school want to be involved more than they are now at most grade levels.	SD	D	A	SA
i. Teachers do not have the time to involve parents in very useful ways.	SD	D	A	SA
j. Teachers need in-service education to implement effective parent involvement practices.	SD	D	A	SA
k. Parent involvement is important for student success in school.	SD	D	A	SA
l. This school views parents as important partners.	SD	D	A	SA
m. The community values education for all students.	SD	D	A	SA
n. This school is known for trying new and unusual approaches to improve the school.	SD	D	A	SA
o. Mostly when I contact parents, it's about problems or trouble.	SD	D	A	SA
p. In this school, teachers play a large part in most decisions.	SD	D	A	SA
q. The community supports this school.	SD	D	A	SA

Q-2. TEACHERS CONTACT THEIR STUDENTS' FAMILIES IN DIFFERENT WAYS. PLEASE ESTIMATE THE PERCENT OF YOUR STUDENTS' FAMILIES THAT YOU CONTACTED THIS YEAR IN THESE WAYS:

a. Letter or memo	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All
b. Telephone	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All
c. Meeting at school	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All
d. Scheduled parent-teacher conference	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All
e. Home visit	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All
f. Meeting in the community	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All
g. Report card pick-up	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All
h. Performances, sports, or other events	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	All

Q-3. SOME TEACHERS INVOLVE PARENTS (OR OTHERS) AS VOLUNTEERS AT THE SCHOOL BUILDING. PLEASE CHECK THE WAYS THAT YOU USE VOLUNTEERS IN YOUR CLASSROOM AND IN YOUR SCHOOL THIS YEAR. (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY IN COLUMNS A AND B.)

A. In my CLASSROOM, volunteers.....

_ (a) I do NOT use classroom volunteers
_ (b) Listen to children read aloud
_ (c) Read to the children
_ (d) Grade papers
_ (e) Tutor children in specific skills
_ (f) Help on trips or at parties
_ (g) Give talks (e.g., on careers, hobbies, etc.)
_ (h) Other ways (please specify)_____

B. In our SCHOOL, volunteers.....

_ (a) Are NOT USED in the school now
_ (b) Monitor halls, cafeteria, or other areas
_ (c) Work in the library, computer lab, or other area
_ (d) Teach mini-courses
_ (e) Teach enrichment or other lessons
_ (f) Lead clubs or activities
_ (g) Check attendance
_ (h) Work in "parent room"
_ (i) Other ways (please specify)_____

THIS YEAR, how many volunteers or aides help in your classroom or school?

C. Number of different volunteers who assist me in a typical week =_____

D. Do you have paid aides in your classroom? ___NO ___YES (how many?_____

E. Number of **different** volunteers who work anywhere in the school in an average week =_____ (approximately)

Q-4. PLEASE ESTIMATE THE PERCENT OF YOUR STUDENTS' FAMILIES WHO DID THE FOLLOWING THIS YEAR:

a. Attend workshops regularly at school	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
b. Check daily that child's home work is done	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
c. Practice school work in the summer	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
d. Attend PTA/PTO meetings regularly	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
e. Attend parent-teacher conferences with you	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
Understand enough to help their child at home:								
f. ...reading skills at your grade level	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
g. ...writing skills at your grade level	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%

Q-5. SCHOOLS SERVE DIVERSE POPULATIONS OF FAMILIES WHO HAVE DIFFERENT NEEDS AND SKILLS. THE NEXT QUESTIONS ASK FOR YOUR JUDGMENT ABOUT SPECIFIC WAYS OF INVOLVING FAMILIES AT YOUR SCHOOL. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE TO TELL WHETHER YOU THINK EACH TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT IS:

NOT IMPORTANT	=> NOT IMP	(Means this IS NOT part of your school now, and SHOULD NOT BE.)
NEEDS TO BE DEVELOPED	=> DEV	(Means this IS NOT part of your school now, but SHOULD BE.)
NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED	=> IMPRV	(Means this IS part of your school, but NEEDS TO BE STRENGTHENED.)
A STRONG PROGRAM NOW	=> STRONG	(Means this IS a STRONG program for most parents AT ALL GRADE LEVELS at your school.)

TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT	AT THIS SCHOOL...			
a. WORKSHOPS for parents to build skills in PARENTING and understanding their children at each grade level.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
b. WORKSHOPS for parents on creating HOME CONDITONS FOR LEARNING.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
c. COMMUNICATIONS from the school to the home that all families can understand and use.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
d. COMMUNICATIONS about report cards so that parents understand students' progress and needs.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
e. Parent-teacher CONFERENCES with all families.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
f. SURVEYING parents each year for their ideas about the school.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
g. VOLUNTEERS in classrooms to assist teachers and students.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
h. VOLUNTEERS to help in other (non-classroom) parts of the school.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
i. INFORMATION on how to MONITOR homework	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
j. INFORMATION for parents on HOW TO HELP their children with specific skills and subjects.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
k. Involvement by families in PTA/PTO leadership, other COMMITTIES, or other decision-making roles.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
l. Programs for AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, recreation, and homework help.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG

Q-6. TEACHERS CHOOSE AMONG MANY ACTIVITIES TO ASSIST THEIR STUDENTS AND FAMILIES. CIRCLE ONE CHOICE TO TELL HOW IMPORTANT EACH OF THESE IS FOR YOU TO CONDUCT AT YOUR GRADE LEVEL.

	HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS PRACTICE TO YOU?			
	NOT IMPORTANT	A LITTLE IMPORTANT	PRETTY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
a. Have a conference with each of my students' parents at least once a year.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
b. Attend evening meetings, performances, and workshops at school.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
c. Contact parents about their children's problems or failures.	NOT IMP	A LITILE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
d. Inform parents when their children do something well or improve.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
e. Involve some parents as volunteers in my classroom.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
f. Inform parents of the skills their children must pass in each subject I teach.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
g. Inform parents how report card grades are earned in my class.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERYIMP
h. Provide specific activities for children and parents to do to improve students' grades.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
i. Provide ideas for discussing TV shows.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
j. Assign homework that requires children to interact with parents.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
k. Suggest ways to practice spelling or other skills at home before a test.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
l. Ask parents to listen to their children read.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
m. Ask parents to listen to a story or paragraph that their children write.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
n. Work with other teachers to develop parent involvement activities and materials.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
o. Work with community members to arrange learning opportunities in my class.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
p. Work with area businesses for volunteers to improve programs for my students.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
q. Request information from parents on their children's talents, interests, or needs.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
r. Serve on a PTA/PTO or other school committee	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP

Q-7. THE NEXT QUESTIONS ASK FOR YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT THE ACTIVITIES THAT YOU THINK SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY THE PARENTS OF THE CHILDREN YOU TEACH. CIRCLE THE CHOICE THAT BEST DESCRIBES THE IMPORTANCE OF THESE ACTIVITIES AT YOUR GRADE LEVEL.

PARENTS' RESPONSIBILITIES	NOT IMPORTANT	A LITTLE IMPORTANT	PRETTY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
a. Send children to school ready to learn.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
b. Teach children to behave well.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
c. Set up a quiet place and time for studying at home.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
d. Encourage children to volunteer in class.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
e. Know what children are expected to learn each year.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
f. Check daily that homework is done.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
g. Talk to children about what they are learning in school.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
h. Ask teachers for specific ideas on how to help their children at home with classwork.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
i. Talk to teachers about problems the children are facing at home.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
j. Attend PTA/PTO meetings.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
k. Serve as a volunteer in the school or classroom.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
l. Attend assemblies and other special events at the school.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
m. Take children to special places or events in the community.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
n. Talk to children about the importance of school.	NOT IMP	A LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP

Q-8. THE NEXT QUESTION ASKS HOW YOU PERCEIVE OTHERS' SUPPORT FOR PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN YOUR SCHOOL. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE ON EACH LINE. HOW MUCH SUPPORT DOES EACH GIVE NOW TO PARENT INVOLVEMENT?

	Strong Support	Some Support	Weak Support	No Support
a. You, personally	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NONE
b. Other teachers	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NONE
c. The principal	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NONE
d. Other administrators	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NONE
e. Parents	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NONE
f. Others in community	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NONE
g. The school board	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NONE

Q-9. OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS, HOW MUCH HAS THE SCHOOL INVOLVED PARENTS AT SCHOOL AND AT HOME?

_____ School involved parents **less this year** than last
_____ School involved parents **about the same** in both years
_____ School involved parents **more this year** than last
_____ Don't know, **I did not teach** at this school last year

The last questions ask for general information about you, your students, and the classes you teach. This will help us understand how new practices can be developed to meet the needs of particular schools, teachers, and students.

Q-10. YOUR STUDENTS AND TEACHING!

A. What grade(s) do you teach THIS YEAR? (Circle all that apply.)
PreK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
If you do not teach, give your position:_____

B. How many **different students** do you teach each day, on average? _____

C. Which best describes your teaching responsibility? (CHECK ONE)

__1. I teach several subjects to ONE SELF-CONTAINED CLASS.
__2. I teach ONE subject to SEVERAL DIFFERENT CLASSES of students in a departmentalized program.
__3. I teach MORE THAN ONE subject to MORE THAN ONE CLASS in a semi-departmental or other arrangement.
__4. Other (please describe):_____

D. Check the subject(s) you teach in an average week (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

___(a) Reading	___(e) Social Studies	___(i) Advisory	___(m) Other (describe)
___(b) Language Arts/English	___(f) Health	___(j) Physical Education	_____
___(c) Math	___(g) Art	___(k) Home Economics	
___(d) Science	___(h) Music	___(l) Industrial Arts	

E. Do you work with other teachers on a formal, interdisciplinary team? ___No ___Yes
If YES, do you have a common planning time with all of the teachers on your team? ___No ___Yes

F. On average, how many minutes of homework do you assign on most school days?
none 5-10 25-30 35-45 50-60 over 1 hour
Do you typically assign homework on weekends?
yes____ no_____

G. About how many hours each week, on average, do you spend contacting parents?
_____ None
_____ Less than one hour
_____ One hour
_____ Two hours
_____ Three hours or more

H. About what percent of your students are:
_____% African American
_____% Asian American
_____% Hispanic American
_____% Native American
_____% White
_____% Other _____

I. **About** how many of your students are in (circle the estimate that comes closest):

Chapter 1	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%
Special education	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%
Gifted and Talented	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%
Free or reduced lunch	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%

J. About what percent of your students are:
___% **Above average** in achievement
___% **Average** in achievement
___% **Below average** in achievement

K. About what percent of your students:
___% Promptly deliver memos or notices home from the school
___% Complete all of their homework on time

L. What is the size of your district according Montana High School Association classification?
___ Class AA ___ Class A ___ Class B ___ Class C ___ Elementary District Only

Q-11. YOUR EXPERIENCE AND BACKGROUND

A. What is your experience?
___(a) Years in teaching
___(b) Years in **this school**

B. What is your gender?
___ Male
___ Female

C. What is your highest level of education?
___ Bachelor's
___ Bachelor's + credits
___ Masters
___ Master's + credits
___ Specialist
___ Docorate
___ Other (describe)_____

D. How do you describe yourself?
___ African American
___ Asian Amencan
___ Hispanic American
___ Native American
___ White
___ Other _____

E. Have you had training in working with parents and other community members?

___ No
___ Yes (If yes, where)
___ College Preparatory
___ Workshops/Conferences
___ Other(specify)_____

F. (a) Would you be willing to be interviewed by telephone to provide additional information about parent involvement?

___ Yes ___ No

(b) If yes, please provide your name and a telephone number where you can be reached.

Name _____
School District where employed_____
Work Telephone No. _____
Home Telephone No. _____

Q-12. OPTIONAL: We would value your ideas on the following questions if you have a few more minutes.

a. What is the most successful practice to involve parents that you have used or that you have heard about?

_____

_____

_____

b. In what ways could better partnerships with families help you as a teacher?

_____

_____

_____

c. In what ways could better partnerships with the community help you as teachers?

_____

_____

_____

d. In what ways has parent involvement changed over the past year or two at this school? Give examples.

_____

_____

_____

e. Do you have any other ideas or comments that you would like to add? (Feel free to add other pages.)

_____

_____

_____

April 20, 1994

Dear High School Teacher:

Most educators would agree that finding ways to effectively involve parents and other community members in public schools is a critical issue. How this might be accomplished in Montana is the focus of a current study being conducted by the Center for Community-School Development and Field Services at MSU. This information will be utilized to develop a set of recommendations for action in Montana. **To do this, we need your help!**

Over the next 2-3 months, we will be seeking information from selected school administrators, school board members, teachers and parents. Input from all of these groups is important so please take about 15-20 minutes to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire.

To insure confidentiality, MEA is working with us to mail the questionnaires. Be assured that the results will only be presented as group data. No one individual or school will be identified. The return envelope is coded but this is only so any necessary follow-up.

A postage paid, pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for you to use in returning the completed questionnaire. If at all possible, we would like the questionnaire back by **MAY 1, 1994.**

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the results, please print your name and mailing address on the back of the envelope. Do not put it on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for helping us with this important project. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call us at 994-6984.

Sincerely,

Gloria A. Gregg
Director

Cheryl Johannes
Research Assistant

PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN MONTANA SCHOOLS

-HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS-

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING AND RETURNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please read the directions for each section carefully before responding.

2. Write all responses **on the questionnaire itself.**

3. In general your responses should take into consideration the parents of all your students.

4. All responses are strictly confidential. The code on the return envelopes is only for the purposes of follow-up if needed. The results will be reported as group data and no one individual will be identified.

5. When you have completed the questionnaire, place it in the enclosed large, postage paid envelope and drop it in the mail. **PLEASE RETURN NO LATER THAN MAY 1.**

Again, our sincere thanks for helping us out.

This questionnaire was adapted from a series by Epstein and Salinas (1993) titled **School and Family Partnerships: Surveys and Summaries,** Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, Johns Hopkins University.

Q-1. THIS QUESTION ASKS FOR YOUR PROFESSIONAL JUDGEMENT ABOUT PARENT INVOLVEMENT. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE FOR EACH ITEM THAT BEST REPRESENTS YOUR OPINION AND EXPERIENCE.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Parent involvement is important for a good high school.	SD	D	A	SA
b. Most parents of high school students do not know how to talk with their teens about schoolwork at home.	SD	D	A	SA
c. High schools should have an active parent organization (e.g., PTA or PTO).	SD	D	A	SA
d. Every family has some strengths that could be tapped to increase their teen's success in high school.	SD	D	A	SA
e. All parents could learn ways to assist their teens on school work at home, if shown how.	SD	D	A	SA
f. Parent involvement can increase teacher effectiveness.	SD	D	A	SA
g. Parents of students at this school want to be involved more than they are now.	SD	D	A	SA
h. High school teachers do not have the time to involve parents in very useful ways.	SD	D	A	SA
i. High school teachers need in-service education to implement effective parent involvement practices.	SD	D	A	SA
j. Parent involvement is important for student success in high school.	SD	D	A	SA
k. This school views parents as important partners.	SD	D	A	SA
l. The community values education for all.	SD	D	A	SA
m. The community supports this high school.	SD	D	A	SA
n. Involving families is a responsibility of teachers.	SD	D	A	SA
o. It is not necessary for parents of high school students to be involved in their teen's education.	SD	D	A	SA
p. High school students are important members of school and family partnerships.	SD	D	A	SA
q. This high school is known for trying new things to improve the school.	SD	D	A	SA
r. In this school, teachers play a large part in most decisions.	SD	D	A	SA

Q-2. HIGH SCHOOLS SERVE DIVERSE POPULATIONS OF FAMILIES WITH DIFFERENT NEEDS AND SKILLS. THE NEXT QUESTIONS ASK FOR YOUR JUDGMENT ABOUT SPECIFIC WAYS OF INVOLVING FAMILIES OF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. CIRCLE ONE CHOICE TO TELL WHETHER YOU THINK EACH TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT IS:

NOT IMPORTANT	=> NOT IMP	(Means this is not part of your program for parents of HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS at your high school now, and SHOULD NOT BE.)
NEEDS TO BE DEVELOPED	=> DEV	(Means this is not part of your high school now, but SHOULD BE.)
NEEDS TO BE IMPROVED	=>IMPRV	(Means this is part of your high school, but NEEDS TO BE STRENGTHENED.)
A STRONG PROGRAM NOW	=> STRONG	(Means this is a STRONG program for most parents OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS at your high school.)

a. Information to parents on parenting skills and adolescent development.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
b. Surveys of parents each year on their ideas about the school.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
c. Communications from the school to the home that all families can understand and use.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
d. Communications about report cards so that parents understand their teen's progress and needs.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
e. Parent-teacher conferences with all families.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
f. Parent and other volunteers at the school.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
g. Information to assist parents to monitor their teen's homework.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
h. Information to assist parents to talk with their teen about classwork, skills, and subjects.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
i. Homework for students that requires them to talk with someone at home about their class work.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
j. Information to parents on how to help their teen plan for education or employment beyond high school.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
k. Participation by families in PTA/PTO, other committees, and decision-making roles.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
l. Committees involving parents to review the high school curriculum.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
m. Committees involving parents to review school policies.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG
n. Business and community partnerships to enrich school programs.	NOT IMP	DEV	IMPRV	STRONG

Q-3. TEACHERS CHOOSE AMONG MANY ACTIVITIES TO ASSIST THEIR STUDENTS. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE OF HOW IMPORTANT IT IS FOR YOU TO CONDUCT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES WITH YOUR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

	NOT IMPORTANT	A LITTLE IMPORTANT	PRETTY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
a. Have at least one conference with a parent of each of my students.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
b. Include students in conferences with parents.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
c. Attend evening meetings and performances of my students at school.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
d. Contact parents when their teen has problems or failures.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
e. Inform parents when their teen does something well or improves.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
f. Involve parents as volunteers.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
g. Inform parents of the skills required to pass my class.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
h. Inform parents how students earn report card grades in my class.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
i. Provide ideas to help parents talk with their teen about what they learn in my class.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
j. Provide specific activities that parents can do to help students improve their grades.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
k. Assign homework that requires students to talk with someone at home.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
l. Work with other teachers to develop parent involvement activities and materials.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
m. Work on school policy committees with parents.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
n. Request information from parents about their teen's talents, interests, or needs.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
o. Work with businesses for volunteers, donations, or other resources to improve programs for my students	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP

Q-4. TEACHERS CONTACT THEIR STUDENTS' FAMILIES IN DIFFERENT WAYS. PLEASE ESTIMATE THE PERCENT OF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' FAMILIES YOU CONTACTED OR MET IN THESE WAYS THIS YEAR.

a. Letter or memo	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL
b. Telephone	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL
c. Meeting at school	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL
d. Scheduled parent-teacher conference	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL
e. Home visit	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL
f. Meeting in the community	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL
g. Report card pick-up	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL
h. Performances, sports, or other events	NA	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	ALL

Q-5. THIS QUESTION ASKS FOR YOUR PROFESSIONAL OPINIONS ABOUT ACTIVITIES THAT YOU THINK SHOULD BE CONDUCTED BY THE PARENTS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS YOU TEACH. CIRCLE THE CHOICE THAT BEST DESCRIBES THE IMPORTANCE OF THESE ACTIVITIES FOR YOUR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

PARENTS' RESPONSIBILITIES	NOT IMPORTANT	A LITTLE IMPORTANT	PRETTY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
a. Set up a quiet place and time for studying at home.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
b. Know what their teen is expected to learn each year.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
c. Check regularly that homework is done.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
d. Talk with their teen at home about what they are learning in class.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
e. Encourage teen to participate in class.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
f. Ask teachers for specific ideas on how to talk with their teen about homework.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
g. Talk to teachers about problems their teen is facing at home.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
h. Attend assemblies and other special events at the school.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
i. Talk to their teen about the importance of school.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
j. Monitor their teen's progress and needs in each subject.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
k. Help their teen balance homework, home chores, and outside activities.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
l. Volunteer to help the school.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
m. Join a parent organization or school committee.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
n. Encourage their teen to participate in community activities.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP
o. Help their teen plan for future work or schooling.	NOT IMP	LITTLE IMP	PRETTY IMP	VERY IMP

Q-6. ESTIMATE THE PERCENT OF YOUR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' FAMILIES WHO DID THE FOLLOWING THIS YEAR.

a. Supervise their teen's behavior	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
b. Attend parent-teacher conferences with you	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
c. Attend sports or music events or other assemblies	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
d. Talk to their teen regularly about class work in your subject	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
e. Joined the PTA/PTO/PTSA/Booster Clubs and attend meetings regularly	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%
f. Know and use services in the community to assist their families	0%	5%	10%	25%	50%	75%	90%	100%

Q-7. THE NEXT QUESTION ASKS HOW YOU PERCEIVE OTHERS' SUPPORT OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN YOUR SCHOOL. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE CHOICE FOR EACH.

How much support does each give now to parent involvement?	**STRONG SUPPORT**	**SOME SUPPORT**	**WEAK SUPPORT**	**NO SUPPORT**
a. You, personally	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
b. The teachers in my department	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
c. Other teachers in the school	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
d. The principal	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
e. Other administrators	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
f. Counselors	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
g. Parents	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
h. The community	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
i. School board members	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO
j. Superintendent	STRONG	SOME	WEAK	NO

Q-8. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THIS HIGH SCHOOL'S COMMUNITY ON THESE ISSUES? CIRCLE ONE ON EACH LINE.

a.	Unemployment	major problem	minor problem	not a problem
b.	Crime	major problem	minor problem	not a problem
c.	Drug use	major problem	minor problem	not a problem
d.	Teen gangs	major problem	minor problem	not a problem
e.	Homelessness	major problem	minor problem	not a problem
f.	Teen parenthood	major problem	minor problem	not a problem
g.	Mobility of families	major problem	minor problem	not a problem

THE LAST QUESTIONS ASK FOR GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT YOU, YOUR STUDENTS, AND THE SUBJECTS YOU TEACH. THIS WILL HELP IDENTIFY HOW NEW PRACTICES CAN BE DEVELOPED TO MEET THE DIVERSE NEEDS OF SCHOOLS, TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND FAMILIES.

Q-9. YOUR STUDENTS AND TEACHING

A. Position:_____teacher _____counselor _____administrator _____other_____

B. Size of school district according to Montana High School Association Classification.
___ Class AA ___ Class A ___ Class B ___ Class C

D. (a) Number of **high school students** you teach each day, on average: _____

(b) Total number of students in all grades that you teach **each** day: _____ Total students

E. Check the subject(s) you teach to high school students. (Please check all that apply.)

___(a) English	___(e)Health	___(i) Geography
___(b) Math	___(f) Art or Music	___(j) Foreign Language
___(c) Science	___(g) Vocational or Technical	___(k) Physical Education
___(d) History	___(h) Business	___(l) Other (describe)_____

F. Do you work with other teachers on a formal, interdisciplinary team? ____No ____Yes

If YES, do you have a common planning time with all of the teachers on your team? ____No ____Yes

G. On average, how many minutes of homework do you assign on most school days?

none 5-10 25-30 35-45 50-60 over 1 hour

H. Do you typically assign homework on weekends?

yes_____ no_____

I. Do you supervise any extra-curricular activities?

____No

____Yes (which ones)_____

J. About how many hours each week, on average, do you spend contacting parents:

___ None
___ Less than one hour
___ One hour
___ Two hours
___ Three hours or more

K. About what percent of your students are:

_____% African American
_____% Asian American
_____% Hispanic American
_____% Native American
_____% white
_____% Other_____
100%

L. **About** how many of your students are in (circle the estimate that comes closest):

a.	Special education	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%
b.	Bilingual ESL	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%
c.	Honors, AP, or Gifted Classes	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%
d.	At-risk of failing	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%
e.	Free or reduced lunch	0%	10%	20%	30-50%	60-80%	90-100%

M. About what percent of your students are:

___% (a) **Above average** in achievement
___% (b) **Average** in achievement
___% (c) **Below average** in achievement
100%

N. About what percent of your students:

____% (a) Promptly deliver memos or notices home from the school
____% (b) Complete all of their homework on time.

Q-10. YOUR EXPERIENCE AND BACKGROUND

A. What is your experience?

____(a) Years in teaching

____(b) Years at **this high school**

B. What is your gender?

__(a) Male

__(b) Female

C. What is your highest level of education?

___(a) Bachelor's
___(b) Bachelor's + credits
___(c) Master's
___(d) Master's + credits
___(e) Specialist
___(f) Doctorate
___(g) Other (describe)_____

D. How do you describe yourself?

____(a) African American
____(b) Asian American
____(c) Hispanic American
____(d) Native American
____(e) White
____(f) Other (describe)_____

E. Have you had training with parents and other community members?

___ No
___ Yes (If yes, where)
___ College Preparatory
___ Workshops/Conferences
___ Other(Specify) ____

Q-11. (a) Would you be willing to be interviewed by telephone to provide additional information about parent involvement?

____ Yes ___ No

(b) If yes, please provide your name and a telephone number where you can be reached.

Name _____
School District where employed_____
Work Telephone No. _____
Home Telephone No. _____

WE WOULD VALUE YOUR IDEAS ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, IF YOU CAN TAKE A FEW MORE MINUTES TO HELP.

a. What is the most successful practice to involve parents of high schoolers that you have used or that you have heard about?
_____
_____

b. In what ways could better partnerships with families help you as a teacher?
_____
_____

c. In what ways could better partnerships with the community help you as a teacher?
_____
_____

d. To strengthen home-school partnerships, what do you need to know about your students' families that you do not know now?
_____
_____

e. What obstacles do you see in building stronger links between families and schools at your school?
_____
_____

f. Do you have any other ideas or suggestions that you would like to add? (Feel free to add other pages with your comments.)

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FOR VARIABLES

High School Parent Questionnaire Items for each Category

High School Parent Variables (Variable Names is in Parentheses)	Analysis of Hypothesis	Question Items
Parent Attitudes toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information on parenting -- Type I (Parenting)	1,9	Q4a, Q4b
Parent Attitudes toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing two-way communication -- Type II (Communicating)	2,9	Q4c, Q4d, Q4e, Q4f, Qfg, Q4i, Q4j, Q4l, Q4n
Parent Attitudes toward School's Effort to Involve Parents in volunteering at school -- Type III (Volunteering)	3,9	Q4k
Parent Attitudes toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information on how to help with homework -- Type IV (Homework)	4,9	Q4l, Q4m
Parent Attitudes toward School's Effort to Involve Parents in decision-making and leadership opportunities -- Type V (Leadership)	5,9	Q4p, Q4q
Parent Attitudes toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information about community resources and services which help families -- Type VI (Community)	6,9	Q4r
Parent Attitudes toward All Types of Involvement --Types I - VI (All Types)	7,8,9	Q4a - Q4r
Self-Reported Practices of Type I of Parent Involvement (PracParenting)	8	Q3a, Q3e, Q3f, Q3h, Q3i, Q3j, Q3l
Self-Reported Practices of Type II of Parent Involvement (PracCommunicating)	8	Q3d, Q3g, Q3h
Self-Reported Practices of Type III of Parent Involvement (PracVolunteering)	8	Q3c, Q3e, Q3i
Self-Reported Practices of Type IV of Parent Involvement (PracHomework)	8	Q2b, Q2c, Q2d, Q2g
Self-Reported Practices of Type V of Parent Involvement (PracLeadership)	8	Q3a, Q3b, Q3f
Self-Reported Practices of Type VI of Parent Involvement (PracCommunity)	8	Q2m
Self-Reported Practices of All Types of Parent Involvement (PracAll Types)	8	Q2a-Q2m and Q3a-Q3i
View	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q1a, Q1b, Q1d, Q1h, Q1q
Success	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q12e, Q12f, Q12g
Effort	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q1g, Q1o, Q1p
Adults	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q13a
Education Level	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q13c
Income Level	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q13g
Gender	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	D

High School Teacher Questionnaire Items for each Category

High School Teacher Variables (Variable Names is in Parentheses)	Analysis of Hypothesis:	Question Items
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information on parenting -- Type I (Parenting)	11, 10	Q2a
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing two-way communication -- Type II (Communicating)	12, 10	Q2b, Q2c, Q2d, Q2e
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents in volunteering at school -- Type III (Volunteering)	13, 10	Q2f
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information on how to help with homework -- Type IV (Homework)	14, 10	Q2g, Q2h, Q2j
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents in decision-making and leadership opportunities -- Type V (Leadership)	15, 10	Q2k, Q2l, Q2m
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information about community resources and services which help families -- Type VI (Community)	16, 10	Q2n
Teacher Perception toward All Types of Involvement --Types I - VI (All Types)	10, 16	Q2a-Q2n
Strengths	10-16	Q1d, Q1e, Q1f, Q1g
Importance	10-16	Q1a, Q1j, Q1k, Q1n, Q1s
Teacher Support	10-16	Q7b, Q7c
Administration Support	10-16	Q7d, Q7e, Q7j
Parent Support	10-16	Q7g
Experience	10-16	Q10Aa
Gender	10-16	Q10B
Number	10-16	Q9D
Education Level	10-16	Q10C

Elementary and Middle School Teacher Questionnaire Items for each Category

Elementary and Middle School Teacher Variables (Variable Names is in Parentheses)	Analysis of Hypothesis:	Question Items
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information on parenting -- Type I (Parenting)	11, 10	Q6b, Q6, Q6, Q6q
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing two-way communication -- Type II (Communicating)	12, 10	Q6a, Q6c, Q6d, Q6g
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents in volunteering at school -- Type III (Volunteering)	13, 10	Q6e
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information on how to help with homework -- Type IV (Homework)	14, 10	Q6f, Q6h, Q6i, Q6j, Q6k
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents in decision-making and leadership opportunities -- Type V (Leadership)	15, 10	Q6n, Q6r
Teacher Perception toward School's Effort to Involve Parents by providing information about community resources and services which help families -- Type VI (Community)	16, 10	Q6o, Q6p
Teacher Perception toward All Types of Involvement --Types I - VI (All Types)	10, 16	Q6a - Q6r
Strengths	10-16	Q1b, Q1d, Q1e
Importance	10-16	Q1a, Q1f, Q1k, Q1l, Q1r
Teacher Support	10-16	Q8b
Administration Support	10-16	Q8c, Q8d, Q8h
Parent Support	10-16	Q8e
Experience	10-16	Q11A
Gender	10-16	Q11B
Number	10-16	Q10C
Education Level	10-16	Q11C

Elementary and Middle School Parent Questionnaire Items for each Category

Elementary and Middle School Parent Variables (Variable Name is in parentheses.)	Analysis of Hypothesis:	Question Items
Parent Perceptions toward School's Program to Involve Parents by providing information on parenting -- Type I (Parenting)	1,9	Q4a
Parent Perceptions toward School's Program to Involve Parents by providing two-way communication -- Type II (Communicating)	2,9	Q4b, Q4d, Q4f, Qfg,
Parent Perceptions toward School's Program to Involve Parents in volunteering at school -- Type III (Volunteering)	3,9	Q4m, Q4k
Parent Perceptions toward School's Program to Involve Parents by providing information on how to help with homework -- Type IV (Homework)	4,9	Q4c, Q4e, Q4h
Parent Perceptions toward School's Program to Involve Parents in decision-making and leadership opportunities -- Type V (Leadership)	5,9	Q4n, Q4o, Q4p
Parent Perceptions toward School's Program to Involve Parents by providing information about community resources and services which help families -- Type VI (Community)	6,9	Q4q
Parent Perceptions toward All Types of Involvement --Types I - VI (All Types)	7,8,9	Q4a - Q4q
Self-Reported Practices of Type I of Parent Involvement (PracParenting)	8	Q3a, Q3r
Self-Reported Practices of Type II of Parent Involvement (PracCommunicating)	8	Q3j, Q3k
Self-Reported Practices of Type III of Parent Involvement (PracVolunteering)	8	Q3o, Q3n
Self-Reported Practices of Type IV of Parent Involvement (PracHomework)	8	Q3c, Q3d, Q3e, Q3f, Q3g, Q3h, Q3i, Q3m, Q3p
Self-Reported Practices of Type V of Parent Involvement (PracLeadership)	8	Q3l
Self-Reported Practices of Type VI of Parent Involvement (PracCommunity)	8	Q3q
Self-Reported Practices of All Types of Parent Involvement (PracAll Types)	8	Q3a-Q3q
View	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q1a, Q1b, Q1c Q1q Q1l
Success	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q9a, Q9b
Effort	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q1d, Q1g, Q1o, Q1p
Adults	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q9f
Education Level	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q9h
Income Level	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	Q9k
Gender	1,2,3,4,5, 6,7	D

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES

Demographic Tables for Parents

Demographic Data - Income Level of Households

	Under $13,000	$13,001-$25,000	$25,001-$35,000	$35,000-$50,000	Over $50,000
Elementary/Middle School Parents	42	77	82	69	56
High School Parents	1	42	25	11	11

Demographic Data - Education Level of Parents

	Less than High Diploma	High School Diploma	Some College	College Degree	Advanced Degree
Elementary/Middle School Parents	7	47	124	122	39
High School Parents	Data file is missing...				

Demographic Data - Gender of Parent Respondent

	Females	Males
Elementary/Middle School Parents	244	192
High School Parents	62	28

Demographic Tables for Teachers

Demographic Data - Years of Experience for Teachers

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	Over 30
Elementary/Middle School Teachers	47	40	33	48	43	15	9
High School Teachers	16	19	6	30	11	9	3

Demographic Data - Education Level of Teachers

	Bachelor of Science	B.S. plus Credits	Master's	M.S. plus Credits	Specialist	Doc.	Other
Elementary/Middle School Teachers	9	118	9	39	8	1	1
High School Teachers	14	56	10	4	X	0	0

Demographic Data - Gender of Teacher Respondent

	Females	Males
Elementary/Middle School Parents	244	192
High School Parents	62	28