DOCUMENT RESUME

EA 016 066 ED 234 483

AUTHOR

Frechtling, Joy A.; Frankel, Steven M. A Survey of Montgomery County Parents Who Transferred Their Children between Public and Private Schools in TITLE.

Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Md. INSTITUTION

Dept. of Educational Accountability.

PUB DATE Jun 82

80p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the NOTE

American Educational Research Association (Montreal,

Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).

Reports - Research/Technical (143) PUB TYPE

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrollment DESCRIPTORS

Influences; *Parent Attitudes; Parent School Relationship; Private Schools; Public Schools;

*School Choice; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Withdrawal

(Education)

IDENTIFIERS Montgomery County Public Schools MD

ABSTRACT

This 1980-81 survey, which follows up a similar 1979-80 study, explores parents' reasons for transferring their children into or out of Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) in Rockville, Maryland. A total of 277 parents of students leaving MCPS for private schools in Maryland and 281 parents of students entering from private schools in Maryland were interviewed. The sample's subdivisions are students transferring to or from nonchurch schools and students transferring to or from church-related schools in grade 1 and grades 2 through 12. Study limitations arise from exclusion both of parents who transferred children into or out of private schools in Washington, D.C., or Virginia, and of parents whose children have always attended private schools. The study recommends that public school educators learn from private school practice. Three exhibits examine eight general categories of reasons (including religion, parental values, discipline, and costs) for initial enrollment in public or private schools and for private school withdrawal. Fourteen tables examine characteristics of students and parents involved in public or private school enrollment or withdrawal, reasons for such actions, and parent attitudes. Nineteen appendixes include survey instruments, correlations between percentages of minority students and transferring white students, and parent attitude statistics. (PB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document. **************



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS Rockville, Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document his been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve

reproduction quality

Points of view or company stated in this docu-

 Points of view or opinions stated in this docu, ment do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy. "PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Survey of
Montgomery County Parents
Who Transferred Their Children
Between Public and Private
Schools in 1980-81

JUNE 1982

EDWARD ANDREWS

Superintendent of Schools



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS Rockville, Maryland

A SURVEY OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY PARENTS WHO TRANSFERRED THEIR CHILDREN
BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN 1980-81

bу

Dr. Joy A. Frechtling Dr. Steven M. Frankel

Steven M. Frankel, Director
Department of Educational Accountability

Joy A. Frechtling, Director Instructional Evaluation & Testing



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A SURVEY OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY PARENTS WHO WITHDREW THEIR CHILDREN FROM PUBLIC TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN 1980-81

BACKGROUND

In 1979, the MCPS Board of Education, requested that the Department of Educational Accountability investigate why parents were withdrawing their children from the public schools. In the course of this undertaking, the results of which are reported in an earlier study by Edwards et al A Survey of MCPS Withdrawals To Attend Private School, it was found that not only did about 2 percent of the MCPS student population withdraw from MCPS each year but that a nearly corresponding percentage returned to MCPS.

The present study was initiated to follow up on these findings and gather further information on why parents chose to transfer their children into or out of MCPS. Its major purpose was to identify policies and practices which MCPS might modify to retain and attract more students to the public schools.

To accomplish this, telephone interviews were conducted with a sample of parents of children in the first through twelfth grades who had transferred their child during the 1980-81 school year. A total of 277 parents of students leaving MCPS for private schools in Maryland and 281 parents of students entering from private schools in Maryland were interviewed. During that year, the total number of students withdrawn from MCPS to attend private schools in Maryland was 1,672, the total number entering MCPS from Maryland private schools was 1,205.

Each sample was further divided into three groups: those transferring to or from nonchurch schools, those transferring to or from church-related schools at the first grade (called Church 1), and those transferring to or from church-related schools in Grades 2 through 12 (called Church 2-12). The sample was subdivided this way because preliminary inspection of the data indicated that these three groups differed systematically in their responses in a number of key areas.

²Kindergarteners were eliminated from the data base because too frequently they sign up for enrollment but never actually attend; children in Special Education Centers were also not considered.



S. Edwards, W. Richardson, and S. Frankel. A Survey of MCPS
Withdrawals to Attend Private School. (Rockville, Md.: Montgomery County
Public Schools, February, 1981).

In interpreting this research, it is important to keep in mind some possible limitations in making generalizations about the findings. First, this study, like that of Edwards (1981), included only parents of students transferring into and out of private schools in Maryland. Students who transferred into or out of private schools in Washington, D.C., or Virginia were not included. This raises the question of whether or not the study fails to represent the opinions of these parents.

This question was examined by looking at the names of the private schools attended by students in the study. It was found that the sample contained substantial numbers of parents who were sending their children to prestigious private schools in Maryland, such as Holton Arms and Landon, which are direct competitors of the Virginia and D.C. private schools. Given these findings, the researchers are of the opinion that this is not serious. The data from the parents sending their children to prestigious Maryland private schools should permit generalization to the D.C. and Virginia parents as well.

A more serious limitation is that the study did not include parents who initially enrolled their children in private schools and have kept their children there. Thus, we can say nothing about why some parents never consider enrolling their child in the public schools or what might be done to attract them. This is a more serious problem and one which should be remediated in future studies.

ERIC

This occured because the codes used by MCPS to record transfers from and to private schools, only recognize two types of transfers: within-state and out-of-state. Expanding the study to include the entire Washington metropolitan area would have required costly manual procedures to separate the Washington metropolitan area transfers from those including the 48 other states.

FINDINGS

This study shows that parents withdraw their children from the Montgomery County Public Schools for a variety of reasons and that different groups are seeking different things when they make the decision to transfer their child to private school. Further, in contrast to the Edwards (1981) study, the present analysis suggests that religion is a critical factor for only a small group of parents (approximately 25%) and that factors potentially under the control of the school system are the cause of dissatisfaction for the vast majority.

of the three groups, only those who withdrew to church-related schools at the first grade level appear to place a great deal of emphasis on religion in reaching their decision. They seem generally to have made the decision to transfer to private schools even before entering MCPS and only use MCFS because of the lack of availability of kindergarten or first grades in some private schools. In addition, there is some evidence from the demographic data that this group is more "private school oriented." That is, they tend more than the other two groups to have other children in private school and are less likely to have the children remaining in public school.

The other two groups, those who transfered their children to church-related schools in Grades 2 through 12 and those who transfered their children to nonchurch-related schools, generally do so because of dissatisfaction with the way the school conducts its business of educating children. The data suggest loud and clear that these parents wanted a more individualized environment, smaller classes, and programs that they feel will meet more effectively their These parents also found fault with children's academic needs. school with administrators and teachers, interpersonal relationships expressing dispatisfaction with staff sensitivity and level of communication. Interestingly, concerns with bussing and desegregation, drug abuse, crime, and vandalism were minimal. The desire for increased discipline and structure the schools also emerged as important, especially for those parents who withdrew their students to church-related schools at the second to twelfth grade levels.

In contrast, those who transfer from private to public schools are not really dissatisfied with the private school program. While some do express concern with the educational program being delivered, convenience and cost are the major reasons for leaving the private school. The data show that the idea of "neighborhood schools" retains a very large drawing power, both in terms of where parents choose to enroll their child initially and why they may ultimately decide to withdraw their child from a private school.

ERIC

RECOMMENDATIONS

These findings provoke some interesting questions regarding current MCPS policies and practices. For example, the county government must soon be making some important policy decisions concerning ways of reusing the 30 plus public schools about to be closed over the next three years. At present no definite policy exists regarding priorities to be used in the recycling of such buildings, and a system for weighing the merits of alternative users is not in place. It can be predicted, however, that a demand for such buildings will come from the private school sector, seeking improved or better located facilities. The findings of this study suggest that the leasing of public school buildings to private schools may not be to the advantage of the public school system. Depending upon the particular circumstances neighborhood, the availability of more "neighborhood private schools" could have a very negative impact on the public school system and increase problems associated with declining enrollments. This concern must however be balanced off against the obvious desirability of the private school to the neighborhood and the increased revenues that would accure to the county as a whole if private schools were encouraged to lease closed buildings.

How to handle the dissatisfied attitude of the small percentage of parents who withdrew their children from MCPS poses other problems and must itself be kept in perspective. Many parents are satisfied with MCPS, and the level of satisfaction is high compared to national data. The MCPS 1981 countywide telephone survey conducted in the Spring of 1981 revealed that 50 percent of the countywide sample and 65 percent of MCPS parents gave the school grades of A or B, while only 36% of all 1981 Callup Poll respondents and 46% of the polled parents graded public school A or B.

More importantly, the functions of the two school systems are meant to be different.

Private schools educate only those children whose family elect to send them to the schools and whom the schools accept. Public schools, on the other hand, do not control the composition of their student bodies by excluding students; they cannot, for example, dismiss children whose behavior disrupts the education of others or who cannot meet some pre-established (sic) standard of academic aptitude. Public schools meet public needs and carry out public policy. The genius of U.S. public education is in its diversity... Nowhere in the world is access to educational opportunity broader than in the United States. Our system of free public education is a cornerstone of our democratic society.



^{4&}quot;How the Community Sees Its Schools," MCPS Learning, October, 1981, p.2.
G. Gallup, "The 13th Annual Gallup Poll," Phi Delta Kappan, 33-47, 63
(1), (1981).

J. Sparling, "Tuition Tax Credits," <u>Today's Education</u>, (November-December, 1981), p.16.

Nonetheless, if MCPS is interested in attempting to retain or attract the parents who seek private schools, this study does suggest some areas which might be explored. While there is little that can be done to satisfy the needs of those who seek a religious education, it may be possible to meet the needs of those who leave because of dissatisfaction with the educational program. The data show that many of the parents who withdrew their child from public school did so because they felt their children's academic needs were not being met. They were especially concerned about class size and the individual attention that their child was abic to receive. Further they seemed to be seeking a more personalized atmosphere in which their needs as parents, as well those of their children, were individually addressed.

MCPS may wish to explore possible alternative ways of reducing class size to the levels which so many parents find attractive, and even to the levels where substantial academic benefits have been found. This is usually considered to be about 15:1 and in fact, researchers have almost universally found that decreases in class size that do not reduce class size to at least 20:1 will have no academic benefits. We might also want to consider other means of creating a more personalized atmosphere in our schools.

While some will say that we have been down both of these routes many times before, and that the truly effective solutions are either financially or politically impossible, we don't think that this is necessarily the case. After all, the private schools which are attracting our students are probably operating under financial constraints at least as tight as our own, and they are hiring staff from the same labor markets.

Also, while only a small percentage of the MCPS population actually transfer to private schools because of concerns regarding class size and individualization, it is likely that many of those who stay with, or never enter, the public schools share some of the dissatisfaction. This also makes it worth reexamining MCPS practices to see whether or not there are ways in which a more personalized, individualized environment could be provided.

One means of doing this would be to examine closely what the more successful local private schools are doing. The initial goal would be to try to determine the degree to which they are truly providing individualized instruction and small class sizes, and the degree to which they are benefiting from an image which is not reflected in the reality of their actual instructional environments. Then, if it is found that they are more effective in these respects than are our own schools, the next goal would be to determine how they are doing it and the whether their strategies are adoptable to MCPS.

We strongly suggest that this be undertaken as a follow-on activity to this report. Just as Giant sends comparison shoppers into Safeway to see how they are pricing and displaying their goods, it is about time that we started taking the private schools of the Country more seriously and realizing that we may have something to learn from them.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>P</u>	ag
ACKGROUND	1
INDINGS	3
STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM MCPS	 3
Who Are the Students Being Withdrawn From MCPS? What Are the Characteristics of Their Families?	<u>.</u>
Where Were the Students Initially Enrolled?	3
Why Did Parents Withdraw Their Child From MCPS?	3
How Satisfied Were the Parents With the Public and Private Schools?	.
STUDENTS ENTERING MCPS FROM PRIVATE SCHOOLS	} :
Who are the Students Entering MCPS From Private Schools? What Are the Characteristics of Their Families?	}
Where Were These Students Initially Enrolled? Why?	
Why Did the Parents Withdraw the Child From Private School? Which Type of Private School Did They Come From?22	
Parent Satisfaction With Public and Private Schools	
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Sample Selection. Appendix A-1: Comparisons of Characteristics Between the Two Withdrawal Samples and Populations. A-2 Appendix B: Survey Instruments. Appendix C: Data Collection and Analysis. Appendix D-1: Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Public School Appendix D-2: Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Private School Appendix E: Reasons for MCPS Withdrawal Appendix F: Appendix F.	
Appendix F: Appendix F	
of White Students Transferring to Private School F-3	
Appendix G-1: Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS Regarding Public and Private Schools G-1	
Appendix G-2: Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS Regarding Public Schools	



•	
Appendix G-3:	Attitudes Regarding Private Schools of Parents
	Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS
Appendix H-1:	Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Public School H-1
Appendix H-2:	Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Private School H-2
Appendix I:	Reasons for Private School Withdrawal
Appendix J-1:	Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From
	Private School Regarding Public and Private Schools
Appendix J-2:	Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From
	Private School Regarding Public Schools
Appendix J-3	Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From
	Private School Regarding Private Schools

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Characteristics of Students Withdrawing From MCPS To Attend Private Schools.	4
Table 2:	Characteristics of Parents Withdrawing Their Children From MCPS To Attend Private School	5
Table 3:	Reasons for Initially Enrolling in Public or Private Schools for Scudents Withdrawing From MCPS	9
Table 4:	Reasons for Withdrawal From MCPS By Type of Group	12
Table 5:	Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS Regarding Public and Frivate Schools	15
Table 6:	Attitudes of Parents Wtihdrawing Their Child From MCPS Regarding Public Schools	16
Table 7:	Attitudes Regarding Private Schools of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS	17
Table 8: ,	Characteristics of Students Withdrawn From & Private School To Attend MCPS	19
Table 9:	Characteristics of Parents Who Withdrew Their Child From Private School To Attend MCPS	 20
Table 10:	General Reasons for Initially Enrolling in Public or Private School for Students Withdrawing From Private School	21
Tāble II:	Reasons for Withdrawal From Private Schools By Type of Croup	.3
Table 12:	Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From Private School Regarding Public and Private Schools	S
Table 13:	Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From Private Schools Regarding Public Schools	Š
Table 14:	Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From Private Schools Regarding Private Schools 2	7

LIST OF EXHIBITS.

•				•			1			,		Page
Exhibit	ì:	•	-	Reasons	for	Initial	Enrollment	in	Public	School	•	6
Exhibit	2:	ji.	:	Reasons	for	Initial	Enrollment	in	Private	School .	• ,	7
Exhibit	3:			Reasons	for	MCPS or	Private Sch	100]	l Withdr	awal	:,	10

Acknowledgements

The work of Dr. James Morgan on designing and implementing the study and Dr. Susan Rothschild in data reduction and analysis are gratefully acknowledged. Thanks also to the support provided by Mrs. Farianae Tate, Mr. Al Jenny, Dr. Susan Gross, Mrs. Patricia Chambers and Mrs. Sue Isle.

A SURVEY OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY PARENTS WHO WITHDREW THEIR CHILDREN FROM PUBLIC TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN 1980-81

BACKGROUND

In 1979, the MCPS Board of Education, requested that the Department of Educational Accountability investigate why parents were withdrawing their children from the public schools. In the course of this undertaking, the results of which are reported in Edward's 1979-80 A Survey of MCPS Withdrawals To Attend Private School, it was found that not only did about 2 percent of the MCPS student population withdraw from MCPS each year but that a nearly corresponding percentage returned to MCPS.

The present study was initiated to follow up on these findings and gather further information on why parents chose to transfer their children into or out of MCPS. Its major purpose was to identify policies and practices which MCPS might modify to retain and attract more students to the public schools.

To accomplish this, telephone interviews were conducted with a sample of parents of children in the first through twelfth grades who had transferred their child during the 1980-81 school year. A total of 277 parents of students leaving MCPS for private schools in Maryland and 281 parents of students entering from private schools in Maryland were interviewed. During that year, the total number of students withdrawn from MCPS to attend private schools in Maryland was 1,672, the total number entering MCPS from Maryland private schools was 1,205.

Each, sample was further divided into three groups: those transferring to or from nonchurch schools, those transferring to or from church-related schools at the first grade (called Church 1), and those transferring to or from church-related schools in Grades 2 through 12 (called Church 2-12). The sample was subdivided this way because preliminary inspection of the data indicated that these three groups differed systematically in their responses in a number of key areas. Appendicies A through C present additional details on the study methodology.



S. Edwards, W. Richardson, and S. Frankel. A Survey of MCPS
Withdrawals to Attend Private School. (Rockville, Md.: Montgomery County
Bublic Schools, February, 1981).

Kindergarteners were eliminated from the data base because too frequently
they sign up for enrollment but never actually attend; children in Special
Education Centers were also not considered.

In interpreting this research, it is important to keep in mind some possible limitations in making generalizations about the findings. First, this study, like that of Edwards (1981), included only parents of students transferring into and out of private schools in Maryland. Students who transferred into or out of private schools in Washington, D.C., or Virginia were not included. This raises the question of whether or not the study fails to represent the opinions of these parents.

This question was examined by looking at the names of the private schools attended by students in the study. It was found that the sample contained substantial numbers of parents who were sending their children to prestigious private schools in Maryland, such as Holton Arms and Landon, which are direct competitors of the Virginia and D.C. private schools. Given these findings, the researchers are of the opinion that this is not serious. The data from the parents sending their children to prestigious Maryland private schools should permit generalization to the D.C. and Virginia parents as well.

A more serious limitation is that the study did not include parents who initially enrolled their children in private schools and have kept their children there. Thus, we can say nothing about why some parents never consider enrolling their child in the public schools or what might be done to attract them. This is a more serious problem and one which should be remidial in future studies.

This occured because the codes used by MCPS to record transfers from and to private schools only recognize two types of transfers: within-state and but-of-state. Expanding the study to include the entire Washington metropolitan area would have required costly manual procedures to separate the Washington metropolitan area transfers from those including the 48 other states:

FINDINGS

STUDENTS WITHDRAWING FROM MCPS

Who Are the Students Being Withdrawn From MCPS? What Are the Characteristics of Their Families?

Overall, the characteristics of students and parents in the three withdrawal groups were similar (Tables i and 2). Students leaving MCPS for private school were most often white (reflecting the overall population distribution), equally divided among males and females, and enrolled in Grades 1 or 9. While some withdrew after limited experience with the public schools, many, especially in the group transferring to nonchurch-related private schools, had attended MCPS for six or more years.

The parents were well educated, long-time residents of Montgomery County. Over 60 percent of parents were college graduates, and approximately 60 percent had lived in Montgomery County for 10 or more years. Further, a substantial number of parents had other children remaining in the public schools, a little over a third of those in the Church 2-12 and Nonchurch groups. Those in the Church I group were less likely to have other children in MCPS.

Where Were the Students Initially Enrolled?

Parents were asked whether they had initially enrolled their child in public or private school and why they had done so. Our analysis of the data showed that nearly all (91%) of the students had initially been enrolled in public school at the start of their educational experience. Well over 50 reasons were offered for making the initial enrollment decision. Inspection of these indicated that they could be meaningfully grouped into eight general categories. These are the following:

Religion
Parental Values
Discipline
School Staff Characteristics
Educational Program
Child Personal/Social Needs
Convenience
Cost

Exhibits 1 and 2 display these categories and the reasons which compose them.



TÄBLE 1 Characteristics of Students Withdrawing From MCPS To Attend Private Schools

		<u> </u>	
	Church I N=70	Church 2-12 N=144	Nechurch N=63
•		Percentage	·
Sex		c ·	
Male Female	50 50	58 42	59 41
Race		-	-
White Nonwhite	89 11	4 87 13	9 <u>7 1</u> 3
Grādeş		•	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		0 10 11 9 10 10 12 5 18 9 0	8 5 6 5 14 5 13 11 18 8 8
Length of School Attendance Before Withdrawal			
Less than 1 year Between 1 and 2 years Between 2 and 3 years Between 3 and 4 years Between 4 and 5 years Between 5 and 6 years More than 6 years	94 6 0 0 0 0 0	13 11 17 12 8 10 29	13 13 3 18 8 5 41
Type of Private School Entere	ēđ	•	
Catholic Non-Catholic Non-church-related	81 19 0	60 40 0	0 0 100

The data suggest that white students may be overrepresented relative to their prevalence in the population in the group withdrawing to nonchurch-related schools. Analyses did not, however, reveal any overall statistically significant differences.

·---

Characteristics of Parents Withdrawing Their Children From MCPS To Attend Private School

	Church 1 N=70	Church 2-12 N=144	Nonchurch N=63	
Number of Years Montgomery County Resident		1 1		
		Percentage	9 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	
Less than 1 year Between 1 and 3 years Between 4 and 9 years Between 10 and 14 years 15 or more	3 13 24 26 34	0 12 26 28 35	0 10 32 37 22	
Parent Education Level				
Elementary School H.S. Incomplete H.S. Graduate Technical School College Incomplete College Graduate Graduate Study Advanced Degree	1 16 7 20 27 14 13	2 13 3 24 28 11 18	0 0 7 3 19 34 16 21	
Number of Other Children in	School			
Public 0 1 2 3 4 or More	81 16 3 0	54 32 10 1 4	52 35 13 0	
Private 0 1 2 3 4 or More	0 40 37 14 8	0 50 34 12 5	78 18 3 0	

EXHIBIT 1

Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Public School

Group 1: Religion

Group 2: Parental Values

Parents were products of public school.

Parents believed in public education.

Parents always expected to send their child to public school.

Parents felt there was a high quality education available in MCPS.

Neutral: public schools are OK.

Parents believed public schools broaden child's experience.

Parents had a poor prior experience in private schools.

Parents felt public schools provided greater lack of conformity.

Group 3: Discipline

Good discipline in public schools.

Group 4: School Staff

MCPS staff had a good reputation.
Good equipment/supplies available.
Teaching judged as good.
Parents pleased with school or teacher choice.

Group 5: Program

Good sports or arts program available.
Resources for handicapped available.
Small class size available.
Flexible program/individualization available.
More caring atmosphere provided by MCPS.
Parents wanted children to learn English/assimilate into US culture.
Good curriculum available.
Free lunch was provided.

Group 6: Child-Related

Child preferred to attend public school.

Group 7: Convenience

Parent taught in MCPS.
Parents wanted to give public schools a chance.
Friends go to neighborhood school.
MCPS provided a good way to meet neighborhood children.
Parents felt they were entitled to public school since they pay taxes.
No good private school available nearby.
Dav care available at public school or baby-sitter nearby.
Private school had no kindergarten.
Earlier enrollment available in public school.

Group 3: 6 Cost

19

Cost

ERIC

EXHIBIT 2

Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Private School

Group 1: Religion

Parents wanted a religious background.

Group_2:--Parental Value

Family tradition to go to a private school.

Better education available in private school.

Wanted academic emphasis, not social experience.

Reaction to poor public school experience of older child.

Parents wanted to stay in own school system/language.

Reaction against bussing.

Parents didn't like U.S. public schools.

Parents didn't like public schools in their own country.

Parents felt private schools provided greater lack of conformity.

Parents wanted child to learn English.

Parents felt private schools provided stronger emphasis on values.

High quality education available in private school.

Group 3: Discipline

Better discipline, stricter controls available.
Drug problems handled more effectively in private schools.
Safety of child greater in private school.

Group 4: School Staff

Reputation of private school was strong.
Relationship with school was better.
Dedicated/competent teachers available.
Parents didn't like particular public school/teacher choice.

Group 5: Program

More caring atmosphere in private school.

Better care for handicapped provided.

Smaller class size available.

Montessori education desired.

Individualization available.

Emphasis on basics and or old-fashioned education desired.

Good curriculum/program available.

Preschool program available.

Structured program atmosphere desired.

Group_6: Child Related

Group 7: Convenience

Parent taught in private school, therefore, no tuition charged.

No permanent residence and no time to investigate public schools.

Location or convenience, bus transportation provided.

Friends went to private school.

Full-day kindergarten or longer of school day available.

Private school chosen as a continuation preschool or earlier enrollment in private school.

Private kindergarten program preferred.

Group 8: Cost

⁻⁷⁼ 24



Many of the reasons most frequently offered for choosing the public schools were similar for all groups. Table 3 shows the distribution of responses by the eight categories described above. Appendix D-1 presents greater detail on the specific reasons mentioned. Convenience was given top priority, especially the desirability of neighborhood schools and the fact that no private school kindergarten was available. This latter factor was especially important for the Church I group. School and staff were also important with the schools' reputation being mentioned frequently, especially by the Nonchurch group. Parental values also played a role with a substantial number of responses indicating that parents believed in public education and no other option had been considered.

The data on the small number of parents who initially enrolled children in private school (9%) is also of interest but must be interpreted with caution because of the small sample size. Table 3 shows Religion and Values were extremely important for the Church 2-12 group. The nonchurch group in contrast stressed convenience. Examination of the individual responses indicates that this group frequently chose private school because of the need for day care or the desire to have an all-day kindergarten program. (See Appendix D-2 for a more detailed presentation of the findings.)

Why Did Parents Withdraw Their Child From MCPS?

The parents surveyed gave many different reasons for deciding to withdraw their child from MCPS. As with the reasons for initial enrollment, it was possible to organize them into eight different categories:

Religion
Parental Values
Discipline
School/Staff Characteristics
Educational Program
Child Personal/Social Needs
Convenience
Cost

Exhibit 3 illustrates this categorization scheme.

Reasons for withdrawal differed among the three groups of parents, indicating some signific int and systematic differences in their reasons for transferring to private schools. Table 4 presents the responses of each of these three groups by category. (Appendix E presents the detailed findings.)

Church l

As might be expected, those transferring at the first grade level to church-related schools did so primarily because of the desire to obtain a religious education for their children. Fifty four percent of the responses of this group fell into the category of religion. It is interesting to note that the vast majority, 81% of these parents, transferred their child to a Catholic school. Second in priority (49%) were concerns related to the educational program offered by the public

TABLE 3

Reasons for Initially Enrolling in Public or Private Schools for Students Withdrawing From MCPS

Type of I Enroll	nitial ment Reasons	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch
ublic Scl N=25				
.1-45.	5			
		<u></u>	Percentage	
	Religion	i l		
	Parental Values	17		0 44**
	Discipline	0	5 <u>4</u> 0	4 <u>45</u> 5
	School Staff/	J	V	
	Interpersonal	19	34	44**
	Program	4	5	77 11
	Child-related	0	5 0	2
	Convenience	89	67	61**
	Cost	. 11	21	26
	, ,2	•	* ·	
ivate Sc	hool			
N=24				
	Religion	==	40	Ö
	Parental Values	 .	40	11
	Discipline	· <u>==</u>	- 33	θ
	School Staff/			•
	Interpersonal		13	22
	Program		20	11
	Convenience	;	27	67*

Percentages are based on multiple responses and may be more than 100 percent.



Extreme caution should be taken in interpreting these data because of the extremely small size of the sample of students initially enrolling in private school.

^{. *}P ⟨.05 **P ⟨.01

EXHIBIT 3

Reasons for MCPS or Private School Withdrawal

1 Religion

Religion in general.
Wanted religious background for certain time period.
Church desired or required private school enrollment.
Wanted religious education for discipline/environment.
Wanted religious education for values/ethics/morals.
Wanted religious education for academic reasons.

2 Parental Values

Concern with sex education.

Concern with integration, bussing, racial problems/tension.

Tradition in family to attend private/public school.

Wanted more social and psychological aspects to be considered.

Wanted higher moral and ethical standards.

Wanted to instill self-discipline, self-worth; character-building.

Reputation; good reports.

Neve: intended otherwise.

Public is as good as private.

3 Discipline

Discipline problems in general.

Discipline problems related to open classroom/combination classes. Inadequate supervision provided by school system and/or staff. Problems in discipline related to specific incidents. Discipline related to behavior of child(ren).

Drug-related concerns.

Safety.

4 School/Staff Interpersonal

General dissatisfaction with school and staff.

General dissatisfaction with school administration and policies.

Dissatisfaction with specific school child will attend/attends.

General dissatisfaction with teachers.

Dissatisfaction with specific teacher(s).

Teachers not qualified; poor teaching.

Teachers poor attitude.

Teachers nonprofessional behavior and actions.

Poor relations/communication with school staff.

Inadequate school environment; poor facilities (school overcrowded--school size, no lunch program or physical education); materials, supplies.

Dissatisfaction with school administration and policies.

Instability of school system--teachers involuntary transferred, too many subs, school closing.

Liked/preferred particular school (system) or staff.

5 Program

Non-American families desire to attend own language/culture school. Better educational quality in public/private school. Preferred environment of private/public school. Wanted more academics, higher academic standards. Generally poor/low quality/unsatisfactory curriculum/program. tack of college preparatory or enriched curriculum in private school. Lack of homework emphasis; no follow-up; lack of study skills/habits. Lack of structure; dislike of open schools or open classrooms -- (withdrawal from public); too structured -- withdrawn from private. Need for tutoring/extra help for special problems. Improper placement into classes/groups; misdiagnosis of problems. Better extracurricular programs desired. Better math program available. More individualization or personal attention desired. Pupil teacher ratio; class size more favorable. School standards slipping. Combination classes judged not desirable. Too demanding or difficult a curriculum; child too pressured.

6 Child-Related

Poor attitude; self-concept, etc.

Child unhappy or depressed.

Child showing troublesome behavior or emotional problems.

Poor personal relations or adjustment problems—personality conflict with teacher, difficulty getting along in general with teacher(s), with other student(s).

Child not living up to potential; underachieving.

Academic needs not being met.

Academic or personal needs were met (no longer need day care, child is older, e.;) so no longer have need for school (system); ready for public schools.

Child preferred to transfer.

Teacher/psychologist recommended the change.

No choice—suspension, expulsion, failure.

7 Convenience

Convenience in general.

Wanted all children in same setting with the same vacations.

Hours preferred.

School had a good location, close to home.

Preferred a neighborhood school.

Transportation available.

Child desired to be with friends.

Family movel.

A good time to switch.

8 Cost

Cost

ERIC -

TABLE 4

Reasons for Withdrawal From MCPS

By Type of Group

	Church 1 N=70	Church 2-12 N=144	N=63		
ė į	**	Percentage			
Religion	54	25	- 3*	٥	
Parental Values	27	-1 7	14		
Discipline	34	47	24*		
School Staff/Interest	29	49	56*		
Educational Program	49	68	92*		
Child-related	14	38	60*	•	
Convenience	14	- 14	6		
Cost	. Ö	Ö	Ö		

*P (.01

Church 2-12

Parents who withdrew their children to church-related schools in the later grades differed from those withdrawing earlier in the degree of emphasis placed on educational concerns. Sixty-eight percent of the responses of this group related to dissatisfaction with the educational program, primarily individualization and class size: This group was also concerned, however, with school/community relations (49%), discipline (47%), and meeting children's emotional and academic needs (38%). It is perhaps somewhat surprising that religion ranked fifth out of eight reasons for this group, with only 25 percent of their responses falling into this category.

Nonchurch

Parents who withdrew their child to nonchurch-related schools overwhelming expressed concerns with the overall MCPS educational program (92%), and specifically cited class size and individualization as important. Also mentioned with considerable frequency were problems related to meeting children's academic and emotional needs (60%) and school/community relations (56%). Discipline ranked fourth, with 24 percent of the responses of this group of parents falling into this category.

It is clear from this pattern of responses that a continuum of concerns exists, from the religious to the academic, with quite differential emphasis being placed on each by the separate groups of parents. The Church I group clearly differs from the other two in its concern for a religious education; and, given the reasons for enrolling in MCPS, its probable intention from the beginning was to enroll their children in private schools once they became available. In this sense, this group may be very much like those who never enroll in MCPS:

At the other extreme are those who transfer their children to nonchurch-related schools. These parents do so primarily because they feel the public schools aducational program is lacking. In addition, they have many complaints about how school or staff have treated them as parents.

The Church 2-12 group falls neatly between the extremes represented by the Nonchurch and Church 1 groups, sharing some of the discipline-related concerns of the latter, but in more ways resembling the former in its concern for educational programs and children's needs. These are parents who eventually choose church-related schools but for what appear to be very different reasons from those transferring to church-related schools at the first grade level.

Interestingly, none of the groups mentioned bussing or desegregation activities as a major reason for selecting to leave MCPS. Additional analysis comparing enrollment and withdrawal patterns (see Appendix F) generally confirm this finding. There appears to be no strong relationship between percentage minority enrollment in a school and the percentage of white students selecting to transfer to private schools.

How Satisfied Were the Parents With the Public and Private Schools?

Parents who transferred their children to private schools were far more satisfied with the private schools and their services than with the public On 40 out of the 42 items examined, the private school was rated as more satisfactory than the public school (Table 5).

On only one item, distance between the school and home, were public schools given a higher rating than private schools: 94 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the distance with public school was from the home, while 62 percent were satisfied with the private school distance from home.

However, the three groups were far from homogeneous in their evaluations of specific features of the public and private schools. Tables 6 and 7 present the findings for items on which significant differences were found. data are presented in Appendix F.) Differences were especially pronounced with regard to attitudes toward the public schools, where differences were found for 31 of the 42 items. These differences, generally, were consistent with differences in withdrawal reasons discussed earlier. example, those attending nonchurch-related schools were far less satisfied with student achievement than those attending church-related schools. also found more fault with school staff in terms of warmth and sensitivity. Those attending church-related schools were less satisfied with the religious aspects of education. Generally, as with the withdrawal responses, the attitudes of the Church 2-12 group fell between those of the Church 1 and Nonchurch groups.



(2)

A follow-up of parents of students who had been included in Edward's study of students who transferred to private school during the 1979-80 school year showed that generally they remained highly satisfied with the services provided by the private schools a year or more after transferring.

MABLE 5

Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS Regarding Public and Private Schools N=277

Satisfaction Items		entage o Private ple
	Public	Private
Student Achievement	Ēi.i	
Student School Satisfaction	51:1 53:1	97.5*
Acceptance of Other Students		97.5*
Disruptive Classroom Behavior	78.0	94.2*
Disruptive School Behavior	45.0	96.4*
Abusive Language	46.9	95.3*
Crime and Vandalism	43.0	89.2*
Drug Abuse	54.9	88.4*
Intimidation and Victimization	44.0	70.8*
Unexcused Absences	56.3	88.1*
Individualization	61.0	81.2*
Staff Academic Qualifications	41.9	` <u>96</u> .0*
Staff Enthusiasm	75.1	93.5*
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	65.1	97.5*
Teacher Turnover and Substitutes	64.4	97.8*
Student-Teacher Ratio	<u>70.4</u>	84.1*
Student Promotion Policy	47.3 +3.3	93.1*
Staff Challenge of Students To Do Best	40.8	68.2*
Amount of Homework	40.1	96.8₹
Follow-up on Assigned Work	40.3	95.3*
Opportunity To Repeat Grades	47.5	96.8*
in Different Settings	21.0	<u> </u>
Appropriate Books and Materials	31.0	38:3*
Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	76.2	96.8*
Peaching Average Students	40.8	40.4*
Teaching Above Average Gifted Students	60.1	90.6*
Curriculum Structure	49.5	72.9*
Elementary Level Basic Skills	59.9	90.6*
Elementary Level Basic Skills Secondary Level Academic Skills ²	52.9	83.5*
Work-Study Skills	24:1	50.0*
College Preparatory Courses 2	37.8 15.5	95. <u>0</u> *
Values	16.5	36.3*
Moral and Ethical Standards	40.1	94 · 2*
Religious Education	45.8	95.7*
Human Growth and Development	30.9	91:0 *
Attention to Parental Concerns	65.3	88.±*
Contacting Parents About Student Problems	58.1	97.8*
Attitude and Cooperation	57.6	95.0*
Aesthetic Appearance of Facility and Grounds	67.5 55. i	98.6*
School Maintenance and Cleanliness	88.1	95.3*
Number of School Dave	86.7	96.4*
Number of School Days School Distance from Home	86.6	
	94.2	61.7*

This is the sample size for the total sample transferring from MCPS to private schools. For each item, however, sample sizes differed, depending on the number of missing responses for each item.

Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.





TABLE 6

Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS

Regarding Public Schools

	Percentage Satisfied or Very Satisfied				
Satisfaction Items	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch		
	N=56	N=120	N=52		
Student Achievement		47	35**		
Student School Satisfaction	71 71	47 48	33 <u>~~</u> 43**		
Acceptance of Other Students	9 <u>1</u>				
Disruptive Classroom Behavior	64	→ 72 38	76**		
Disruptive School Behavior		-	38**		
Crime and Vandalism	5 <u>9</u>	40	49*		
Orug Abuse	60 30	55 (5	48 * ∕ 8∓∓		
Intimidation and Victimization	39	4 <u>5</u>	48∓≭		
Individualization	56	58 *1	52**		
Staff Academic Qualifications	61	41	22**		
Staff Enthusiasm	81	77	65 *		
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	83	64	48**		
Teacher Turnover and Substitutes	83	63	46**		
Student-Teacher Ratio	79 63	68	67 **		
Student Promotion Policy	36	52	19**		
Staff Challenge of Students To Do Best		44	4 0**		
mount of Homework	<u>53</u>	41	22**		
follow-up on Assigned Work	39	4 <u>4</u>	32**		
opportunity To Repeat Grades	51	52	32*		
	4-	44	. :=:		
in Different Settings	27	39	18*		
eaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	44	43	32**		
eaching Average Students	70	52	4 6**		
eaching Above Average Gifted Students urriculum Structure	51	50	46*		
econdary Level Academic Skills ²	54	63	59* °		
ork-Study Skills	13	26	33*		
ollege Preparatory Courses ²	40	39	31**		
alues	4	21	21 **		
eligious Education	47 97	39	35**		
	27	28	43**		
uman Growth and Development ttention to Parental Concerns	67	68	57 *		
	70	59 3 5	41**		
ontacting Parents About Student Problems	71	58 	40**		
ttitude and Cooperation	. 73	72	52**		

This is the sample sizes for the total sample transferring from MCPS to private schools. For each item, however, sample sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

2j

Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.

^{*} P < .05 **P < .01

TABLE 7 Attitudes Regarding Private Schools of Parents
Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS

Satisfaction Items		Percentage Satisfied or Ver, Satisfied				
	. <u>7</u>	Church i	Church 2-12	Nonchurch		
Disruptive Classroom Sehavior		96	99	91*		
Unexcused Absences		70	87 87	81*		
Amount of Homework		90	97	97*		
Teaching Average Students		96	92	81*		
Elementary Level Basic Skills		97	79	79**		
Secondary Level Academic Skills 2		26	55	65**		
Nork-Study Skills		90	97	95 *		
College Preparatory Courses 2		16	38 '	54 **		
Values	γ .	. 97	98	83**		
foral and Ethical Standards		100	97	89**		
Religious Education		100	97	67**		

Sample Sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

² Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.

^{*} P < .05 **P < .01

STUDENTS ENTERING MCPS FROM PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Who are the Students Entering MCPS From Private Schools? What Are the Characteristics of Their Families?

Overall, the students entering MCPS from private school were very similar to those withdrawing in terms of the characteristics examined in this study. The students were generally white and equally divided among males and females. The most popular grades for entrance were grades one, four, and nine. A disproportionately large number of those transferring from church-related schools did so at the ninth grade. This may reflect the fact that many such schools end at the ninth grade level. A little over 50 percent of those entering MCPS had attended private school for less than three years. However, a quarter of those withdrawing from church-related schools did so after attending for six years or more. This probably reflects those students transferring at the ninth grade level.

Nearly half (49%) of the parents were college graduates, with many of those transferring from nonchurch-related schools having advanced degrees. The majority (61%) had lived in Montgmery County for ten or more years. These parents tended to have other children in the public schools, with a small minority also having children remaining in private school. Tables 8 and 9 present further details regarding student and parent characteristics.

Where Were These Students Initially Enrolled? Why?

The scudents who withdrew from private school were almost evenly divided between those who had begun their education in Montgomery County in private and public schools (54% vs. 46%). Those who had initially enrolled in public school had done so for reasons similar to those presented earlier—convenience and especially the desirability of neighborhood schools and unavailability of kindergarten in the private school. Parental values and cost also were cited.

Reasons for initially enrolling in private school showed more group-to-group differences. Religious training was mentioned by the Church I and Church 2-12 groups 27 and 60 percent of the time, respectively. These groups also rated parental values highly. Finally, convenience, especially the availability of a full day kindergarten, was mentioned frequently by the Nonchurch and the Church I groups. Table 10 presents the reasons by category. (Further details are presented in Appendix H.)

TABLE 8

Characteristics of Students Withdrawn From Private School
To Attend MCPS

· ·	Church 1 N=16	Church 2-12 N=100	Nonchurch N=165	
		Percentage		
Şex				
Male	44	48	59	
Female	36	52	41	
Race				
White	86	82 ;	83	
Nonwhite	14	18	17	
Grades				
1	100	Ö	29	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ö	0 11	. <u>6</u>	7
3	Ö	9	ii	
₫	Ð	9		
5	0	10	16 5 1 3 3 9 6 7	
<u>ő</u>	Ö	7	i	
7	0	7 9 7	3	
. 8	Ö		3	
9	0	20	9	
10	0	9	6	
11	0	7		
12	0	2	4	
ength of School				
Attendance Before				
Withdrawal				J
			• •	
Less than 1 year	25	15	16	
Between 1 and 2 years	44	16	16 23	
Between 2 and 3 years	19	16	25	
Between 3 and 4 years	Ö	13	17	
Between 4 and 5 years	Ö		5	
Between 5 and 6 years	Ö Ö	16 16 13 7 9 24	17 5 4 10	
More than 6 years	U	24	10	
ype of Private School Atten	ded			
Catholic	44	67	0	
Non-Catholic	56	33	Ö	
Non-church-related	0	. 0	100	•



TABLE 9

Characteristics of Parents Who Withdrew Their Child
From Private School To Attend MCPS

	Church 1 N=16	Church 2-12 N=100	N=165	•
umber of Years Montgomery County Resident				
		Percentage		
Lëss than 1 year	6	6	ä.	
Between 1 and 3 years	13	10	14	
Between 4 and 9 years	38	17	30	
Between 10 and 14 years	12	26	3 i	
15 or morē	31	41	21	
rental Education Level				
Elementary School	ō	į	Ō	
H.S. Incomplete	_ 0	<u>. 5</u>	1	
H.S. Graduate	25 ·	22	å ,	
Technical School	ő	5	9 2 21	•
College Incomplete		27	- -	-
College Graduate	43	21	<u> </u>	
Graduate Study	0	7	2 <u>5</u> 15	
Advanced Degree	6	13	26	
mber of Other Children in	School .			
Public				
0 "	Ö	Ė.	Ö	
i	56	. 39	49	
2	19	39	42	č
3	19	1 \	9	
4 or Morē	6	7	· ó	
Privatē				
0	88	71	83	
	6	, <u>1</u>	12	
1 2 3 4 or More	Ö	7.	5	
: . 3	Ö .	. 1	ñ	
4 or More	о. 6	1 .	. 0	



TABLE 10

General Reasons for Initially Enrolling in Public or Private School for Students Withdrawing From Private School

Type of Initial Enrollment School	Reasons	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch
			Percentage	
Public			<u> </u>	
N=128	Religion	$\ddot{\mathfrak{o}}^1$	Ō	Ä
	Parental Values	100	32	0 50
•	Discipline School/Staff	0	0 32 0	3
•	_ Interpersonal	0	17	33
•	Program	Ö	4	8
	Child-related	0	i	33 8 0 42*
* .	Convenience	100	66	42*
	Cost	100	26	19
Private N=153				
	Religion	27	60	2**
	Parental Values	47	49	36
ì	Discipline School/Staff	13	20	0**
	Interpersonal	7	10	$\bar{3}$
	Program	33	15	34**
	Convenience	53	22	61**

Percentages are based on multiple responses and may be more than 100 percent.

^{*} P <.05 **P <.01

Why Did the Parents Withdraw the Child From Private School? Which Type of Private School Did They Come From?

As was noted with the groups withdrawing from public school, the three groups of parents withdrawing their children from private school also gave somewhat different reasons for making their decisions. Convenience was, however, important to all. Cost was also consistently mentioned. Table 11 presents their responses. (Appendix I presents more detailed data on the responses.)

Church 1

Those withdrawing from church-related schools at the first grade level generally did so because of convenience or cost. Fifty-six percent of their responses fell into each of these categories. Specific aspects of the convenience category mentioned included the attractiveness of a neighborhood school; the desire to attend school with neighborhood friends, and the fact that their children would no longer require bus transportation.

Church 2

Those transferring from church-related schools in Grades 2 through 12 also rated convenience highly (47%). However, almost equal stress was placed on reasons associated with the educational program (44%) and meeting children's academic and emotional needs (42%). Thirty-nine percent of the responses were related to cost.

Nonchurch

Those withdrawing their children from nonchurch-related schools mentioned convenience in 60 percent of their responses. Like the church group, they were attracted by the neighborhood school concept. In addition, however, many simply said it was "an appropriate time." This group also cited problems with the private school's educational program-54 percent of their responses fell in this category. Finally, cost was directly mentioned in 37 percent of the responses of this group, which was somewhat less than was the case with those leaving church-related schools.



⁵A follow-up of parents of students who had been included in Edward's study showed that a small proportion of students had transferred back into MCPS by the end of the 1980-81 school year. The major reason for this decision was cost.

TABLE 11
Reasons for Withdrawal From Private Schools
By Type of Group

	Church 1 N=16	Church 2-12 N=165	Nonchurch N=100
•	<u> </u>	Percentage	·
Religion	<u>-</u>	7	. i
Parental Values	6	8	ä
Discipline	_ 0	3	4
School Staff/Interest	25	21	26
Educational Program	25	42	54 *
Child-related	13	44	35*
Convenience	56	47	60
Cost	56	39	37

*P (.05

Parent Satisfaction With Public and Private Schools

In contrast to parents of students withdrawing from MCPS, parents who transferred their child to MCPS from private schools in Maryland were generally quite satisfied with the services offered by both the public and private institutions (Table 12). (Appendix J presents more detailed findings.) And, despite the fact that they had chosen to withdraw their child from private school, they rated the private school somewhat more satisfactorily than the public school in nearly half the 42 areas. On nine of the 42 items, the public schools received significantly higher ratings. The greatest differences in satisfaction favoring private schools were found in the areas of:

- o Disruptive school behavior
- o Abusive language
- o Crime and vandalism
- o Drug abuse
- o Intimidization and victimization
- Student teacher ratio
- o Values
- o Moral and ethical standards
- o Religious education

Differences in satisfaction favoring the public schools were also found in several areas. These were:

- o Student-school satisfaction
- o Teaching the below average handicapped student
- 5 Attitude and cooperation
- o School distance from home

Differences between the three groups in satisfaction also were found (Tables 13 and 14): These did not, however, add up to any overall pattern.

TABLE 12 Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From Private School Regarding Public and Private Schools N=281

Satisfaction Items	Percentage	Satisfied or Satisfied
	Public	Private
Student School Satisfaction	88.7	77.7**
Disruptive Classroom Behavior	69:±	//*/?? 85:5**
Disruptive School Behavior	68.1	86:2**
Abusive Language	55.7	81.6**
Crime and Vandalism	62:4	86:2**
Drug Abuse	60:3	78:4**
Intimidation and Victimization	71.6	85:5**
Jnexcused Absences	81:4	88:9**
Staff Academic Qualifications	77.3	81:9**
Staff Enthusiasm	86.2	84.0**
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	85.5	81.6**
leacher Turnover and Substitutes	64.4	77.9* *
Student-Teacher Ratio	66.0	87.2**
Student Promotion Policy	67.9	78.9**
Mount of Homework	69.6	72.1**
pportunity to Repeat Grades		
in Different Settings	51.3	46.2**
eaching Below Average, Handicapped Student?	64.5	35.8**
eaching Above Average Gifted Students	75.4	74.1*
lementary Level Basic Skills	75.1	82.9*
ork-Study Skills	68.2	82.9**
alues	67.9	88.3**
oral and Ethical Standards	67.1	92.9**
eligious Education	41.8	78.4**
ttention to Parental Concerns	82.6	77.2**
ontacting Parents About Student Problems	76.5	79.8*
ttitude and Cooperation	88.6	80.9**
chool Distance from Home	98.6	64.5**
chool Schedule Convenience	92.5	81.9**

Sample Sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.

^{*} P <.05 **P <.01

TABLE 13 Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From Private Schools Regarding Public Schools N=281

Satisfaction Items	Percentage Satisfied or Very Satisfied			
··	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch	
Disruptive Classroom Behavior	81		80**	
Disruptive School Behavior	88	60	79* *	
Abusive Language	69	44	73*≭	
Student-Teacher Ratio	88	<u>71</u>	56**	
Amount of Homework	56	- 70	70*	
Follow-up on Assigned Work	63	72	82*	
Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	88	66	59*	
Secondary Level Academic Skills	19	54	27**	
College Preparatory Courses 2	13	50	25**	
/alues	72	64	72**	
foral and Ethical Standards	86	60	75**	
eligious Education	3 i	34	56**	
ttention to Parental Concerns ;	8 i	82	84*	
Attitude and Cooperation	69	87	93**	

This is the total sample size. Sample sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

 $[\]frac{2}{\text{Many}}$ respondents had no opinion in these areas.

^{*} P <.05 **P <.01

TABLE 14

Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From Private Schools Regarding Private Schools N=281

Satisfaction Items 47	Percentage Satisfied		
	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch
Individualization	94	68	82**
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	87	77	87**
Student Promotion Policy	94	77	79**
Staff Challenge of Students to Do Best	94	74	88≭*
Amount of Homework	81	74	67**
Follow-up on Assigned Work	88	80/	80× *
Appropriate Books and Materials	100	8/2	87**
Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	63	29	42**
Curriculum, Structure	88	8ì	80*
Secondary Level Academic Skills ²	19	49	31**
College Preparatory Courses ²	25	46	26**
Moral and Ethical Standards	94	95	89**
Religious Education	81	92	57**
Attention to Parental Concerns.	94	. 71	86**
Contacting Parents About Student Problems	94	75 &	86*

Sample sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

Many respondents had no opinion in this area.

^{*} P < .05 **P < .01

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study shows that parents withdraw their children from the Montgomery County Public Schools for a variety of reasons and that différent groups are seeking different things when they make the decision to transfer their child to private school. Further, in contrast to the Edwards (1981) study, the present analysis suggests that religion is a critical factor for only a small group. of parents (approximately 25%) and that factors potentially under the control of the school system are the cause of dissatisfaction for the "vast majority."

Of the three groups, only those who withdrew to church-related schools at the first grade level appear to place a great deal of emphasis on religion in reaching their decision. They seem generally to have made the decision to transfer to private schools even before entering MCPS and only use MCPS because of the lack of availability of kindergarten or first grades in some private schools. In addition, there is some evidence from the demographic data that this group is more "private school oriented." That is, they tend more than the other two groups to have other children in private school and are less likely to have the children remaining in public school.

The other two groups, those who transfered their children to church-related chools in Grades 2 through 12 and those who transfered their children to nonchurch-related schools, generally do so because of dissatisfaction with the way the school conducts its business of educating children. The data suggest loud and clear that these parents wanted a more individualized environment, smaller classes, and programs that they feel will meet more effectively their academic needs. These parents also found fault with their interpersonal relationships wi th school ädministrators and teachers. expressing dissatisfaction with staff sensitivity and level of communication. Interestingly, concerns with bussing and desegregation, drug abuse, crime, and vandalism were minimal. The desire for increased discipline and structure in the schools also, emerged as important, especially for those parents who withdrew their students to church-related schools at the second to twelfth grade levels.

In contrast, those who transfer from private to public schools are not really dissatisfied with the private school program. While some do express concern with the educational program being delivered, convenience and cost are the major reasons for leaving the private school. The data show that the idea of "neighborhood schools" retains a very large drawing power, both in terms of where parents choose to enroll their child initially and why they may ultimately decide to withdraw their child from a private school.



These findings provoke some interesting questions regarding current MCPS policies and practices. For example, the county government must soon be making some important policy decisions concerning ways of reusing the 30 plus public schools about to be closed over the next three years. At present no definite policy exists regarding priorities to be used in the recycling of such buildings, and a system for weighing the merits of alternative users is not in place. It can be predicted, however, that a demand for such buildings will come from the private school sector, seeking improved or better located facilities. The findings of this study suggest that the leasing of public school buildings to private schools may not be to the advantage of the public school system. Depending upon the particular circumstances of neighborhood, the availability of more "neighborhood private schools" could have a very negative impact on the public school system and increase problems associated with declining enrollments. This concern must however be balanced off against the obvious desirability of the private school to the neighborhood and the increased revenues that would accrue to the county as a whole if private schools were encouraged to lease closed buildings.

Mow to handle the dissatisfied attitude of the small percentage of parents who withdrew their children from MCPS poses other problems and must itself be kept in perspective. Many parents are satisfied with MCPS, and the level of satisfaction is high compared to national data. The MCPS 1981 countywide telephone survey conducted in the Spring of 1981 revealed that 50 percent of the countywide sample and 65 percent of MCPS parents gave the school grades of A or 3°, while only 36% of all 1981 Gallup Poll respondents and 46% of the polled parents graded public school A or B.

More importantly, the functions of the two school systems are meant to be different.

Private schools educate only those children whose family elect to send them to the schools and whom the schools accept. Public schools, on the other hand, do not control the composition of their student bodies by excluding students; they cannot, for example, dismiss children whose behavior disrupts the education of others or who cannot meet some pre-established (sic) standard of academic aptitude. Public schools meet public needs and carry out public policy. The genius of U.S. public education is in its diversity....Nowhere in the world is access to educational opportunity broader than in the United States. Our system of free public education is a cornerstone of our democratic society.

1981), p.16.



^{6&}quot;How the Community Sees Its Schools," MCPS Learning, October, 1981, p.2.
G. Gallup, "The 13th Annual Gallup Poll," Phi Delta Kappan, 33-47, 63
(1), (1981).
J. Sparling, "Tuition Tax Credits," Today's Education, (November-December,

Nonetheless, if MCPS is interested in attempting to retain or attract the parents who seek private schools, this study does suggest some areas which might be explored. While there is little that can be done to satisfy the needs of those who seek a religious education, it may be possible to meet the needs of those who leave because of dissatisfaction with the educational program. The data show that many of the parents who withdrew their child from public school did so because they felt their children's academic needs were not being met. They were especially concerned about class size and the individual attention that their child was able to receive. Further they seemed to be seeking a more personalized atmosphere in which their needs as parents, as well those of their children, were individually addressed.

MCPS may wish to explore possible alternative ways of reducing class size to the levels which so many parents find attractive, and even to the levels where substantial academic benefits have been found. This is usually considered to be about 15:1 and in fact, researchers have almost universally found that decreases in class size that do not reduce class size to at least 20:1 will have no academic benefits. We might also want to consider other means of creating a more personalized atmosphere in our schools.

While some will say that we have been down both of these routes many times before, and that the truly effective solutions are either financially or politically impossible, we don't think that this is necessarily the case. After all, the private schools which are attracting our students are probably operating under financial constraints at least as tight as our own, and they are hiring staff from the same labor markets.

Also, while only a small percentage of the MCPS population actually transfer to private schools because of concerns regarding class size and individualization, it is likely that many of those who stay with, or never enter, the public schools share some of the dissatisfaction. This also makes it worth reexamining MCPS practices to see whether or not there are ways in which a more personalized, individualized environment could be provided.

One means of doing this would be to examine closely what the more successful local private schools are doing. The initial goal would be to try to determine the degree to which they are truly providing individualized instruction and small class sizes, and the degree to which they are benefiting from an image which is not reflected in the reality of their actual instructional environments. Then, if it is found that they are more effective in these respects than are our own schools, the next goal would be to determine how they are doing it and the whether their strategies are adoptable to MCPS.

We strongly suggest that this be undertaken as a follow-on activity to this report. Just as Giant sends comparison shoppers into Safeway to see how they are pricing and displaying their goods, it is about time that we started taking the private schools of the Country more seriously and realizing that we may have something to learn from them.



APPENDIX A

SAMPLE SELECTION

Using the MCPS pupil data base, two samples were selected for telephone interviews. The two working samples are part of a small and specifically defined targeted population which is only about 2 percent of Montgomery County Public School's students: those Montgomery County residents who in 1980-1981 transferred their first through twelfth grade child who was not in an MCPS special education center from MCPS to a Maryland private school or vice versa. Although the samples were not randomly selected, on key factors (sex, race, and grade level), they are representative of these groups and include 278 students who withdrew from MCPS and 285 who withdrew from Maryland private schools--17 percent and 24 percent of the two groups, respectively (Table A-1).

While some bias may have been introduced into the sample since all children from the same family who withdrew were both members of the targeted population and possible sample, there were few of these cases since most parents only responded to the telephone interview for one child.

TABLE A-1

Comparisons of Characteristics Between the Two
Withdrawal Samples and Populations

	MCPS W	ithdr awa ls —	Private Sch	ool Withdrawai
	Sample	Population	Sample	Population
Characteristics	(n=278)	(N=1672)	(n=285)	(N=1205)
Sex		• •		•
 Male	55.1	56.0	51.6	52.0
Femāle	44.9	44.0	48.4	48.0
Race				
American Indian	Ö.4	0.2	··· 0.0	0.0
Asian	1.4	3.5	2 + 8	3.9
Black	5.1	7.4	9.5	12.0
White	89:5	84.3	82.5	79.3
Hispanic	3.6	4.6	5.3	4.7
rade				:
i.	27.5	22.4	iē i	i8:8
1 2 3 4 5 6	6.9	6.7	8.4	8∶9
3	7.2	7 . t	9 . i	ē i i
<u></u>	4.7	5.3	11.2	7.9
5	8:3	8.0	7.4	7:3
	5.2	7.3	4.2	5.0
7	9 . i	12.0	. 6.3	8.2
7 8 9	5.1	6.2	4.9	5.i
	13.4	11. <u>1</u>	14.7	12.3
10	5.5	6.5	8.1	9.2
	4.3	4.5	6.7	7.2
11 12	0.7	1.6	2-8	2.9

Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding error.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

The survey instruments for the two groups were essentially identical. Both addressed reasons that parents withdrew their child from public or private school, and characteristics and attitudes of the parents, as well as reasons that the parents, as Montgomery County residents, initially enrolled their child in public or private school. The questions were similar to those used in the earlier 1979-80 Edward's study, although the attitudinal items in the present survey were greatly expanded.



Instructions for Interviewers - Form 1 Public to Private

Card Col.

INTERVIEW SCRIPT

Hello, this is		
parents or guardian of?		
		-T
(INQUIRE AS TO WHETHER THE PERSON INTERVIEWED IS THE 1: MOTHER, 2: FATHER, 3: GUARDIAN OF THE CHILD.)	1	î:
(IF THE PERSON REACHED INDICATES THAT HE OR SHE IS NOT THE PERSON TO INTERVIEW, SAY) Do you have a number where the parents of this child may be reached? (IF YES, WRITE THE NUMBER:		
The school system is surveying parents who withdrew their children from public school to place them in a private school. Your participation is voluntary. Your answers will be kept confidential and be recorded with no association with you or your child.	,	
We would like you to participate in the study because our		
records show that you recently withdrew your child from a Montgomery County public school. Is that correct? (1: YES, 2: NO)	1	Ī:
(IF YES, CONTINUE)		
(IF NO, SAY:) I'm sorry. It was my understanding that had been withd	irawn	
from school to attend	a private	
school. Thank you for the information. Goodbye.		

Card Col.

Survey Questionnaire - Form 1

	When you first enrolled this child in a school as a Montgomery County resident, was that school public or private?	
	Public (Go to 2)	I:
2.	Prior to your recent withdrawal, was your child enrolled in a MCPS school continuously since your initial residence in Montgomery County?	,
	Ŷēs (Go to 3)	i:
	IF NO, SAY: You are not one of the parents or guardians that we wish to interview. Thank you very much for your time. Goodbye.	
3.	Please think for a moment about your reasons for enrolling your child initially in a Montgomery County public school rather than a private school. Then state the 3 most important reasons in the order of their importance, naming the most important one first.	
	a. Most Important	_
	b. Sēcond	_
	c. Third	- -
4.	You have enrolled your child in a private school. Were there particular policies or actions of the Board of Education which influenced your decision to withdraw your child from Montgomery County Public Schools?	
u	Yes	Ï:
	IF YES, Please tell me which policies or actions.	
		-
		_



5 . .	from	se think for a moment about your reasons for withdrawing your child MCPS. Then state the 3 most important reasons in the order of their rtance, naming the most important one first.	
	a.	Most Important	
	Ъ.	Second	
	ć.	Third	
6.	You	said that was the most reason for withdrawing your child from MCPS. Please give some	ì
	impo publ	ic school illustrations of this problem.	
	What	could have been done by MCPS school staff to avoid this problem?	
	What	could have been done by MCPS school staff to avoid this problem?	
:	What	could have been done by MCPS school staff to avoid this problem?	
		could have been done by MCPS school staff to avoid this problem? TO 11)	
	(GO Plea init impo		\
7.	(GO Plea init impo	TO 11) use think for a moment about the reasons you enrolled your child itself in a private school rather than MCPS. Then state the 3 most ortant reasons in the order of their importance, naming the most	
7.	(GO Plea init impo impo	TO 11) ase think for a moment about the reasons you enrolled your child tially in a private school rather than MCPS. Then state the 3 most ortant reasons in the order of their importance, naming the most ortant one first.	
7.	(GO Plea init impo impo	TO 11) ase think for a moment about the reasons you enrolled your child tially in a private school rather than MCPS. Then state the 3 most ortant reasons in the order of their importance, naming the most ortant one first.	
	Plea init impo impo	TO 11) ase think for a moment about the reasons you enrolled your child itself in a private school rather than MCPS. Then state the 3 most ortant reasons in the order of their importance, naming the most ortant one first. Most Important	
	Plea init impo impo	TO 11) ase think for a moment about the reasons you enrolled your child itself in a private school rather than MCPS. Then state the 3 most ortant reasons in the order of their importance, naming the most ortant one first. Most Important	



No		1 2			. <u> </u>
IF YES, Ple	ase tell me which	ch policies or	actions.	(
		···-		·	<u></u>
•					
<u></u>					
IF NO, GO T	0 9	<u>-</u>	•		~ .
from the MC	k for a moment a PS. Then state tance, naming th	the 3 most im	portant reason	s in the order	
a. Most i	mportant	<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
				_	
b. Second					
			 _		
- Third				<u> </u>	
c. Third		<u> </u>			
	v		<u>;</u> <u></u>	<u> </u>	
You said the	 a t	·	was t	ne most import	ant •
	withdrawing your strations of thi		CPS. Please g	ive me some pul	blic
		,			
					
	الم حشمة للمان حالت	y MCPS school	staff to avoid	this problem?	
What could h	lave been done b	•		,	

I will read a list of topics which have to do with school in general. I would like you to consider your satisfaction with each topic when your child was in the most recent public school he/she attended. To indicate your satisfaction with each topic I would like you to use the following Satisfaction Scale. (READ THE SCALE.)

SATISFACTION_SCALE (READ SCALE)

- 1 = Very Satisfied
- 2 = Satisfied
- 3 = Not Satisfied
- www. Very Unsatisfied
- 9 No opinion/Don't know/
 Not applicable/No Answer

Now, I will read the list and you are to use the scale to rate your satisfaction with the public school.

(READ THE LIST OF TOPICS. HAVE THE INTERVIEWEE RESPOND FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOL. RECORD THE APPROPRIATE NUMBERS FOR THE SCALE ON THE BLANKS BESIDE EACH TOPIC. YOU MAY RE-READ THE SCALE WHEN NEEDED BY PARENT.)

Now, I will read the list again and ask you to use the same scale to rate your satisfaction with the private school your child is now attending. (READ THE LIST AGAIN AND RECORD THE SCALE NUMBERS.)

The topics are organized into these categories for your convenience: students, classroom instruction, curriculum, and school services. I will now read the topics under each category.

		PUBLIC	PRIVATE	Card Co
Α.	Amount or level of student:		W 1 	12.
ii.	Achievement	•	/	/Ī:
iż.	Satisfaction with school	•		ī:
i3.	Acceptance of other students	•	<u> </u>	ï:
į4:	Disruptive Behavior in the classroom	•	$-\Delta$	I:
15.	Disruptive behavior in the school	•		Ī:
i6:	Abusive language	• /	/:	ī:
í7:	Crime and vandalism	•	1	, r . \
		/	Ì	1

		PUBLIC	PRIVATE	Card
18.	Drug abuse	•		ī: ´
19.	Intimidation and victimization of other students	•		Ĭ:
20.	Unëxcused absences	•	-1710-1711-10-10-1	ī:
в.	Classroom Instruction - Extent or level of:	•		
21.	Individualization to meet student needs:	•		I:
22.	Staff academic qualifications	•	 ,	I:
23.	Staff enthusiasm	•		I:
24.	Staff warmth and sensitivity to students	•		I:
25.	Teacher turn-over and use of substitutes	•		Ī:
26.	Teacher-student ratio	•		I:
27.	Student promocion policy	•		I:
28.	Challenging students to do their best		-	I:
29.	Amount of homework	•		I:
30.	Follow-up on assigned work	•		ī:
ЗÌ:	Opportunities to repeat grades in different settings	•		I:
32.	Appropriate books and materials	•		Ī:
33.	Teaching of below average or handicapped students	• ===	·	Ī:
3 4 .	Teaching of average students	• ===		İ:
35.	Teaching of above average or gifted students	•	,	Ĭ: ;
ĉ.	Curriculum Amount of emphasis on:	•		
36.	Currîculum structure		-	ī:
37.	Elementary level basic skills	•	- 	ī:
38.	Secondary level academic skills	•	. =====	I:
	$ar{ar{5}}ar{ar{z}}$		1	

	PUBI	LIC PRIVATE	Card
39.	Work-study skills		Ī:
40.	College preparatory courses	-	Īŧ.
41.	. Values		I:
42.	Moral and ethical standards	· ·	I:
43.	Religious education:		ī:
44.	Human growth and development		Ī:
D.	School Services		
45.	Attention to parent concerns		I:
46.	Contacting parents about student problems		I:
4 7 .	Attitude and cooperation		ī:
48.	Appearance of facility and grounds		I:
49.	School maintenance and cleanliness		Ī:
50.	Number of days school is open		Ī:
51.	School distance from home		ī:
52.	Convenience of school schedule to family schedule		I: \
REPI	PEAT 11 THROUGH 52 FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS	•	
53.	a. Before withdrawing your child from MCPS did you attempt to him/her to another Montgomery County public school?	o transfer	
:	Yes, GO TO (b) 1, No, GO TO (d) 2	<u></u>	ī:
	b. Was the request granted?	;	•
	Yes, GO TO (d)	<u></u>	Ĭ:
	c. If the request had been granted, would you have withdrawn	your child?	
	Yes GO TO (d) 1 No GO TO 60 2	<u>//</u>	Ĭ:

		<u>Car</u>	d Col.
	d.	If transportation to another MCPS school was provided by MCPS at no cost to you, would you have withdrawn your child?	
		Yes	, ,
•	e.	If transportation to another MCPS school was provided by MCPS at your expense, would you have withdrawn your child?	
	,	Yes	
54.	a.	How long did your child attend Montgomery County public schools?	!
		One year or less	-
55.	Whici	n private 'school does he/she attend?	
- .	WRIT!	NAME OF SCHOOLCODE SCHOOL	
56.	a.	What kind of private school is he/she attending now? Is it a (READING THE FOLLOWING ALTERNATIVES) Catholic school	
نستسن		Non-catholic, church related school	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
57.	ā.	How many school aged (Grades K-12) children do you have, other than (IF NONE, GO TO #58.) /-/ I:	D.
	b •	Including, how many of your children are in public schools and how many are in private schools? (RECORD THE NUMBERS.)	·
•	•	PUBLIC SCHOOL ,	•
	÷	PRIVATE SCHOOL 1:	ā
			ī
<i>'</i> .			
			•
		54 -8 $+$	

58. How	many years have you lived in Montgo	mery County?	,
	Less than one year		I:
59. What	was the highest grade (or year) of	school you completed?	
1	Elementary school (K-8). High school incomplete High school graduate Technical, trade, or business scho College incomplete College graduate Graduate study Advanced degree. Don't know/no answer		I:
(CLOSURE)			
That was for takin	the last question in the interview. g the time to answer these question	Thank you very much is for us.	

1388A

Goodbye.

Instructions for Interviewers - Form 2 Private to Public

INTERVIEW SCRIPT

•		Card Col.
Hello, this is I'm working with the Montgomery County Public School System's Department of Educational Accountability. May I speak with the		
parent or guardian of?		
(INQUIRE AS TO WHETHER THE PERSON INTERVIEWED IS THE 1: MOTHER, 2: FATHER, 3: GUARDIAN OF THE CHILD.)		Ĭ:
(IF THE PERSON REACHED INDICATES THAT HE OR SHE IS NOT THE PERSON TO INTERVIEW, SAY) Do you have a number where the parents of this child may be reached? (IF YES, WRITE THE NUMBER:)		
The school system is surveying parents who withdrew their children from private school to place them in a Montgomery County Public School. Your participation is voluntary. Your answers will be kept confidential and be recorded with no association with you or your child.		
We would like you to participate in the study because our records show that you recently enrolled your child in a Montgomery County public school from a private school. Is that correct?		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
(1: YES, 2: NO)		Í:
(IF NO, SAY:) I'm sorry. It was my understanding that had been withdrawn from a private school and enrolled in school. Thank you for the information. Goodbye.	<u></u>	
(IF YES, CONTINUE)		. •

MCRS 024-06-4 AZ,11/80

Survey Questionnaire - Form 2

i:	When resi	n you first enrolled this child in a school as a Montgomery ident, was that school public or private?	County	
		blic (Go to 7) 1 ivate (Go to 2) 2	<u>//</u>	i:
2.	priv	or to your recent withdrawal, was your child enrolled in a vale school continuously since your initial residence in tgomery County?		
		s (Go to 3)	<u>//</u>	i:
	IF N	NO, SAÝ:		
3.	init scho	You are not one of the parents or guardians that we wish t interview. Thank you very much for your time. Goodbye. ase think for a momemt about your reasons for enrolling your tially in a private school rather than a Montgomery County pool. Then state the 3 most important reasons in the order optionce, naming the most important one first.	child ublic	
	a.	Most important	 	·
	ъ.	Second	· · ·	=
			<u></u>	_
	c.	Third	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_

No		I	
IF I	NO, GO TO 5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
IF '	(ES, Please tell me which policies	or actions.	
orde	the private school. Then state to of their importance, naming the	most important one f	reasons in the
b.	Second		
		,	
ċ.	Third		
	said that ortant reason for withdrawing your me some private school illustrati	child from private sons of this problem.	wäs the most chool. Please
impo			<u></u>
impo			•
impo			·
impo	could have been done by private s	chool staff to avoid	this problem?
impo	could have been done by private s	chool staff to avoid	this problem?

a.	Most important			
٠.	The super case			
				
b.	Second			
		-		
c.	Third			
You	have now re-enrolled your child in MCPS. Were the	re particu	lar	
poli	cies or actions by the Board of Education which in sion to return your child to Montgomery County Pub	rineuced A	OUL	
deci	sion to return your child to montgomery country rus	110 5011401	,	
Yes	<u>1</u> =		,,	
Yes No .				
			<u>/</u> /	
	ËŜ, Please tell me which policies or actions.			
			<i></i>	
			<i></i>	
				
İF Ÿ				_
ÎF Ŷ	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions.			
ÎF Y	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd	rawing you	ir child	
IF N	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd the private school. Then state the 3 most import	ant reason	ir child	
IF N	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd the private school. Then state the 3 most import of their importance, naming the most important o	ant reason	ir child	
IF N	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd the private school. Then state the 3 most import	ant reason	ir child	
IF N	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd the private school. Then state the 3 most import of their importance, naming the most important o	ant reason	r child	
IF Y Plea from orde	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd the private school. Then state the 3 most import or of their importance, naming the most important of their important of their important of their important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most importan	ant reason	ir child	
IF Y Plea from orde	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd the private school. Then state the 3 most import of their importance, naming the most important o	ant reason	ir child	
IF Y	ES, Please tell me which policies or actions. O, GO TO 9 se think for a moment about your reasons for withd the private school. Then state the 3 most import or of their importance, naming the most important of their important of their important of their important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most important of the most importan	ant reason	ir child	

ğiv e	më so	në pr	ivate	school	illus	trations o	of this	problem.		
	<u> </u>						<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	J.		·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· ·	
		;				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			``````````````````````````````````````	
What	could	have	been	done b	y priv	ate school	stäff	to avoid	this pro	blem?
								<u> </u>		

I will read a list of topics which have to do with school in general. I would like you to consider your satisfaction with each topic when your child was in the most recent private school he/she attended. To indicate your satisfaction with each topic I would like you to use the following Satisfaction Scale. (READ THE SCALE.)

SATISFACTION SCALE (READ SCALE)

- 1 = Very Satisfied
- = Satisfied
- 3 = Not Satisfied
- 4 = Very Unsatisfied
- 9 = No opinion/Don't know/ Not applicable/No Answer

Now, I will read the list and you are to use the scale to rate your satisfaction with the PRIVATE SCHOOL.

(READ THE LIST OF TOPICS. HAVE THE INTERVIEWEE RESPOND FOR THE PRIVATE SCHOOL. RECORD THE APPROPRIATE NUMBERS FOR THE SCALE ON THE BLANKS BESIDE EACH TOPIC. YOU MAY RE-READ THE SCALE WHEN NEEDED BY PARENT.)

Now, I will read the list again and ask you to use the same scale to rate your satisfaction with the public school your child is now attending. (READ THE LIST AGAIN AND RECORD THE SCALE NUMBERS.)

The topics are organized into these categories for your convenience: students, classroom instruction, curriculum, and school services. I will now read the topics under each category.

_	<u></u>	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	Card Col.
Α.	Amount or level of student:			
ii.	Achievement	•		Ĭ: <u>·</u>
12.	Satisfaction with school	•		Ï:
i 3 .	Acceptance of other students	•	-	Ī:
14.	Disruptive behavior in the classroom	•		ī:
15.	Disruptive behavior in the school	•	·	ī:
16.	Abusive language	•		I:
ī	Crime and vandalism	•		I:
iā.	Drug abusē	•		I:
19.	Intimidation and victimization of other students	•	:	I:
20.	Unexcused absences	• 		Ĭ:
Ē.	Classroom Instruction Extent or level of:	<i>**</i>		
21.	Individualization to meet student needs:	•		I:
22.	Staff academic qualifications	•		ī:
23.	Staff enthusiasm	•		I:
24.	Staff warmth and sensitivity to students	• :		I:
25.	Teacher turn-over and use of substitutes	•		I:
2ē.	Teacher-student ratio	•		I: ¿
27.	Student promotion policy	•		Ī:
28.	Challenging students to do their best			Ī:
29.	Amount of homework	•		I:
30.	Follow-up on assigned work	•		I:
31.	Opportunities to repeat grades in different settings	•		Ī:
32.	Appropriate books and materials	•		Ī:

-6-

		PRIVATE	PUBLIC	Card Col
33.	Teaching of below average or handicapped students	•	· ,	Ī:
34:	Teaching of average students	•		i:
35.	Teaching of above average or gifted students	•		I: a
c.	Curriculum Amount of emphasis on:			
36.	Curriculum structure	•	· · -	ī:
37.	Elementary level basic skills	•		ī:
38;	Secondary level academic skills	•		ī:
39:	Work-study skills	•		ī:
40.	College preparatory courses	•	12/11/12/12	I:
4±:	Values :	•	•	I:
42.	Moral and ethical standards			ī:
43.	Religious education	-		I:
44.	Human growth and development	•		I:
D.	School Services			
45.	Attention to parent concerns			ī:
46.	Contacting parents about student problems			ï:
47.	Attitude and cooperation			ī:
48.	Appearance of facility and grounds			Ī:
49.	School maintenance and cleanliness		į . 	ī:
50.	Number of days school is open			ī:
51.	School distance from home			: Ī:
52.	Convenience of school schedule to family schedule		•	Ī:

REPEAT 11 THROUGH 52 FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

53. ā.	How long did your child attend private schools?	Card Col.
	One year or less 1 3+ to 4 years 4 One+ years to 2 years 5 2+ to 3 years 3 More than 6 years 7	ī:
54. a	Which private school did he/she last attend?	•
	WRITE NAME OF SCHOOL CODE SCHOOL	Î:
55.	What kind of private school did he/she withdraw from? Is it a (READING THE FOLLOWING ALTERNATIVES)	Time:
÷	Catholic school	Ĭ:
56. a	How many school aged (Grades K-12) children do you have, // other than(IF NONE, GO TO \$57.)	Ï:
ъ		
	PUBLIC SCHOOL /	ī:
	PRIVATE SCHOOL	Í:
57. H	ow many years have you lived in Montgoway County"	
1. 4 1. 1	= 3 years	Î::

(Closure)

That was the last question in the interview. Thank you very much for taking the time to as ower these questions for us.

Goodbye.

2998A

.9-

APPENDIX C

DATA COLLECTION

The data were collected by telephone interviews with, whenever possible, a parent of the student. Of the public to private respondents, 76 percent were the mothers and 23 percent were the fathers; 76 percent of the private to public respondents were mothers, and 21 percent were fathers. The interviews, conducted under the auspices of the MCPS Department of Educational Accountability from November, 1980, through May, 1981, took, in some cases, as long as one hour to complete. The parents were, in general, excremely cooperative in their participation efforts.

DATA ANALYSIS

After the data were collected, open-ended withdrawal and initial enrollment items were coded and categoriezed. Analyses of a descriptive nature were performed using Statistical Programs for the Social Sciences (SPSS)

In almost all cases, percentages based on the frequency of responsive respondent were calculated and reported. It should be noted (withdrawal and initial enrollment) questions with multiple responsive percentage of respondents (cases) or percentage of responsive be utilized. Using both sets of statistics, the end results were essentially the same; thus, consistent with the mathod utilized for single response questions, percentages of respondents are reported for multiple response items, too.

APPENDIX D-1 °

Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Public School

By Percentage

	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch
Group 1 Religion			•
Group 2: Parental Values			•
Public school experiences Parents believed in public Parents always expected to	education. 0	14 9	7 11*
their child to public so Parents felt there was a h	hool. 11	18	15
education available in M	icps. 3	8	7
Group 3: Discipline			افر
Group 4: School Staff			:
MCPS staff had good reputa	tion. 7	30	35**
Parents pleased with school teacher choice.	ior	4	7
Group 5: Program	4		:
Group 6: Child-related			
Group 7: Convenience			
Friends go to neighborhood No good private school near Private school has no kinde	by. 1	50 9 3	57 2* 4**
Group 8 Cost	·	•	
Cost.	ii	21	26

Includes only reasons mentioned in 5 percent or more of the responses.

^{*} p **< .**05 **P **< .**01

APPENDIX D-2

Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Private School

By Percentage

	Church 2-12	Nonchurch
Group 1: Religion	*	
Parents wanted religious background.	40	ö
Group 2: Parental Value		
Better education available in		
private school.	<u> 6</u>	ĺÍ
Reaction to/poor public school experie	nce ·	
of older/child.	13	θ
High quality education available in		
private school.	. 20	- 1 1
Group 3:// Discipline		
Better/discipline/stricter		
controls available.	33	0
Group 4: School Staff		
Relationship with school was better.	13	0
	•	
Group 5: Program		
Ballan bank dan bandianand	32	: :
Better care for handicapped. Smaller class size available.	- 33 7	, <u>11</u> 11
Montessori education desired.	20	: 11
	20	•
Group 6: Child-related		•
	N	•
Group 7: Convenience		
Education or convenience; bus	1 Ġ	24
transportation provided.	13	22
Full day kindergarten or longer school day available.	13	33
Desire to continue preschool or	15	JJ <
earlier enrollment in private school.	7	57*
Group 8 Cost	¢	•
1		·
Cost.		
	%	1

includes only reasons mentioned in 5 percent or more of the responses.

^{*} p 🗸 .05

APPENDIX E Reasons for MCPS Withdrawal

By Percentage Church 1 Church 2-12 Nonchurch Group 1 Religion in general. 43 17 Group 2 Parental Values Tradition in family to attend private/public school. 13 3 8 Wanted Wigher moral and ethical standards. 6 11 Group 3: Discipline Discipline in general. 29 29 18 Inadequate supervision provided by school system and/or staff. 11 Group 4: School/Staff Interpersonal Teachers poor attitude. 13 16** Teachers nonprofessional. behavior and actions. 6 10 Poor relations/communication. 19. 21 with school staff. School administration & policies. 11 ~ Group 5: Program Better educational quality in public/plivate school. 13 Wanted more academics, higher academic standards. 11 tack of college preparatory or curriculum. 10 3 16* tack of structure. 14 5* Need for tutoring/extra help 21** for special problems. 1 Improper placement into classes groups; misdiagnosis of 5 14** problems. More individualization, 41** personal attention desired. 13 24 Pupil tēācher rātio; cļašš size more favorable. 22 43** Group 6: Child-relat/ed Child not living up /to potential; underachieving. 13 22** Child's academic needs not hēing met. 10 29** Child's preference.

Group 7: - Convenience

Group 8: Cost

63

2*

E-1





APPENDIX F

To further explore the finding that parents failed to mention desegregation activities or bussing as a major reason for transferring, a correlation was run between minority percentage in each school and the percentage of white students transferring. The analyses generally supported the inference from the parental responses that the racial makeup of the student body was not a critical factor. Appendix F-1 shows that only at the elementary level is there a statistically significant relationship between percentage minority enrollment and percentage of white students transferring. Further these correlations are generally low (although statistically significant) indicating that race by itself does not explain the observed findings to any great extent. The data displayed in Appendix F-2 confirm this. Among the schools with the highest percentages of white students transferring to private schools are schools with both high and low minority enrollments.



APPENDIX F-1

Correlation Between Minority Enrollment and Percentage of White Students Transferring to Private Schools

	All Minorities	Asians	Black	Hispanic
Elementary	.29**	.06	/ ;23*≠	.32**
Junior	.07	.37*	02	:16
Senior	≔. 26	05	32	03
	L. L.			

^{*} P (.05 **P (.01

APPENDIX F-2

Schools with the Highest and Lowest Percentages of White Students Transferring to Private School

Schools with the highest percentage of white students transferring to private schools

Schools with the lowest percentage of white students transferring to private schools

School	% Minority	% of Whites Transferring	<u>School</u>	% Minority	% of Whites Transfer ing
A	24.2	7.33	H	53.1	0.00
В	76.4	11.11	I	32.0	0.46
C	17.2	7.20	J	11.0	0.17
D.	37.2	7.51	K	15.8	0.56
Ε	15.0	9.30	L	1.9	0.27
F	17.6	7.83	М	15.0	0.73
Ğ	58.9	8.14		•	
		:			

Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From MCPS Regarding Public and Private Schools N=277

Satisfaction Items	Public to Private Sample		
	Public	Private	
	PE	RCENTAGE	
Student Achievement	51.1	07 54	
Student School Satisfaction	53.1	97.5*	
.ceptance of Other Students	78.0	97.5 *	
Claruptive Classroom Behavior	45.0	94.2*	
Isruptive School Behavior	46.9	96.4*	
busive Language	43.0	95.3*	
Crime and Vandalism		89.2*	
Drug Abuse	54.9	88.4*	
Intimidation and Victimization	44.0	70.8*	
Unexcused Absences	56.3	88.1*	
Individualization	61.0	81.2*	
Staff Acad the Quelifications	41.9	96.0*	
Staff Enthus asm	75.1	93 . 5*	
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	65.1	97.5*	
Teacher Turnover 3 Substitutes	64.4	97.8*	
Student-Teacher Ratio	70.4	84:1*	
Student Promotion Policy	47.3	93:1₹ 、	
Staff Challenge of Students To Do Best	40.8	68.2*	
Amount of Homework	40.1	96.8*	
Follow-up on Assigned Work	40.3	95.3*	
Opportunity To Repeat Grades	47.5	96.8*	
in Different Settings	3 1 .0	38.3*	
Appropriate Books and Materials	76.2	96.8*	
Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	40.8	40.4*	
leaching Average Students	60.1	90.6*	
Teaching Above Average Gifted Students	49.5	72.9*	
Curriculum Structure	59.9	90.6*	
Elementary Level Basic Skills	52.9	83.5*	
Secondary Level Academic Skills	24.1	50.0 *	
Work-Study Skills	37.8	95.0*	
College Preparatory Courses	16.5	36.3*	
Values	40.1	94.2*	
Moral and Ethical Standards	45.8	95.7*	
Religious Education	30.9		
Human Growth and Development	65.3	91∓0* 88÷i∓	
Attention to Parental Concerns	58.1	97.8 *	
Contacting Parents About Student Problems	57.6		
Attitude and Cooperation	67.5	95.0*	
Aesthetic Appearance of Facility and Grounds	88.1	98.6*	
School Maintenance and Cleanliness		95.3*	
Number of School Days	86.7	96.4*	
School Distance from Home	86.6	95.3**	
School Schedule Convenience	94.2	61.7**	
	92.1	92.1	

This is the sample size for the total sample transferring from MCPS to private schools. For each item, however, sample sizes differed, depending on the number of missing responses for each item.

"Many respondents had no opinion in these areas:



Percentage Satisfied or Very Satisfied

Satisfaction Items	Church i N=56	Church 2-12 N=120	Nonchurch	
Student Achievement			<u>~</u>	
Student School Satisfaction	74	47	35**	
Acceptance of Other Students	71	48	43**	
Disruptive Classroom Behavior	91 67	<u>72</u>	76**	
Disruptive School Behavior	64	3 <u>8</u>	38**	
Abusive Language	59	40	49*	
Crime and Vandalism	54	40	<u>37</u>	
Drug Abuse	60	55	48*	
Intimidation and Victimization	39	45	48**	
Unexcused Absences	56 73	58	52**	
Individualization	47	67	62	
Staff Academic Qualifications	61	41	22**	
Staff Enthusiasm	81 .	77	65*	
Caff (amak and constitution	83	64	48**	
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	83	63	46**	
Teacher Turnover and Substitutes Student-Teacher Ratio	79 63	68	67**	
Student Promotion Policy	63	52	19**	
	36	44	40**	
Staff Challenge of Students To Do Best Amount of Homework	53	41	22**	
Follow-up on Assigned Work	39	44	32**	
Opportunity To Repeat Grades	51	52	32*	
in Different Settings				
Appropriate Books and Materials	<u>27</u>	39	18*	
Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	77	76 * 2	73	
Teaching Average Students	44	43	32**	
Teaching Above Average Gifted Students	70	62	46**	
Curriculum Structure	51 52	50	46*	
Elementary Level Basic Skills	54	63	59*	
Secondary Level Academic Skills	53 13	52 '	54 20-	
Work-Study Skills	13	26	33*	
College Preparatory Courses	40	39	31**	
Values	4	21	21**	
Moral and Ethical Standards	<u>47</u>	39	35**	
Religious Education	53 27	<u>41</u>	49	
Human Growth and Development	+ =	28	43**	
Attention to Parental Concerns	67 70	68	57*	
Contacting Parents About Student Problems	70 71	59 28 .	41**	
Attitude and Cocteration	7 t	58 '	40 **	
Aesthetic Appearance of Facility & Grounds	73	72	52**	
	90	90	81 .	
School Maintena e and Cleanliness	86	89	83 .	
Number of School Days	89	88	.81	
School Distance from Home	94	92	98	
School Schedule Convenience	۵ ۸	94	9 i	

This is the sample sizes for the total sample transferring from MCPS to private schools. For each item, however, sample sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

"Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.



75

Attitudes Regarding Private Schools of Parents With rawing Their Child From MCPS

	Percentage Satisfied or Very Satisfied			
Satisfaction Items	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch	
Student Achievement	, , ,			
Student School Satisfaction	' 97 5m	97	98	
Acceptance of Other Students	97	97	98	
Districtive Circums Patron	98	94	91	
Disruptive Classroom Behavior Disruptive School Behavior	<u> 25</u>	99	91*	
Abusive Language	93	98	92	
Crime and Vandalism	91	91	81	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	83	92	86	
Drug Abuse	6Ô	73	<u>78</u>	
Intimidation and Victimization	84	90	87	
Unexcused Absences	70	. 87	81*	
Individualization	93	96	100	
Staff Academic Qualifications	97	. 92	94	
Staff Enthusiasm	99	<i>j</i> :96	98	
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	96	(98	100	
Teacher Turn-over and Substitutes	87	∌ 85	79	
Student-Teacher Ratio	83	95	100	
Student Promotion Policy	63	73	65.	
Staff Challange of Students To Do Best	93	97	100	
Amount of Homework	90	97	297*	
Follow-up ca Assigned Work	94	97	98	
Opportunity To Repeat Grades		•	•	
in Different Settings ²	36	4 i	35	
Sppropriate Books and Materials	99	95	98	
Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	40	43	. 3 5	
Teaching Average Students	96	92	- 81*	
Teaching Above Average Gifted Students	67	71	83	
Corriculum Structure	87	92	92	
Hementary Level Basic Skills Secondary Level Academic Skills	97	79	79**	
ork-Study Skills	26	55	65**	
College Preparatory Courses	90	97	95*_	
alues	16	38	54**	
oral and Ethical Standards	97	98	83**	
eligious Education	100	97	89**	
uman Growth and Development	100	<u>97</u>	67**	
ttention to Parental Concerns	87	88	87	
ontacting Parents About Student Problems	99	98	<u>97</u>	
ttitude and Cooperation	97	94	95	
esthetic Appearance of Facility & Grounds	100	97 3 -	100	
chool Maintenance and Cleanliness	9 1	97	97	
umber of School Days	93	97	98	
chool Distance from Home	91	96	98	
chool Schedule Convenience	63	6 <u>1</u>	62	
- Conventence	91	94	89	

Sample Sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.

^{* 2 (.05}

APPENDIX H-1

Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Public School

By Percentage

	Church 2-12		Nonchurch
Group 1: Religion	ì	8	•
Group_2: Parental Values			9
Public school experiences were good. Parents always expected to send to	6		11
public school.	7		19
Parents felt there was a high quality education available in MCPS.	14	ζ,	
Group 3: Discipline	,		
Group 4: School Staff		,	• •
MCPS staff had good reputation.	9		31**
Group 5: Program			
Group 6: Child-related	•		
Group 7: Convenience			
Friends went to the neighborhood school Private school had no kindergarten.	. 39 . 26		36 8
Group 8: Cost			ā.
Cost	26		1 9 °

¹Includes only those responses mentioned 5 percent or more.

^{**}P <.01

APPENDIX H-2

Reasons for Initial Enrollment in Private School

By Percentage

	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch
Group 1: Religion			 -
Parents wanted religious background.	27	60	2**
Group 2: Parental Value			
Family tradition to go to a private school. Better education available in	0	10	2
private school. Parents wanted to stay in own	7	ŧί	6
school system/language. High quality education available in	; Ö	- 5	6
private school.	.n 40	24 -	14
Group 3: Discipline			
Better discipline, stricter controls available.	13	20	0**
Group 4: School Staff			•
Group 5: Program			
More caring atmosphere. Montessori education desired. Preschool program available. Smaller class size available. Individualization available.	7 7 7 0 13	4 0 0 12 11	11 11* 13** 19
Group 6: Child-related		•	
Group 7: Convenience			
Location or convenience; bus transportation provided. Frivate kindergarten program	13	7	14
_ preferred. Full day kindergarten or longer	13	4	5
school day available. Desire to continue preschool or earlier enrollment in	27	3	41**
private school.	13	7	14

Group 8: Cost

Includes only those responses mentioned 5 percent or more.

^{*} p < .05 **2 < .01

APPENDIC I

. 77

Reasons for Private School Withdrawal

By Percentage

	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch
Group 1: Religion		\$ - **	
Group 2: Parental Values			
Reputation; good reports.	6	8	1*
Group 3: Discipline			
Group_4: School/Staff Interpersor	<u>nāl</u>	4	
Preferred particular public school or staff.	19		13*
Group 3: Program			
Preferred the environment of the public school. Lack of college preparatory or	6	6	. yii
enriched curriculum in private school.	0	13	10
Needed tutoring/extra help for special problems. Individualization, personal	6	10	8
attention desired.	6	8	9
Group 6: Child-related			ø
Child unhappy or depressed. Child not living up to potential; underachieving. Child's academic needs not taing'me Academic or personal needs were me Child's preferred to transfer.	0 0 et: 0 t. 0	8 10 10 6 12	5 6 4 13 6
Group 7: Convenience	· .	- 	ŭ
School had a good location; close to home. Transportation available. Child desired to be with friends. Family moved. A good time to switch.	13 25 19 13 13	12 12 17 8 9	21 5* 20 5 25**
Group 8: Cost			
Cost.	4 56	39	37
			·

¹ Includes only those responses mentioned 5 percent or more.

^{.05} .0:

Satisfaction Items Perceitage Satisfied or Ve Satisfied Public Private PERCENTAGE Student Achievement 78.8 84:5 Student School Sat: . action 88.7 77.7** Acceptance of Other Students 92.6 89.7 Distuptive Classroom Behavior 69:1 85.5** Disruptive School Behavior 68.1 86.2** Abusive Language 55.7 81.6** Crime and Vandalism 62.4 86.2** Drug Abuse 60.3 78.4** Intimidation and Victimization 71.6 85.5** Unexcused Absences 81.4 88.9** Individualization 77.0 74.5 Staff Academic Qualifications 77.3 81.9** Staff Enthusiasm 86.2 84.0** Staff Warmth and Sensitivity 85.5 81.6** Teacher Turnover and Substitutes 64.4 77.9** Student-Teacher Ratio 66.0 87.2** Student Promotion Policy 67.9 78.9** Staff Challenge of Students To Do Best 75.6 79.9 Amount of Homework 69.6 72.1** Follow-up on Assigned Work 75.4 80.4 Opportunity To Repeat Grades

51.3

88:3

64.5

85.1

75.4

83.9

75.1

42.9

68.2

38.6

67:9

67.1

41.8

74.6

82.6

76.5

88.6

90.4

91.5

88.6

98.6

92.5

48.2**

84.8

35.8**

85.1

74:1*

80.8

82.9%

40.9

37.0

82.93%

88.3**

92.9**

78.4∺*

77.2**

79.8*

80.9**

86.2

91.1

90.1

64.5**

81.9**

82:2

Sample Sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each

Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.

in Different Settings

Teaching Average Students

Elementary Level Basic Skills

College Preparatory Courses

Moral and Ethical Standards

Human Growth and Development

Attitude and Cooperation

School Distance from Home

School Schedule Convenience

Number of School Days

Attention to Parental Concerns

School Maintenance and Cleanliness

Secondary Level Academic Skills

Curriculum Structure

Work-Study Skills

Religious Education

Values

Appropriate Books and Materials

Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student²

Teaching Above Average Gifted Students

Contacting Parents About Student Problems

Aesthetic Appearance of Facility and Grounds

Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child F om Private School Regarding Public Schools N=281

Percentage Satisfied or Vary Satisfied

	or vary Satisfied			
Satisfaction Items	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch	
calded the second				
Student Achievement	6 9	75	87	
Student School Satisfaction	81	87		
Acceptance of Other Students	94	90	92	
Disruptive Classroom Rehautor	81	50 61	96	
Disruptive School Rehavior	88		80**	
Abusive Danguage	6 <u>9</u>	6 0	79**	
Crime and Vandalism	69	44	73**	
Drug Abuse		56	<u>72</u>	
Intimidation and Victimization	69	56	66	
Unexcused Absences	81	<u>67</u>	78	
Individualization	94	8 <u>1</u>	81	
Staff Academic Qualifications	<u>8</u> 8	7 7	77	
Staff Enthusiasm	88	74 .	81	
Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	94	85	87	
Teacher Turnover and Substitutes	<u>87</u>	85	87	
Student-Teacher Ratio	81	62	67	
Student Peacher Natio	୧୫	71	56**	
Student Promotion Policy	7.5	68	67	
Staff Challenge of Students To Do Best	88	73	79	
modific of nomework	. 56	70 .	70*	
Tollow-up on Assigned Work	63	72	82*	
pportunity To Repeat Grades			02	
in Different Settings ²	69	53	47	
ppropriate Books and Materials	94	90	85	
eaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	88	66	59*	
eaching average Students	94	888	86	
eaching Above Average Gifted Students	81	7 <u>3</u>		
arriculum Stiucture	88	<u>8</u> 5	78 51	
lementary Level Basic Skills	. 88	74	8±	
acondary Level Academic Skills	19	7. 4 54	76	
ork-Study Skills	88		27**	
ollege Preparatory Courses	13	64	72	
ilues	72	50 57	25**	
oral and Ethical Standards	86 86	64	72**	
eligious Education 🧳		50	75★★	
man Growth and Development	31 - 94	34	56**	
tention to Parental Concerns	4.4.4	74	72	
ntacting Parents About Student Problems	81	82	84*	
titude and Cooperation	81	77	76	
sthetic Appearance of Facility & Crounds	4 6 9	87	93**	
noor maintenance and leanliness	88 .	89	93	
mber of Schoo! Days	88	89	96	
hool Distance from Home	. 94	88	89	
nool Schedule Convenience	99	98	100	
	88 .	94	91	

This is the total sample size. Sample sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.

^{*} P < :05 **P < :01

APPENDIX J=3

Attitudes of Parents Withdrawing Their Child From Private School Regarding Private Schools N=281

			Percentage Satisfied or Very Satisfied		
,	Satisfaction Items	Church 1	Church 2-12	Nonchurch	
			<u> </u>	·	
	Student Achievement	100	81	an .	
	Student School Satisfaction	94	75	89 80	
	Acceptance of Other Students	100	8 9	88 88	
	Disruptive Classroom Behavior	94	85 85		
	Disruptive School Behavior	94 94	87 :	85 85	
	Abusive Language	94	83	83	
	Crime and Vandalism	100		78	
	Drug Abuse	81	85 83	86	
	Intimidation and Victimization	88	82	72	
•	Unexcused Absences		87	82	
	Individualization	94 87	88	89	
	Staff Academic Qualifications	94	68	82**	
	Staff Enthusiasm	100	77	86 ;	
	Staff Warmth and Sensitivity	94	79	90	
	Teacher Turnover and Substitutes	87	77	87**	
	Student-Teacher Ratio	94	80	73	
		88	84	93	
	Student Promotion Policy	94	77	79**	
	Staff Challenge of Students To Do Best	94	74	88**	
	Amount of Homework	. 81	74	67**	
	llow-up on Assigned Work	88	80	80 * *	
	portunity To Repeat Grades				
	in Different Settings ²	63	44	47	
1	Appropriate Books and Materials	100	82	·87** /	
Į	Teaching Below Average, Handicapped Student	63 -	29	42**	
, ~	Teaching Average Students	<u>.</u> 100	85	83 /	
	Teaching Above Average Gifted Students	81	71	79	
	Curriculum Structure	88	81	* 80★	
	Elementary Level Basic Skills	94	82	84	
	Secondary Level Academic Skills	19	49	31**	
	Work-Study Skills	100	81	84	
	College Preparatory Courses	` 25	46	26**	
	Values	100	90	85	
	Moral and Ethical Standards	94	95	∕ 89∓ ∓	
	Religious Education	81 \	92	57**	
	Human Growth and Development	94	83	80 4	
	Attention to Parental Concerns	94	71	86**	
٠, (Contacting Parents About Student Problems	94 ,	75/	86*	
	Attitude and Cooperation	94	7.7 7.7		
ā	Aesthetic Appearance of Facility & Grounds	94	85 .	85 87	
	School Maintenance and Cleanliness	94	1	87	
3	Number of School Days	94 88	91	90	
	School Distance from Home		93 🖟	87	
5	School Schedule Convenience	56	65	64	
		88	82	81	
	•				

Sample sizes differed, depending on number of missing responses for each item.

Many respondents had no opinion in these areas.

