DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 257 95 UD 015 658

AUTHOR Blackman, Julie
TITLE Voucher Schools: Who Participates? ERIC-CUE Urban Disadvantaged Series, Number 46, August 1975.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 75
CONTRACT NIE-C-400-75-0008
NOTE 71p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College - Columbia University, New York, New York 10027 ($2.50, paper)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Alternatives; Educational Change; *Educational Equality; *Educational Experiments; Educational Improvement; *Educational Innovation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Opportunities; Education Vouchers; *Parent Participation; School Community Cooperation; School Improvement; School Involvement; School Organization; School Role; School Systems; Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS *California (Alum Rock)

ABSTRACT

A brief review of a school system in Alum Rock, California that uses the voucher, this paper focuses on an educational strategy intended to maximize the school's responsiveness to the expressed needs of the parents. The ideas and values underlying the development of the voucher school, the problems of operationalization, as these are said to influence the measures used in the research cited, are discussed. The paper also deals with (1) some of the Alum Rock data on rates of parental participation, where the indices of participation include both school and non-school context and rely on both attitudinal and reported behavioral measures of participation; and (2) some correlates of parental participation such as education, ethnicity, income, and occupation in the voucher schools, drawing inferences about the implications of these varying rates of participation on the educational processes shaped by the voucher school system. The pattern of findings is said to be interpretable in terms of social class differences, parental participation being of key importance in the voucher school plan. The intentions of the planners of the voucher school system are considered not to have been fulfilled in the Alum Rock school system by the time of its first evaluation. (Author/AM)

ERIC/CUE URBAN DISADVANTAGED SERIES
Number 46, August 1975

Voucher Schools: Who Participates?

Julie Blackman

Graduate Student
Teachers College, Columbia University

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION
and
INSTITUTE FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 10027

The Institute for Urban and Minority Education (IUME) is an agency for human resource development and school organization improvement in the nation's cities. Founded in 1973, the Institute is jointly sponsored by the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, and Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York. Its mission includes:

- The reconceptualization and specification of issues and problems related to education in urban communities
- The conduct of research related to these areas of concern
- The dissemination of knowledge and information related to urban education and the education of minority groups
- The design, development, and delivery of multiple services for education in urban and minority communities.

Program activities of the Institute focus on three problem areas in urban and minority education. They are:

- Problems related to the diversity of individual and group patterns of cognitive and affective function in learning
- Problems related to patterns of high geographic mobility coupled with social immobility among low income urban populations
- Problems related to the rigidity of individual and group behaviors and of social and organizational systems in public schools.

Inquiries concerning IUME may be addressed to:

INSTITUTE FOR URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J. 08540

(609) 921-9000

Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, N. Y. 10027
(212) 678-3780

Edmund W. Gordon, Executive Director

Charles C. Harrington, Associate Director
E. Frederic Morrow, Associate Director

This paper is one in the ERIC/CUE Urban Disadvantaged Series produced by the ERIC Clearninghouse on Urban Education under contract 400-75-0008 between the National Institute of Education (DHEW) and Teachers College, Columbia University. Addition copies will be available from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P. O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210.

Its ED identification number and full ordering instructions will be found in Resources in Education, the monthly ERIC abstract journal or can be obtained by contacting ERIC/CUE.

Copies are also available from the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, for $2.50 each.

Voucher Schools: Who Participates? is a prize paper in a national graduate student competition conducted by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. The goal of the competition was to identify graduate student work, not yet widely known, that can make a contribution to knowledge about the theory and practice of urban and minority education.

The traditional view of public education as providing guaranteed routes to upward social mobility is challenged by the vast inequities in the distribution across socio-economic strata of educational resources and positive outcomes. One tactic which has grown out of concern over these inequities is the voucher school system, an educational strategy intended to maximize the school's responsiveness to the expressed needs of the parents. The fundamental question addressed here is: How effectively do voucher school systems, which stress family participation and decision-making, counter the present inequities in the availability of quality schooling?

First, this paper will present a brief review of one such school system in Alum Rock, California, funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE). Secondly, the ideas and values underlying the development of the voucher school will be discussed. Thirdly, the problems of operationalization will be considered, as they influenced the measures used in the research cited in this paper. Specifically, the reasons for the discrepancies typically found between attitudinal and behavioral measures will be reviewed. Fourthly, some of the Alum Rock data on rates of parental participation

will be considered. The indices of participation include both school and non-school contexts and rely on both attitudinal and reported behavioral measures of participation. Finally, this paper will delineate some correlates of parental participation (e.g. education, ethnicity, income and occupation) in the voucher schools and will draw inferences about the implications of these varying rates of participation on the educational processes shaped by the voucher school system.

In Brief: The Voucher-School System at Alum Rock

Alum Rock is a largely Chicano district in San Jose, California. Since the 1972-1973 school year, the National Institute of Education (NIE) has funded a voucher school system there. The parents of each child of elementary school age receive a voucher from the district which they use to "pay" for their child's tuition at the elementary school program of their choice. Transportation grants were included in the funding of this project, so that all programs are equally accessible to all children. At present, the voucher system is in its third year of operation. There are fifty-three mini-schools housed in fourteen buildings, from which the parents may select a program

which seems best suited to their child's interests and needs. Furthermore, the parents may transfer their child from one program to another during the school year.

This school system is experimental in nature and includes provisions for extensive evaluation. Parents were interviewed in November of 1972, 1973 and 1974. The data to be described in this paper were collected in 1972, at an early point in the voucher school system's existence. However, although these interviews occurred only shortly after the program began, it is important to realize that the purposes and procedures of the voucher school system were quite intensively advertised (in both Spanish and English) through school publications, meetings, counselor visits and the mass media.

Public Schools and the Distribution of the Educational Wealth

Cremin (1965) in The Genius of American Education, stated that "Education has been . . . America's instrument of social progress and reform." He noted, ". . . the boundless faith of the citizenry in the power of popular education" (p. 119). The educational bootstrap provided by the public school

system has long been regarded as the equalizer of opportunity.

However, the prevalent pattern of lower-class, inner-city populations attending schools separate from the middle and upper class suburbanites demonstrates that school districts are not equal throughout the country's public school system. The poorly distributed wealth of resources and facilities belies the potential impact of education as social equalizer. Nevertheless, as Banfield (1970) pointed out in his book, The Unheavenly City, "The most widely recommended 'solution' to the problems of the city is more and better schooling. There is almost nothing that someone does not hope to achieve by these means" (p. 132). In spite of these inequalities in resources across school districts, social reformers still look to improved schooling strategies as the best remedies for social class inequities.

Unfortunately, the Coleman (1971) study on equality of educational opportunity found striking correlations between socio-economic class and school learning performance. Furthermore, it found that physical facilities such as ". . . newer school buildings, more teachers, more materials, libraries, special programs, and the rest did not alter the central fact

of socio-economic determinism" (Sizer, 1971, p. 226). The seemingly unshakeable family influence that a child brings with him (her) to school is best illustrated by the fact that there is a pupil attitude factor that is more strongly related to achievement than all the "school" factors together. It is the ". . . extent to which an individual feels he has some control over his own destiny" (Coleman, 1971, p. 252). Further, the responses of the pupils who took part in this study indicated that minority students (except for Orientals) ". . . have far less conviction than whites that they can affect their own environment and futures"(Coleman, 1971, p. 254).

The fact that family-related factors were shown to play a central role in school achievement led the movement for reform through the schools to change tactics. Rather than pouring money directly into the school system, it was suggested that the parents of school-age children receive education vouchers to be used to pay their children's tuitions at the schools of their choice. The impetus behind this redirection can be explained by examining some of the implicit assumptions of the voucher school scheme. By designing a school system where the parents play a central role in determining the course of their children's educations,

it is being assumed that there is some process of value induction, whereby the values and beliefs of the parents are transmitted to and shared by their children. Some research done by Greenstein (1969) on the political views of children indicated that there is almost complete congruence between the political attitudes of parents and of their elementary school-age children. Further, given the nature of familial structures and living environments in this country, it seems not unreasonable to assume that parents transmit at least some portion of their attitudes, beliefs and values to their children. Naturally, this model is limited to the extent that this transmission of values does not occur. However, evidence provided by the Coleman report (1971) and by other research on the relationship between educational inputs and outcomes (see Noah and Eckstein, 1974) suggest that parental background and related attitudes are potent forces in shaping the attitudes of children and that these attitudes are of considerable importance in determining their performance in school. This transmission of values is not assessed in this paper. However, it is necessary to discuss the reasons for involving the parents in order to validate the importance of looking at parental participation

as a potential harbinger of change from the educational status quo.

It was hoped that the attitudinal differences across socio-economic status groups that Coleman (1971) discovered would be diminished by the increased participation of the parents and of the children. More specifically, the voucher school was designed to increase involvement among the lower socio-economic status groups, thereby reducing their school-related disadvantages relative to the higher socio-economic status groups. Further, it was hoped that active involvement in the schools would encourage and nurture the development of a sense of personal efficacy among the participating parents and that this sense of efficacy would generalize to their other areas of endeavor (as well as to their children). Here, particularly for the stereotypical lower socio-economic status parent, the intervention of the education voucher is being assigned a position of considerable influence in the parents' estimations of their capabilities. While it was not being assumed that the institution of voucher schools would have such far-reaching impacts, it was hoped that the effects of active involvement in the school system's functioning would have such implications for the parents. For both

the parents and the children of those families who are being educationally disadvantaged, the voucher school was intended to bring about reforms, to lessen the impact of social class on involvement in and advantages due to education.

Perspectives on the Voucher School

Economists, sociologists and psychologists have detailed the purposes of the voucher school, whose primary foci have included the enhancement of the parental-participation process. For economists, like Milton Friedman, this heightened emphasis on parental participation in the school system would guarantee the successful operation of the laws of supply and demand. Surely, as parents newly empowered by the voucher school's structure expressed their feelings about the kinds of educational services which they believed would be most responsive to their children's needs, effective means would be found to attain these ends. Indeed, Friedman (1973) noted that:

> . . . the way to achieve real reform in schooling is to give competition and free enterprise greater scope; to make available to children of low- and middle-income parents, particularly those living in slums, a range of choice in schooling comparable to that which the children of upper-income parents have long enjoyed. (p. 22)

From a more sociological perspective, this participation process has important implications for the socially stratified nature of educational outcomes in American public schools. As Friedman (1973) noted, parents from higher socio-economic status groups typically have had greater input into the school system's functioning than parents from lower socio-economic status groups have had. Partly as a consequence of these unequal rates of involvement in activities intended to impact on the school's decision-making processes, educational programs have been tailored to meet the demands of these self-selected parents. (An example of selective responsiveness on the part of the schools is provided by the issue of "culture bound" education, where the values of different socio-cultural groups are differentially represented.) The voucher school system was constructed so as to "select all parents for decision-making involvement.

The psychological perspective on these concerns focuses on the family, with the parents as an important locus of change for the school system. This viewpoint asserts that parents know and can act on what is best for their child. In fact, in Alum Rock's statement of purpose, the voucher school system was conceptualized, in part, as an all-out effort to

". . . encourage parental participation at a meaningful level in the decision-making processes" (The Rand Corporation, 1972).

In the voucher scheme, the role of the parents and the nature of their involvement are centrally important. The economic view is the most global, placing the issue of participation within the broader context of schooling-as-commodity. That this competition in the education-marketplace would give greater power to the participating consumer has important societal implications, given the existing relationship between educational services of high quality and the socio-economic status of the school's population. Specifically, empowering the poor via vouchers guarantees them the opportunity to intervene within the structure of the school system, on behalf of their children. The contention, at the level of the family, is that parents are both able and eager to use this power to make educational choices for their children. In fact, the keystone of this interdisciplinary bridge between the parent and the school is parental participation in the decision-making processes.

Attitudinal and Behavioral Issues in Participation

Once having identified the involvement of the parents as vital for the processes of social change intended as a result of the implementation of the voucher school system, it becomes essential to define "participation" in a way that allows it to be evaluated both in the context of the program in Alum Rock, and in a broader societal context. As Table 1 indicates, there are sixteen items in the interview schedule whose contents bear on the general issue of participation. The items selected include a range of settings: from the schools to the political system. In addition, it is particularly important to note that some of the items asked for an attitudinal assessment of participation, while others requested information about real, behavioral rates of participation in both school and non-school related activities.

Assessments: Attitudinal vs. Behavioral

An initial question which must be addressed prior to the consideration of the findings obtained using these items focuses on the nature of the differences between attitudinal and behavioral assessments of phenomena that intuitively seem to be the same. (Of

course, in the Alum Rock data, the behavioral assessments involve only verbal self-reports about behaviors and not the acting out of the behavior itself.) As Calder and Ross (1973) noted: "One of the more persistent problems in social science has been the failure to demonstrate an unequivocal relationship between attitudes and behavior" (p. 1). In addition, it is of value to recognize the fact that such comparisons are really between two kinds of behaviors, one which involves the acting out of behaviors and another which consists of reporting one's attitudes.

The range of reasons suggested for this lack of relationship between attitudinal and behavioral measures includes the following:

1. Most attitudinal (and some behavioral) measures are self-report indices and are subject to the influence of such factors as social desirability, acquiescent response set and experimenter expectancy effects" (see Webb, Campbell, Schwartz and Sechrest, 1966; Rosenthal, 1963).

2. These measures are often limited in scope. For example, Calder and Ross (1973) wrote: "One possible reason for the low attitude-behavior correlations is that in many instances a general attitude was measured while the behavior to be predicted was extremely

specific. Consequently, the behavioral incident may have had little or no relationship to the attitude" (p. 17).

3. Attitudes are multidimensional, having cognitive, affective and conative components. The single-attitude measures provided by traditional attitude scales cannot adequately represent all of an attitude's dimensions and so, consequently cannot predict behavior accurately (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1974).

4. More generally, attitudes and behaviors are overdetermined. As Wicker (1969) points out, both attitudes and behaviors are more complexly determined than most measures of these concepts allow. Other attitudes or behaviors, besides those being measured, may interfere with high correlations between a particular behavior and a single attitude. Insko and Schopler (1967) argue that while an overt behavior may seem to be inconsistent with a particular attitude, that the behavior may be consistent with one or more other attitudes which are more strongly held. Fishbein and Ajzen (1974) suggest that intentions and the factors which shape them act as "confounding attitudes" in the attempt to delineate a clear relationship between some measured attitude and behavior. In addition, competing motives may override the behavior-producing

motive related to a particular behavior.

5. Triandis (1971) contends that three factors internal to the individual operate in addition to attitudes: social norms, habits, and expectancies about reinforcement.

6. Individual differences are likely to impact on the attitude-behavior relationship. For example, individual differences in general activity levels may act as controlling factors in determining how likely an individual is to act in ways that are consistent with his expressed attitudes (Wicker, 1969).

7. Campbell (1963) contends that behaviors may have different thresholds for appearance and that some indications of attitudes have low thresholds in that they will occur even with a weak attitude, while other manifestations may require a strong attitude before they will occur.

8. Wicker (1969) postulates that ". . . the more similar the situations in which verbal and overt behavioral responses are obtained, the stronger will be the attitude-behavior relationship" (p. 69). Wicker (1969) specifies six dimensions of such similarity: (1) The actual or considered presence of other people; (2) Normative prescriptions of proper behavior; (3) Alternative behaviors available; (4) The specificity of

attitude objects; (5) Unforeseen extraneous events; and (6) Expected and/or actual consequences of various acts.

Some Specific Uses of Attitudinal and Behavioral Measures

In this paper, the attitudes and behaviors to be investigated involve participation. Behavioral (reported) participation was measured across different situations: in the schools and in a socio-political realm. The attitudinal measures dealt only with the schools.

The 1972 sample used here consisted of a probability sample of 600 parents, representing over 25 percent of the total number of households involved in the Alum Rock project. This sample was approximately 34 percent Anglo, 11 percent Black, 31 percent English-speaking Mexican-Americans, 13 percent non-English-speaking Mexican-Americans and 11 percent Others. Thirty-eight percent of those sampled earned less than $7,500 per year, 20 percent earned between $7,500 and $10,000 per year and 43 percent earned over $10,000 per year. Twenty-nine percent had completed eight or fewer years of school; 25 percent had finished from nine to eleven years. Twenty-seven percent were high school graduates. Sixteen percent had attended college

or technical school and 3 percent were college graduates (Bridge, 1974).

Factor Analyses

In order to identify those items which would comprise an index of participation, the items which appear in Table 1 were selected and included in a series of factor analyses. As previously noted, some of the items asked for an attitudinal assessment of the act of participation, while others requested information about real, behavioral rates of participation in both school and non-school related activities. (All items were presented using a 5 point Likert type scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.)

The first factor analysis included all sixteen of the items listed in Table 1. The results of that factor analysis appear in Table 2. This analysis yielded seven factors. On the basis of this factor analysis, items Q29G, Q35D and Q43 were eliminated and a second factor analysis was computed. This analysis yielded six factors. The results of this second analysis appear in Table 3. In a third run, which represents the most refined analysis of this series, the factor analysis was limited to extracting only three factors. A detailed interpretation of this

factor analysis appears below (see Table 4 for the loadings on each item). (Note: All the factor analyses used the Varimax Rotations procedure.)

Factor I was comprised of items Q36A, Q36B, Q36C, Q36D and Q29A and accounted for 44 percent of the variance. The issue here was clearly one of participation in decisions related to the school's functioning. Whether the specific focus was the hiring and firing of the teachers or the principal, the curriculum or the school budget, a consistent response tendency was activated. The items all asked about one's attitudinal commitment to the idea of participation in the schools. The structural similarities of items Q36A, Q36B, Q36C and Q36D suggested that methodological artifact could account for these findings. However, the fact that Q29A also loaded (although less strongly) on this factor lends support to the contention that the substantive component centering on attitudes about decision-making caused these five items to hang together.

Factor II, which accounted for 26 percent of the variance, included items Q57A, Q57B, Q57C and Q58 (recoded as RSCHGRP). The focus of these items was on real participation in school-related activities. The questions asked whether or not the parent or

some family member had talked with the teacher, attended meetings about the schools, attended special events at the schools, and/or joined the parents' organization in the schools. The import of this factor, which like Factor I, assessed participation within the school system, lies with the fact that in Factor II, a more "behavioral" assessment of participation (reported participation) was being made (as opposed to the attitudinal assessment in Factor I). As the review of the reasons for the low correlations between attitudinal and behavioral measures noted, most often there is not a positive relationship between attitudinal and behavioral measures of the same phenomena. This factor analysis substantiated this trend with regard to the disparities between attitudinal and behavioral assessments. The items which comprised Factor II did so because all of them involved rates of real participation within the school system. As such, these items represented an index of real participation in the schools via the conventional routes of access available to an interested parent.

Factor III consisted of items Q37A, Q37B, Q37C and Q59 (recoded as RATTMTG) and accounted for 17 percent of the variance. These items, like those in Factor II, dealt with indices of behavior rather than

of attitudes. Here, however, the arena of activity changed from the schools to the polity--causing a different set of behavioral tendencies to be evidenced. Here, real involvement in activities that typify participation in the political system were used to assess "participation." Those respondents (or some member of their family) who worked for a candidate, registered to vote, wore a campaign button and/or attended public meetings that were not about the schools were demonstrating a predisposition for participation in the political-social system. It is important to note that these measures of behavioral participation in the political-social system did not load on the same factor as the assessment made of behavioral participation in the school-related events. It is not unreasonable to assume that the schools differed from the polity in the kinds of opportunities they offered for participation or involvement; and different threshold behaviors existed for the different social settings. In order to compare the kinds of people (and families) who were involved in these various activities, to explore more fully the differences between attitudinal and behavioral measures and to investigate some of the implications of attitudinal endorsement for behavioral

participation, a crosstabs analysis was run.

Correlates of Participation: Crosstabs Analyses

The factor index computed for each individual equals the sum of "yes" responses given to the items loading on each factor. The possible range of scores for Factor I goes from 0-5, and from 0-4 for both Factors II and III. The scores on Factors I, II and III were crosstabbed by education, ethnicity, income and household occupational status. (In order most clearly to present these findings, the factor index was divided into high and low scores--this division occurs approximately at the median.) In addition, some of the two-variable crosstabs were included in three-variable crosstabs, which added the parent's sex as a mediating ("test") variable. This body of findings is of particular importance because they specified the interrelationships among the traits listed above and the attitudinal and behavioral components of measurable participation. These relationships specify the impact of differences in the respondents' characteristics on their attitudes and behaviors with regard to participation.

As previously discussed, a focal point of the principles underlying the development of the voucher

system was the belief that parental involvement in the educational process would guarantee each child the best of all possible educations. The voucher school system in Alum Rock was designed with the knowledge that the sample of parents who typically have participated in school affairs was not a random one and that such varying factors as education, income, ethnicity and occupation have brought about varying rates of participation. A basic purpose of the voucher system was to involve more directly each parent, regardless of his education, ethnicity or socio-economic status. Therefore, the particular importance of these crosstabs analyses lies with the fact that they describe trends in the willingness to participate which are highly dependent on the characteristics of the respondent. The following crosstabs address fundamental questions with regard to this purpose: Has the voucher school system created more nearly equal rates of participation across educational, ethnic and socio-economic groups? Has participation increased among the lower echelons of these groups? Who is participating?

Education

In this section, the relationships between education and the attitudinal and behavioral factor-

measures of participation will be discussed. The education of the respondent was significantly related to all three factors. In general, as level of educational attainment increased, the rate of expressed willingness to participate in schools increased, as did the reported rates of behavioral participation in school activities and in socio-political activities.

Education and Attitudinal Participation in the Schools

More specifically, in the crosstab which involved education and Factor I, it is important to note that 55 percent of those with only a grade school education were high in agreement on this factor (agreed with three or more of the five items) which investigated attitudes about participation in decision-making with regard to the schools. Sixty percent of the high school graduates were high in participation. Seventy-two percent of those with more than a high school diploma were high in their advocacy of parental participation in the schools. Therefore, given this distribution of responses, it is clear that educational differences are important in determining endorsements of this participative ethic. The better educated a person is, the more likely he is to express approval of the ideas involving participation in school affairs. (See Table 5)

Educational and Attitudinal Participation as Mediated by Sex

When sex was added as a mediating variable in the relationship between education and ~~Factor I~~, some interesting results emerged. (See Table 6) Among the women, the pattern described in the two-variable crosstab was intensified (see Table 7). Only 49 percent of the women with a grade school education highly endorsed attitudinal participation. For women who were high school graduates, this percentage rose to 61 percent. Eighty-two percent of women with more than a high school education were high on this index of attitudinal participation. Therefore, fewer mothers with less than a high school education endorsed participation than did the combination of parents represented in the previous crosstab. More mothers with more than a high school education endorsed participation than did the corresponding groups of parents in the first crosstab. (Among the fathers, the relationship between educational attainment and Factor I was non-significant ($p. = .296$). Educational attainment played no role in determining who would endorse this belief in participation.) Clearly, the trend described in the original crosstab between education and Factor I was well-augmented by the sex of the respondent. The positive relationship

between increasing amount of education and high agreement on the items about decision-making in the schools held only for the mothers, not for the fathers. Among the men, educational attainment did not predict attitudinal advocacy of participation.

Education and Reported Participation in School Activities

The relationships between educational attainment and reported school participation evidenced a trend parallel to the one described above for the women. Only 25 percent of those respondents with a grade school education reported that they or some member(s) of their families had participated in two or more of the four items which comprised Factor II (real school participation). This percentage rose to 39 percent among those with a high school education and to 54 percent for those with more than a high school education (see Table 8). The phenomenon of participation in schools as depicted by this behavioral assessment appears to be predictable from the educational level of the parent. There are several alternative explanations for this behavioral trend. One possibility is that those who had been most successful within the education system (i.e. had completed the most schooling) would be most likely to

feel comfortable in that setting (have a low threshold for the expression of these behaviors) and therefore, would be more likely to participate in school-related activities. A second possibility is that the better educated parents were more familiar with the workings of the school system and so were more likely to become involved in the school's activities. A third alternative points to differences in acculturation among different educational groups. Behavioral prescriptions may vary across educational groups. Those with only a grade school education may feel that the educational process is best determined by educators and not by parents. Although this attitude would be assessed as a kind of passivity, it is possible that leaving participation in school activities to the educators is an "active" choice, supported by that subculture for reasons which do not hinge on a sense of discomfort or unfamiliarity with the school system, but on the belief that educators are better qualified than poorly educated parents to make schooling choices. A fourth possibility is that the impact of social desirability operates differently at different levels of education. For well-educated parents, participation is more clearly appropriate. For those with less education, leaving the decisions and involvements

up to the educators may seem a more desirable response. However, insofar as one's sense of what is socially desirable influences his behavior (as well as his reporting of it) the impact of social desirability here is unlikely to be a methodological artifact. Those parents who felt that it was of value to report playing no role in school activities were probably more likely to be non-participators than those parents who believed that reporting participation in school affairs was desirable.

Education and Reported Socio-Political Participation

Although less distinct, a pattern similar to those which appeared in the two-variable crosstabs appeared again in the relationship between education and reported measures of socio-political participation. Real political participation (as measured by reported participation in such activities as working for candidates) is a less frequent activity among these respondents. In fact, approximately 70 percent of the total number of respondents (and/or members of their families) in this sample reported having participated in one or none of the described activities. Furthermore, there are particularly low rates of political participation among the poorly educated. Approximately

21 percent of those with only a grade school education had performed two or more of the political activities which comprised Factor III (see Table 9). This same level of political participation occurred in 31 percent of the high school graduates and 39 percent of those with more than a high school diploma. With socio-political participation as with real school participation and with attitudinal participation among women, differences in educational attainment explained the significant differences in rates of participation.

Summary of Education by Participation Crosstabs

In all three of the two-variable crosstabs, amount of education was significantly related to the amount of participation, whether it was measured attitudinally or behaviorally. The better educated the parents were the more likely they were to report that they or some member of their family were actively involved in both school and socio-political affairs. Furthermore (at least among the women), they were more likely to endorse attitudinally school-related participation. These results would seem to indicate that there is some fundamental phenomenon being measured by these three participation-indices. For reasons

like social desirability and high thresholds for behavioral acts, the patterns were strongest (the largest numbers of people were participating) on the attitudinal index. However, the fact that the directions of the results were consistent across measures suggests that these indices were accurately tapping some underlying disposition focused on the willingness to participate. That the trend in all three varieties of participation ran counter to the idealistic underpinnings of the voucher school system is of considerable importance for the formulation of future policy. These findings will be discussed with a view toward such policy implications in a later section of the paper.

Ethnicity

The ethnicity of the respondent was crosstabbed by all three factors. Ethnicity proved to be of considerable value in explaining differential rates of participation. In fact, all three factor-indices of participation were significantly related to ethnicity. Blacks showed themselves to be the ethnic group strongest in their attitudinal endorsement of participation, while anglos and blacks were the most active groups in terms of their reported behavioral participation

in the school and in political activities.

Ethnicity and Attitudinal Participation in the Schools

The crosstabs analysis involving ethnicity and Factor I showed blacks to be the highest endorsers of "attitudinal" participation in school decisions. Table 10 demonstrates that blacks endorsed participation more than any other ethnic group. Seventy-five percent of all black respondents were high in agreement (agreed with three or more of the five items) with the items which asked about beliefs with regard to participation in the schools. The same percentages were 65 percent for anglos, 54 percent for English-speaking Mexicans, 56 percent for non-English-speaking Mexicans and 56 percent for Others. As these numbers indicate, anglos were fairly high in their attitudinal endorsement of participation. Non-English- and English-speaking Mexican-Americans were both fairly low as were Others. (The latter three groups were virtually indistinguishable in their attitudes toward participation.)

Ethnicity and Attitudinal Participation in the Schools as Mediated by Sex

The relationship between ethnicity and the endorsement of participation was significant for the women ($p < .001$), but was not significant for the men

($p = .120$). Ethnicity played an important role in determining attitudes about school participation for the women. For the men, with the exception of the blacks, all the groups looked approximately the same. (74 percent of the black men endorsed three or more of the five items asking about decision-making in the schools. This percentage for the other four groups ranged from 55 to 62 percent.) However, these differences were not significant. One can only note the apparent trend. For the women, the relationship between ethnicity and attitudinal endorsement of these participation items approximately paralleled that found in the two-variable crosstab. Unlike the two-variable crosstab, though (where the blacks were higher than the anglos in their endorsement of participation), anglo and black women showed almost equal rates of high advocacy of these participation items: 73 percent of anglo mothers agreed with three or more of the five items. This percentage was 75 percent among black mothers. (Surprisingly, these percentages for the fathers were 55 and 74 percent, respectively. Anglo men were much lower in their support for parental decision-making in the schools than were anglo women. This discrepancy accounts for the differences between

anglos and blacks in the two-variable crosstab.) Among the women, both non-English and English-speaking Chicanos were underrepresented in the high endorsement category, with 50 percent and 48 percent, respectively. Fifty-six percent of the Other women appeared in this high agreement group. Clearly, ethnicity is important for the mothers in determining their attitudes. For the men, this is not true at a sufficiently strong level of significance. Still, controlling for sex adds an interesting dimension to this view of the dynamics involved in the relationship among sex, ethnicity and attitudinal support for participation in the schools (see Tables 11, 12).

Ethnicity and Reported Participation in School Activities

This more behavioral assessment of participation in the schools showed a reversal in the levels of participation evidenced by anglos and blacks as compared with the results from the attitudinal items. Fifty percent of the anglos reported that they or some member of their family had participated in two or more of the four school activities described. This proportion among the black respondents was 45 percent. Basically, though, these rates of behavioral participation were similar. Here, as with the attitudinal

assessment of school-participation, anglos and blacks reported themselves as the most actively involved in school events. In a pattern that paralleled the relationship between Factor I and ethnicity, Others, English-speaking Chicanos and non-English-speaking Chicanos reported significantly lower rates of participation in the schools: 33 percent of the Others, 29 percent of the English-speaking Chicanos and 21 percent of the non-English-speaking Chicanos reported having participated in two or more of the four school-related activities (see Table 13). It is particularly important to note the differences in rates of reported behavioral participation between English and non-English-speaking Mexican-Americans, as these findings compare with those from the Factor I analysis. Although non-English and English-speaking Chicanos expressed similar attitudes about participation in the schools, the English-speaking Chicanos reported having actually participated more frequently than their non-English-speaking counterparts.

Ethnicity and Reported Socio-Political Participation

The trend which appeared in the two-variable corsstab between Ethnicity and Factor II was almost exactly replicated in the Factor III-Ethnicity crosstab

analysis. Once again, anglos and blacks were considerably higher than the three other ethnic groups in participativeness. As Table 14 indicates, 36 percent of the anglos and a similar proportion of the blacks were high in participation (reported that they or some member of their family had participated in two or more of the four activities) on the activities included in this behavioral index of socio-political participation. The comparable percentage is 28 percent for Others, 26 percent for English-speaking Mexican-Americans and 18 percent for non-English-speaking Mexican-Americans. As with reported participation in the schools (Factor II), English-speaking Chicanos reported having participated in socio-political activities more often than did non-English-speaking Chicanos.

Summary of Ethnicity by Participation Crosstabs

These crosstabs involving ethnicity demonstrated clearly that there are important ethnic distinctions to be drawn. First, Chicanos, whether they were interviewed in Spanish or in English were consistently less participative than were the anglos and the blacks on all three factor-measures of participation (with Others somewhere between the Chicanos and the anglos and the blacks). When the analysis involving Factor I

was controlled for sex, this pattern was replicated among the women, although the relationship for the men was not significant. Neither the non-English-speaking nor the English-speaking Chicanos ever exceed the mean value for the category defined as "high in participation" on any of the three indices. Clearly, being Mexican-American exerted some influence in the direction of non-involvement in school and political affairs. Not surprisingly, Mexican-Americans who did not speak English reported even less activity than did English-speaking Mexican-Americans. However, this pattern was reversed (although the differences were small) in the attitudinal assessment made by the Factor I index. It would seem that the inability to speak English acted as an additional source of participation-suppression, inhibiting involvement (vis à vis English-speaking Chicanos) in both school and political activities. Certainly this language factor acted in a non-random way in its determination of the needs that went unexpressed. That non-English-speaking Mexican Americans indicated more acceptance of the attitudinal participation items comprising Factor I than did English-speaking Mexican-Americans suggests that aspects of the systems may be operating in such a way as to encourage real participation in a selective way.

The findings which involved anglos and blacks were also of considerable importance. In the two-variable crosstab, blacks exceeded anglos in their attitudinal support of participation in the schools. This trend reversed when reported involvement in school activities was assessed, with anglos evidencing slightly higher amounts of involvement than blacks. The two groups were virtually identical in the high participation category of the socio-political index. Obviously, these two groups presented no consistent, interpretable differences across measures. However, overall, it remains clear that anglos and blacks reported more involvement as measured by these factor-indices than either English-speaking Chicanos, non-English-speaking Chicanos or Others.

Income

Next, amount of income was considered in its interrelationships with Factors I, II and III. Here, as in the previous analyses, the goal of this procedure was to ferret out those inputs (e.g. education, ethnicity) which impact upon the end-products of attitudinal and behavioral assessments of participativeness. Interestingly, in the two-variable crosstab, income was not significantly related to Factor I, the attitudinal

index of participation in decision-making about the school's functioning. However, in the three-variable crosstab, where sex was held constant, the relationship for the men achieved significance ($p = .018$). In addition, amount of income was significantly related to factors II and III. As income increased, reported amounts of participation increased in both school and political activities.

Income and Attitudinal Participation in the Schools as Mediated by Sex

The relationship between family income and the amount of advocacy for participation in the schools was significant among the fathers, but not among the mothers. Interestingly, there appears to be a curvilinear relationship between the amount of income and the attitudinal endorsement of participation in the schools. The fathers in the lowest income category (with incomes of less than $7,500 per year) and the fathers in the highest income category (with incomes greater than $15,000 per year) demonstrated similar patterns in their endorsements of participation in the schools. (See Table 15) Fifty-two percent of fathers with a family income of less than $7,500 per year agreed with three or more of the five attitudinal items. This percentage was 53 for men with family incomes

above $15,000 per year. However, of fathers with a family income between $7,500 and $10,000 per year, 67 percent endorsed three or more of the items. This percentage for fathers with a family income between $10,000 and $15,000 per year was 63 percent. Therefore, it appears that fathers with incomes below $7,500 per year or above $15,000 per year were not as strong in their endorsements of participation in the schools as fathers with incomes between $7,500 and $15,000 per year.

Income and Reported Participation in the Schools

Only 28 percent of those with incomes of less than $7,500 per year reported having participated in two or more of the four school-related activities measured. Among those who earned between $7,500 and $10,000 per year, this percentage rose to 40, while 45 percent of those who earned $10,000 per year or more were high on this index of reported participation (see Table 16). In a further division of this last income group, it was found that for those earning between $10,000 and $15,000 per year, 40 percent reported that they or some member of their family had participated in two or more of the activities. This rate of participation was essentially identical to that of the $7,500-

$10,000 income group. However, 59 percent of those who had incomes over $15,000 reported this rate of participation. Clearly, in the case of reported participation in the schools, family income predicted the amount of participation. Interests are being differentially represented, with the poorest sector of the sample demonstrating the least real involvement in school affairs.

Income and Reported Socio-Political Participation

Although diluted in magnitude, a parallel pattern appeared in the relationship between behavioral participation in social and political activities and income. Twenty-seven percent of those earning less than $10,000 per year reported that they or some member of their family had participated in two or more of the activities measured by the Factor III index. This proportion rose to 35 percent for those earning above $10,000 per year (see Table 17). A division of those earning more than $10,000 per year into groups earning more or less than $15,000 showed that 34 percent of the lower-income group reported having participated in socio-political activities. This proportion rose to 41 percent in the upper-income group created by the $15,000 division. As income increased, reported

participation in socio-political activities increased, and as with reported participation, the trend appeared to be monotonic with a particularly large increase in behavioral participation for those earning more than $15,000 per year.

Summary of Income by Participation Crosstabs

With the exception of the attitudinal measure, income predicted the amount of participation. The attitudinal index showed that middle-income fathers advocated participation more than the fathers with incomes of less than $7,500 per year or greater than $15,000 per year. The "behavioral" measures showed that the higher the family income of the parents the more likely they were to report that they or some members of their families had participated in both school-related and political system events. This latter finding confirms the idea that poorer parents are less likely to be involved in the schools and the polity than their wealthier counterparts. It was the recognition of inequities such as this one that led to the development of the voucher system.

Furthermore, the high rate of attitudinal advocacy of participation by men with family incomes of less than $7,500 per year suggests that at some point between

the expression of beliefs and the performance of behaviors there are impediments to active involvement. There are both methodological and substantive reasons for such discrepancies. The methodological issues focus on threshold differences between expressing an attitude and acting out a behavior in accordance with that attitude. From a more substantive perspective, one may note that it is often true that poorer people have less "free time" to devote to civic affairs than do their richer neighbors. In addition, it is not unreasonable to assert that the schools and the political system operate in ways that "discourage" participation among the lower socio-economic strata.

Occupation

Finally, the three factors were crosstabbed by the occupational status of the respondent's household. Since it is reasonable to assume that income and occupational status are highly correlated with one another, it is not surprising that (as with income) occupational status was not significantly related to attitudes toward participation in the schools. (Note: Factor I and Occupation were not included in a three-variable crosstab, controlling for sex, because occupational data on the women are poor. Housewives were coded as

unemployed.) Similarly, one would expect the trends resulting from the crosstabs between participation as measured by Factors II and III and occupational status to resemble those found for the interrelationships between income and these factors.

Occupation and Reported Participation In School Activities

In fact, 58 percent of the respondents from white-collar households reported that they or some member of their family had participated in two or more school-related events, versus 32 percent of the respondents from households with blue-collar occupational status. In addition, 37 percent of the blue-collar workers had not participated in any school-related activities, while 28 percent of the white-collar workers were in this non-involvement group. This participation pattern parallels that found for income groups: the higher the parents' statuses, the more likely they were to report involvement in school activities. (See Table 18)

Occupation and Reported Participation in Socio-Political Activities

In the realm of socio-political participation, 43 percent of the white-collar workers reported that they or some family member had participated in two or more of the four activities, while only 22 percent of blue-

collar workers had not participated in any of the events described, while this proportion was only 17 percent among the white-collar workers. (See Table 19)

Summary of Occupation by Participation Crosstabs

It is obvious that occupational status predicted major differences in reported participation within both the scholastic and the socio-political arenas. Like the other uneven rates of participation across educational, ethnic and income groups, these analyses described participation trends which are likely to promote the increase of the school and political systems' reliances upon particular, interested groups in the making of policy decisions.

Summary

A brief review of the findings shows that as the educational level of the mothers increased, their attitudinal endorsement of participation increased, as did the reported rates of participation in school and socio-political activities for all the parents. The analyses involving ethnicity showed blacks to be strongest in their attitudinal endorsement of participation, followed by anglos, others, non-English-speaking Chicanos and English-speaking Chicanos. These differences were non-

significant for the fathers. However, a parallel trend was evidenced among the mothers, with anglo and black women reporting the highest endorsements of participation in the schools. The two measures which relied upon reported rates of actual participation also showed anglos and blacks to be the most involved in both school and non-school related activities, followed by others, English-speaking- and non-English-speaking Chicanos. Family income was related to differences in reported rates of actual participation, with those earning more money reporting more participation. The trends were clearly monotonic for both the school and the socio-political indices. Surprisingly, the attitudinal index showed the two middle-income groups to be the highest in their endorsements of participation in the schools with those earning less than $7,500 per year or more than $15,000 per year evidencing less attitudinal support of involvement in school decision-making. Finally, the data using occupational status showed that white-collar workers reported higher rates of real participation in both school and political activities than did blue-collar workers (see Table 20).

Conclusions and Implications

Overall, these results were remarkably consistent. The pattern of findings are largely interpretable in terms of social class differences. The higher the educational attainment, income and occupational status of the respondents, the more likely they were to report that they should have been and were involved in both school and political activities (with the one exception created by the curvilinear trend across income groups for men on the attitudinal assessment of participation in the schools). There were also consistent participation trends related to ethnic group membership, with anglos and blacks reporting higher rates of participation than did the Chicanos or the others. These differences were also related to social class differences. In Alum Rock, anglos and blacks are higher in social class than are Mexican-Americans.

At this point it is important to reconsider the idealistic intentions of the designers of the voucher school. In particular, Friedman advised that the institution of a wider range of educational choices for lower class parents would operate so as to put their children in the educationally advantageous position heretofore occupied only by children from middle and

high-income families. Certainly a prerequisite for this advantaged status is involvement in the school's activities and decision-making processes. Without similar high rates of parental involvement across socio-economic groups, it is impossible for children from different social classes actually to enjoy the same benefits from the increased responsiveness on the part of the schools. Further, since the voucher school system was structured so as to maximize the impact of parental input, it is possible that the children of lower class parents will suffer an even greater loss relative to their middle and upper class counterparts than they did in the typical non-voucher school. Of course, it could be argued that in Alum Rock all the school children will enjoy a "Hawthorne effect" improvement in their educations and that relative to prior conditions the distribution of educational resources will have improved. However, it is certain that it will improve more for some children than for others, thereby falling short of the goal of creating a school system which would equalize educational opportunities.

Parental participation was of key importance in the voucher school plan, since without it, the children of uninvolved parents would be obliged to attend classes

created to fulfill the choices of the participating parents. If the needs of the children of non-participating parents are different from the needs of the children of participating parents, then the former group will be at an educational disadvantage.

Clearly, the intentions of the planners of the voucher school system were not fulfilled in the Alum Rock school system by the time of its first evaluation. Those parents who traditionally have been known to participate reported substantially higher rates of involvement than did the parents who were known to be under-participators. Therefore, due to the fact that the structure of the school system empowered the parents, it seems likely that the educational advantages due to the high rates of parental participation will be exacerbated in Alum Rock. The parents who were better educated, wealthier and anglo or black increased still further their impact via the routes of access provided by the voucher school system.

These findings suggest several explanations. First, it is possible that these analyses occurred too early in the course of the project to represent accurately the workings of the voucher school system. However, the fact that the differences in the measures of participation were so strongly influenced by socio-

economic status differences suggests that the more substantive factors presented as interpretations of the data are central to the discussion of implications for the future. In a dynamic, developing system like the one at Alum Rock, it is essential to realize that any class-related lags in participation are certain to create differential impacts on the school programs, with the early participators having the most influence and the best information about which programs to select for their children.

In addition, the consumer's (parent's) competence is basic to the issue of participation in the school or in societal activities. It is conceivable that lower socio-economic status people perceive themselves as less competent in the educational arena than do those in the higher socio-economic strata. Therefore, they refrain from participating, leaving a vacuum which is quickly filled by the latter group.

A further possibility is that those in the lower socio-economic strata are simply less familiar than the middle and upper socio-economic status groups with the proper ways to operate within the school system. This alternative is made more plausible by the recognition that people in lower socio-economic status groups tend to be less educated than the people in higher socio-

economic status groups. They have had less experience with the schools and their functioning. Therefore, the costs of participation are higher for them, the benefits more remote.

Another conclusion is that rates of participation (whether measured attitudinally or behaviorally) are mediated by the parents' social class and the shared beliefs which tend to predominate within each class for its members. It seems that no matter how attractively the educational package is wrapped or how widely information about the voucher schools is distributed, the parents' attitudes and beliefs about their children's educations seem certain to be the best predictors of measurable participation. Since socio-economic status groups seem likely to hold such beliefs in common, it seems all but certain that the general opportunity to participate will be used differentially by parents from different socio-economic strata, in accordance with their beliefs about education and the role parents should play in shaping the educational process. Therefore, for this reason and the others suggested, it is not unreasonable to anticipate a decentralization of school programs, with different programs tending to different needs, creating classes more homogeneously grouped by social class, and thereby

exacerbating social class differences.

Possible solutions include the provision by the schools of more information more often to lower socio-economic status families. Furthermore, the schools should tailor the information delivery system to fit the population's information-seeking patterns. Evidence suggests that lower socio-economic status parents attach the most credence to information they receive in face-to-face personal conversations; and they tend to attach less importance to printed materials than do middle class parents (Bridge, 1974). This suggests that, in some cases, schools should rely on conversational approaches to distribute information; simply sending home a school bulletin may not be very effective with some parents.

It is the responsibility of the administrators of the voucher system to develop organizational barriers to prevent the varying rates of participation from creating a system expressly tailored only to the needs of the active participants. The voucher system in Alum Rock was intended to be a compensatory educational scheme, reflecting a sensitivity on the parts of the supervisors of educational programs to the inequities in the distribution of the educational wealth. A continuing awareness of such inequities is necessary.

The establishment of a new participatory school system structure in no way guarantees that parental involvement will result. Only the combination of an administration sensitive to the needs of the lower socio-economic strata and informed, involved parents can bring about the educational reforms intended by the designers of the voucher school system.

References

Banfield, E. The unheavenly city. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970.

Bridge, R. G. Family choice in schooling: Parental decision-making in the Alum Rock Education Voucher Demonstration. (WN-8806-NIE). Santa Monica, Ca.: The Rand Corporation, 1974.

Calder, B. J., and Ross, M. Attitudes and behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1973.

Campbell, D. T. Social attitudes and other acquired behavioral dispositions. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 6. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Coleman, J. Equality of educational opportunity. In L. Loewenstein (Ed.), Urban studies. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Cremin, L. The genius of American education. Horace Mann Lecture. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press, 1965.

Fishbein, M., and Ajzen, I. Attitudes toward objects as predictors of single and multiple behavioral criteria. Psychological Review, 1974, 81, 59-74.

Friedman, M. Capitalism and freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Friedman, M. The voucher idea. The New York Times Magazine, September 23, 1973, pp. 22-23, 65-72.

Greenstein, F. I. Children and politics. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Insko, C. A., and Schopler, J. Triadic consistency: A statement of affective-cognitive-conative consistency. Psychological Review, 1967, 74, 361-376.

Noah, H. J., and Eckstein, M. A. International study of school achievement. Notes on Education, 1974, 4, 6-9.

Rosenthal, R. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: The experimenter's hypothesis as unintended determinant of experimental results. American Scientist, 1963, 51, 268-283.

The Rand Corporation. Technical analysis plan for evaluation of the OEO Elementary Education Voucher Demonstration: Technical Dissertation. Santa Monica, Ca.: Author, 1972.

Triandis, H. C. Toward an analysis of the components of interpersonal attitudes. In C. W. Sherif and M. Sherif (Eds.), Attitude, ego-involvement, and change. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R.D., and Sechrest, L. Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1966.

Wicker, A. W. Attitudes vs. actions: The relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 41-78.

Table 1

Q29A	Parents should have more to say about what their children learn in school.
Q29G	In general teachers and principals don't want the advice of parents.
Q35D	Giving parents a choice about the schools their children attend will make teachers more responsive to their complaints and suggestions.
Q36A	Do you think parents should be able to help decide which teachers get hired or fired in their children's schools?
Q36B	Should parents be able to help decide whether a principal is hired or kept on?
Q36C	And should parents be able to help decide what should be taught in school?
Q36D	Should they be able to help decide how the school spends its money?
Q37A	Have you or any other member of your family ever worn a campaign button?
Q37B	Have you or any other member of your family ever worked for a political candidate?
Q37C	Are you registered to vote in this area?
Q43	Taking everything together, do you think giving parents a choice between different types of programs is a very good idea, a good idea, a fair idea, or a poor idea?
Q57A	How many times did you or other members of your family: Have talks with the teachers or other people at the schools about your children?
Q57B	How many times did you or other members of your family: Attend any parent or neighborhood meetings at which the schools were discussed?

Q57C How many times did you or other members of your family: Attend any special events at elementary schools, such as plays or ballgames or special assemblies, etc. . . .?

Q58 Last year, did you or any other members of your family belong to any committees or groups at your elementary school such as the PTA, the Chicano Parents of Alum Rock, or other parent groups? (RECODE: RSHCGRP)

Q59 Last year, did you or anyone else in your family attend any special public or neighborhood meetings about local issues not related to the schools? (RECODE: RATTMTG)

Table 2

Fall 1972 Parent Survey Probability Sample
Rotated Factor Loadings

Variable Description	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Commun-ality
Par More Say Ab Lea	R4Q29A	0.072	-0.053	0.074	-0.188	-0.404	0.063	0.058	0.219
Pr + Tc Not Want Par	R4Q29G	0.072	0.031	0.015	0.039	0.040	0.020	0.326	0.116
Par Ch Make Te More	R4Q35D	0.140	0.037	-0.034	-0.054	-0.352	-0.000	-0.063	0.153
Par Decide Teachers	R2Q36A	0.719	0.074	0.052	-0.160	-0.142	0.038	0.136	0.591
Par Decide Princip	R2Q36B	0.702	0.024	0.044	-0.153	-0.214	-0.017	0.134	0.582
Par Decide Curicul	R2Q36C	0.214	0.063	0.059	-0.614	-0.162	-0.004	-0.030	0.457
Par Decide Sch Spnd	R2Q36D	0.436	0.062	0.142	-0.475	-0.145	0.068	-0.057	0.469
Wore Camp Butn	RQ37A	0.052	0.070	0.637	-0.067	-0.016	0.062	-0.023	0.422
Worked For Candidate	RQ37B	0.043	0.046	0.630	-0.018	-0.071	0.044	0.124	0.424
Registered To Vote	RQ37C	-0.012	0.143	0.287	-0.047	-0.007	0.320	-0.027	0.208
Program Choice	RQ43	0.043	0.009	0.042	0.001	-0.390	-0.018	-0.021	0.156
Talks Wi Teac	R2Q57A	0.057	0.584	0.097	-0.004	-0.017	-0.065	-0.075	0.363
Atnd Meetings	R2Q57B	0.032	0.599	0.038	-0.077	-0.077	0.204	0.171	0.445
Atnd Spec Events	R2Q57C	-0.016	0.629	0.077	-0.039	0.076	0.031	0.067	0.415
Member Par Org	R2Q58	0.110	0.481	0.028	0.024	-0.039	0.401	0.086	0.414
Att Pub Meet Nt Schs	RQ59	0.057	0.110	0.320	-0.069	-0.028	-0.050	0.344	0.245
	Sum Squares	1.303	1.385	1.042	0.711	0.573	0.329	0.337	5.680

Table 3

Fall 1972 Parent Survey Probability Sample
Rotated Factor Loadings

Variable Description	Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	Commun-ality
Par Decide Teachers	R2Q36A	0.745	0.061	0.083	0.143	0.039	-0.097	0.597
Par Decide Princip	R2Q36B	0.729	0.028	0.057	0.173	-0.010	-0.096	0.575
Par Decide Curicul	R2Q36C	0.216	0.095	0.062	0.585	-0.002	-0.224	0.451
Par Decide Sch Spnd	R2Q36D	0.421	0.073	0.122	0.512	0.087	-0.068	0.472
Par More Say Ab Lea	R5Q29A	0.116	-0.055	0.027	0.148	-0.032	-0.409	0.207
Talks With Teac	R3Q57A	0.058	0.532	0.082	0.049	0.017	0.128	0.312
Attnd Meetings	R3Q57B	0.067	0.575	0.060	0.013	0.181	-0.121	0.386
Attnd Spec Events	R3Q57C	-0.051	0.582	0.072	0.090	0.021	0.059	0.358
Member Par Org	RSCHGRP	0.114	0.407	0.046	-0.066	0.391	-0.029	0.339
Wore Camp Button	RQ37A	0.032	0.017	0.631	0.098	0.107	-0.009	0.421
Worked For Candidate	RQ37B	0.057	0.017	0.632	0.031	0.089	-0.004	0.411
Registered to Vote	RQ37C	-0.022	0.115	0.252	0.079	0.368	0.074	0.225
Att Pub Meet Nt Schs	RATTMTG	0.088	0.230	0.477	-0.007	-0.000	-0.053	0.291
	Sum Squares	1.361	1.206	1.136	0.708	0.352	0.284	5.046

Table 4

Fall 1972 Parent Survey Probability Sample
Rotated Factor Loadings

Variable Description	Name	1	2	3	Communality
Par Decide Teachers	R2Q36A	0.718	0.090	0.054	0.526
Par Decide Princip	R2Q36B	0.719	0.047	0.022	0.520
Par Decide Curicul	R2Q36C	0.520	0.095	0.076	0.285
Par Decide Sch Spnd	R2Q36D	0.619	0.110	0.138	0.414
Par More Say Ab Lea	R5Q29A	0.273	-0.079	0.018	0.081
Talks With Teac	R3Q57A	0.031	0.523	0.081	0.281
Attnd Meetings	R3Q57B	0.079	0.593	0.083	0.365
Attnd Spec Events	R3Q57C	-0.025	0.565	0.079	0.326
Member Par Org	RSCHGRP	0.058	0.494	0.102	0.258
Wore Camp Button	RQ37A	0.090	0.022	0.642	0.420
Worked for Candidate	RQ37B	0.078	0.016	0.634	0.408
Registered to Vote	RQ37C	0.001	0.203	0.319	0.143
Att Pub Meet Nt Schs	RATTMTG	0.090	0.201	0.460	0.260
	Sum Squares	1.794	1.308	1.185	4.287

Table 5

		Education			
		Grade School	High School	High School +	Total
Factor I	0,1,2	45.0 (68)	40.1 (114)	28.3 (30)	39.1 (212)
	3,4,5	55.0 (83)	59.9 (170)	71.6 (76)	60.8 (329)

$p < .009$
Gamma = .019

Table 6

MALES: (n.s.)

		Education			
		Grade School	High School	High School +	Total
Factor I	0,1,2	40.1 (32)	42.1 (53)	36.1 (22)	40.1 (107)
	3,4,5	60.1 (48)	57.9 (73)	63.9 (39)	60.0 (160)

$p < .296$
Gamma > .5

Table 7

FEMALES:

		Education			
		Grade School	High School	High School +	Total
Factor I	0,1,2	50.6 (36)	38.7 (61)	17.7 (8)	38.4 (105)
	3,4,5	49.4 (35)	61.4 (97)	82.3 (37)	61.6 (169)

$p < .007$
Gamma = .003

Table 8

		Education			
		Grade School	High School	High School +	Total
Factor II	0,1	75.5 (114)	61.1 (159)	45.9 (45)	62.5 (318)
	2,3,4	24.5 (37)	38.9 (101)	54.1 (53)	37.5 (191)

$p < .001$
Gamma < .001

Table 9

Education

		Grade School	High School	High School +	Total
Factor III	0,1	78.6 (136)	69.1 (215)	60.8 (70)	70.2 (421)
	2,3,4	21.4 (37)	30.9 (96)	38.1 (45)	29.8 (178)

$p < .001$
Gamma $< .001$

Table 10

Ethnicity

		Anglo	Black	Other	Mex.-Eng.	Mex.-Span.	Total
Factor I	0,1,2	34.9 (67)	25.5 (14)	43.9 (25)	45.6 (76)	43.6 (31)	39.3 (213)
	3,4,5	65.1 (125)	74.5 (41)	56.1 (32)	54.4 (91)	56.4 (40)	60.7 (329)

$p < .001$
Gamma = .115

Table 11

FEMALES:

		Ethnicity					
		Anglo	Black	Other	Mex.-Eng.	Mex.-Span.	Total
Factor I	0,1,2	26.6 (28)	25.1 (8)	44.0 (11)	52.4 (44)	50.0 (14)	38.4 (105)
	3,4,5	73.3 (77)	75.0 (24)	56.0 (14)	47.6 (40)	50.0 (14)	61.6 (169)

$p < .001$
Gamma $< .001$

Table 12

MALES: (n.s.)

		Ethnicity					
		Anglo	Black	Other	Mex.-Eng.	Mex.-Span.	Total
Factor I	0,1,2	44.8 (39)	26.0 (6)	43.8 (14)	38.6 (32)	39.5 (17)	40.2 (108)
	3,4,5	55.2 (48)	73.9 (17)	56.3 (18)	61.5 (51)	60.5 (26)	59.7 (160)

$p = .120$
Gamma = .287

Table 13

Ethnicity

		Anglo	Black	Other	Mex.-Eng.	Mex.-Span	Total
Factor II	0,1	50.3 (91)	54.7 (29)	66.7 (42)	71.4 (105)	78.8 (52)	62.5 (319)
	2,3,4	49.7 (90)	45.3 (24)	33.3 (21)	28.6 (42)	21.2 (14)	37.5 (191)

$p < .001$
Gamma $< .001$

Table 14

Ethnicity

		Anglo	Black	Other	Mex.-Eng.	Mex.-Span	Total
Factor III	0,1	63.9 (121)	64.1 (41)	71.6 (48)	73.9 (136)	82.6 (66)	70.4 (422)
	2,3,4	36.1 (74)	35.9 (23)	28.4 (20)	26.1 (48)	17.6 (14)	29.6 (178)

$p = .002$
Gamma $< .001$

Table 15

MALES:

		Income				
		Less $7,500	$7,500-$10,000	$10,000-$15,000	More $15,000	Total
Factor I	0,1,2	48.4 (29)	32.8 (20)	37.2 (39)	46.9 (15)	40.0 (103)
	3,4,5	51.7 (31)	67.2 (41)	62.9 (66)	53.2 (17)	60.1 (155)

$p = .018$
Gamma > .5

Table 16

		Income				
		Less $7,500	$7,500-$10,000	$10,000-$15,000	More $15,000	Total
Factor II	0,1	72.6 (122)	60.0 (60)	60.3 (96)	41.1 (23)	62.3 (301)
	2,3,4	27.4 (46)	40.0 (40)	39.7 (63)	58.9 (33)	37.7 (182)

$p < .001$
Gamma < .001

Table 17

Income

		Less $7,500	$7,500-$10,000	$10,000-$15,000	More $15,000	Total
Factor III	0,1	72.9 (156)	73.0 (81)	66.9 (121)	58.7 (37)	69.4 (395)
	2,3,4	27.1 (58)	27.0 (30)	33.1 (60)	41.3 (26)	30.6 (174)

$p = .033$
Gamma $< .001$

Table 18

Occupation

		Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
Factor II	0,1	68.4 (217)	52.3 (89)	62.9 (306)
	2,3,4	31.6 (100)	57.7 (81)	37.2 (181)

$p = .012$
Gamma $< .001$

Table 19

Occupation

		Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
Factor III	0,1	77.9 (297)	56.7 (110)	70.7 (407)
	2,3,4	22.1 (84)	43.3 (84)	29.3 (168)

$p < .001$
Gamma = .002

Table 20

Summary

		Factor I	Female	Male	Factor II	Factor III*
Educ.:	< High School	55	49		25	21
	High School	60	61		39	31
	> High School	72	82		54	39
Ethnicity:	Anglo	65	73		50	36
	Black	75	75		45	36
	Other	56	56		33	28
	Mex.-Eng.	54	48		29	26
	Mex.-Span.	56	50		21	18
Income:	< $ 7,500			52	28	27
	$ 7,500-$10,000			67	40	27
	$10,000-$15,000			63	40	34
	> $15,000			53	59	41
Occupation:	Blue-Collar				32	22
	White-Collar				58	43

*The numbers represent percentages of high scorers; for Factor I, the percentage is for those who agreed with three or more of the five items; for Factors II and III, the percentage is for those who agreed with two or more of the four items.