DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 950 EA 020 650

AUTHOR Bauch, Patricia A.
TITLE Family Choice and Parental Involvement in Inner-City Catholic High Schools: An Exploration of Psycho-Social and Organizational Factors.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Catholic Schools; Economically Disadvantaged; Family Characteristics; High Risk Students; High Schools; *Inner City; Parent Background; Parent Influence; *Parent Participation; Parent Role; *Parent School Relationship; Parent Teacher Conferences; *Participative Decision Making; *School Choice; School Involvement; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

In this study, the degree of parent involvement--as measured by the amount of their participation in school-related activities, communication with teachers, and school decision-making--is examined for 1,070 parents whose at-risk children attend five innercity Catholic high schools. The variables of parents' education, religion, marital status, and reasons for school choice were associated with their degree of involvement. This research provides insights into how family choice and parental involvement mechanisms operate for "at-risk" youth in innercity Catholic high schools. While parent characteristics, especially level of education, influence parent communication with teachers, the willingness of school administrators to permit and encourage parental input in decision-making processes appears to strengthen parent involvement. Tables and a list of references are provided. (JAM)

FAMILY CHOICE AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN INNER-CITY CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS: AN EXPLORATION OF PSYCHO-SOCIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

by

Patricia A. Bauch

The Catholic University of America
Department of Education
The Study of Youth Development
Washington, DC 20064

Revision of paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April 1987. The author wishes to thank John J. Convey, Thomas W. Small, and Sally M. Flanzer for their assistance in the preparation and revision of this paper. (11/30/88)

ABSTRACT

The idea that parent involvement influences attitudes and promotes achievement is receiving widespread attention particularly in the wake of school reform. Despite its importance, parent involvement research is fragmented and lacks preciseness. Little is known about the kinds of participation activities in which parents engage. Correlational studies are disconnected from the everyday realities of home-school interaction which vary from school to school. In addition, status attainment variables are overemphasized while family process and school organizational factors are frequently neglected. In this paper, the association of parent characteristics including education, religion, marital status and reasons for school choice with parent involvement (as measured by three dimensions: participation in school-related activities, communication with teachers, and involvement in school decision making) is examined for 1070 parents in the context of five inner-city Catholic high schools. While parent characteristics, especially level of education, influences parent communication with teachers, school organizational factors appear to strengthen parent involvement within schools. This research provides insights into how family choice and parent involvement mechanisims operate for "at risk" youth in inner-city Catholic high schools.

Family Choice and Parent Involvement in Inner-city Catholic High Schools: An Exploration of Parent Psycho-Social and School Organizational Factors

INTRODUCTION

A large body of research suggests that parent involvement can influence attitudes and promote achievement (Bauch, 1985; Epstein, 1986; Henderson, 1981; Kagan, 1984). The form of parent involvement does not seem critical as long as it is well-planned, comprehensive, and long-lasting. Programs that include parent participation in school learning activities at home, parents' communicating with teachers about their children's school progress, and parents assuming supervisory and other roles at school seem to accelerate achievement gains, especially in young children (e.g. Becker & Epstein, 1982; Clark, 1983; Comer, 1980; Leichter, 1974; Litwak & Meyer, 1974; Marjoribanks, 1980). Furthermore, school reform reports emphasize parent involvement as a necessary component of school effectiveness (e.g., Alexander, 1986).

Parent involvement research, however, is fragmented and disconnected from the everyday realities of families and communities working together in the context of a specific school setting for the benefit of children. Most lack an ecological perspective which recognizes that parent involvement is a plastic process that is unique from school to school (Kagan, 1984). What might appear to be a high level of involvement at one site may be low in another. Furthermore, correlational studies of school-based parent involvement have not been sufficiently precise to determine the necessary conditions under which attitudes and achievement are influenced, particularly for older children and adolescents.

At a time when there is widespread concern for the achievement of lower-

income and minority students, recent reports have drawn the public's attention to Catholic schools where minority youth achieve at a higher rate than those in public schools (e.g., Coleman & Hoffer, 1987; Coleman, Hoffer & Kilgore, 1982; Greeley, 1982). Parent involvement is cited as a factor in Catholic school achievement (Cibulka, O'Brien, & Zewe, 1982; Good & Hinkel, 1985; Vitullo-Martin & Vitullo-Martin, 1973) suggesting the possibility that such involvement may mitigate the effects of socioeconomic characteristics. Clark (1983) argues that home factors such as the value parents place on education and their reinforcing at-home behaviors are more important than socioeconomic status. In contrast, it is widely accepted in the status attainment literature that parents' backgrounds play a significant role in school achievement (e.g., Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfeld, & York, 1966; Jencks, Smith, Acland, Bane, Cohen, Gintis, Heyns, & Michelson, 1972; Sewell & Hauser, 1976). However, this body of literature focuses primarily on a few demographic variables neglecting family process variables (Epstein, 1986). Consequently, little is known about how parent psycho-social characteristics and school organizational factors interact to affect parent involvement.

This study examines the assumption that different levels and kinds of parent involvement are related to parent characteristics, specifically education, religion, church participation, family structure, and parents' reasons for choosing a private school. It compares parent's involvement in a variety of school-related activities for over 1,000 parents within five inner- city Catholic secondary schools. Although school's differ with regard to parent socioeconomic background factors, the study is not as concerned about across school variations in parental involvement as it is with within

school comparisons related to the frequency and kinds of activities in which parents participate in these low-income-serving Catholic schools. Neither is it concerned with comparing student outcomes with parent involvement; rather, it seeks to explore the phenomena of parent involvement in schools that are thought to be effective for "at risk" students and to provide insights into how parent involvement mechanisms operate in inner-city Catholic high schools for these students.

CHOICE, VOICE, AND RESPONSIVENESS: TWO PERSPECTIVES

In examining parent involvement in private schools, it is necessary to indicate how these schools differ from public ones since some elements of school organization unique to private schools may contribute to parent participation. However, these same elements also could inhibit parent involvement. At the very least, private schools differ from most public schools regarding family choice, some forms of school organization and governance (e.g., size, principal autonomy, gender composition), and community membership, especially church-affiliation. These unique private school elements and their influence on parent involvement are examined below.

Choice as a Facilitator of Parent Involvement

Family choice enables parents to designate the school their child will attend. It motivates parents to take greater responsibility for their children's education and become more involved (Alexander, 1986; Quie, 1987). Parents usually feel a greater affiliation with the school if its focus (i.e., academic, comprehensive, or vocational) is one they approve. For this reason, an increasing number of public school systems are creating differentiated school formats. Specialty and magnet schools, for example, offer parents attendance options for their children.

As a result of family choice, parents may be more demanding of school officials in requiring high standards of academic achievement and discipline (Cibulka, O'Brien, & Zewe 1982). In private schools, parents not only choose the school, but pay tuition as well. In their study of inner-city private elementary schools, Cibulka and his colleagues conjecture that perceived school responsiveness to parents' demands may be due, in part, to the less bureaucratic organizational structure of private schools compared to public schools thus attracting motivated and active parents.

While parents can be more demanding, schools in turn can be more demanding of parents. It would seem that private schools do have greater organizational advantages than public schools in seeking parental involvement and in giving parents a voice. Principals enjoy greater autonomy facilitative of policy and decision making related to involving parents and being responsive to their demands. Private schools are smaller in size thus facilitating familiarity that enhances parent involvement. They have a less rigid hierarchical structure attractive to parents who have predisposition toward being involved. Such characteristics permit schools to place great demands on parents. They can be selective in their admissions process as well as in deciding which students to continue to enroll from year to year (Chubb & Moe, 1986). At the same time, they indirectly exert pressure on parents to continue to "perform", thus assuring a clientele that meets the school's expectations for involvement.

Parents choose private schools for a variety of reasons, including religious as well as academic ones. Religious reasons could be especially facilitative of parent involvement. Coleman and Hoffer (1987) view private schools, especially Catholic schools, as functional communities in which

individual families benefit from cultural resources found in the social cohesion of school families who belong to a common religious group. Thus, by choosing a religious school, parents have an opportunity to obtain valuable resources to assist them in their child-rearing tasks.

This community membership perspective advanced by Coleman and Hoffer (1987) views the Catholic school as the agent of the religious community of which the family is a part, rather than as an agent of the state. Responsiveness extends to include the Church as well as the school. Within this membership group, families interact beyond school events to include church and other community activities. Such interactions provide connections that bind the child and the parents to the school as well as to the larger religious community. These connections are found in the sharing of common religious values and social exchanges that occur as a part of religious worship. Parents who choose religious schools, especially for discipline and religious reasons, could be expected to be more involved than those who choose the school primarily for a academic reasons because of value system compatibility between home and school.

As an extension of parent involvement, then, church participation could ben an important factor in enhancing community membership. If so, in Catholic schools this could be expected more frequently for Catholic parents than nonCatholic ones and more for Catholic single parents than Catholic two-parent families particularly in light of the community support function attributed to Catholic schools by Coleman and Hoffer (1987). Consequently, greater church involvement by "religious" Catholic single-parent families, that is, those who choose the school primarily for discipline and religious values reasons, could provide empirical support for the Coleman and Hoffer

thesis and help explain parent involvement in these schools.

Conflicting arguments, however, can be put forth concerning choice, school organizational structures, and community membership in regard to parent involvement in private schools.

Choice as an Inhibiter of Parent Involvement

Choice may function in a way that discourages parent involvement. Parents differ in their attitudes toward involvement and in the amount of time they give to their children's schooling and school life. They may choose a private school because they want to compensate for this lack of time or may feel their child is better cared for at a private than at a public school. In addition, they may believe that responsibility for the child's education is best left to the school. This belief could be stronger in private than in public schools especially in church-related schools where religion and values are a part of the curriculum and where parents choose the school with these values in mind. Parents may view the school as taking on a greater share of parental responsibility for the child's development. This may serve as a rationale for less involvement. Thus, giving parents responsibility for school choice may not in itself result in more extensive parent involvement.

Similarly, although private school organizational factors may facilitate parent involvement, a particular school's educational philosophy and goals may inhibit parent participation. Parents may not exercise voice under a particular school philosophy. In a study of private elementary schools including elite, church-related, and independent schools, Slaughter and Schneider (1986) found that parents' educational goals and those of the individual school chosen were related to parental involvement. Parent

involvement and school goals took on different patterns at each school from that of quite separate roles to highly interactive relationships between parents and the school. It appeared that parents were attracted to a particular private school based on their own philosophy of education and the perceived philosophy of the school which included a tacit agreement concerning how and to what degree parents were involved. Subsequently, the press for parent involvement and opportunities for involvement may be absent in a particular school through its educational philosophy, lack of commitment to involving parents or for other reasons. Even schools sharing similar educational goals may differ in their efforts to facilitate parent involvement. Thus, a school's favorable organizational characteristics alone are not sufficient for assuring parent involvement. Private schools need to capitalize on their unique organizational advantages.

Lastly, many who choose Catholic schools are not themselves Catholic although they may be active within their own denominations suggesting value compatibility with Christian religions. Denominational incompatibility may act as a deterrent to the formation of functional communities thereby reducing social integration (Coleman and Hoffer, 1987). Contrariwise, denominational compatibility may not aid in the development of functional communities if Catholics in Catholic schools are not church-going.

Parent involvement and social integration could be based on other than a religious value system. Parent level of educational attainment and income may be indicators of shared social class values. Parents have various reasons other than religious values for choosing a Catholic school. In addition to psycho-social characteristics as ethnicity, education, and family structure, there are other characteristics that may mitigate denominational

incompatibility between home and school in explaining parent involvement in Catholic schools.

In an earlier study, Bauch and Small (1986) found that academic reasons were given most frequently for choosing a Catholic inner-city high school, not religious values. Parents' level of educational attainment and ethnicity were highly correlated with academic reasons for choosing a school. Middle and upper-income blacks, more than whites, chose these schools primarily for academic reasons. Thus, shared values other than those based on a common religious denomination such as a school's academic focus may exert a stronger influence on parent involvement. This relationship might be explored productively by considering the commonality of parents' educational level as well as their denominational compatibility with the school when examining parents' reasons for school choice and their involvement in school-related activities.

Parents' level of education plays an important role in school achievement (e.g., Coleman, et al, 1966; Jencks, et al, 1972; Sewell & Hauser, 1976). It also reflects social class values (Kohn, 1969). Therefore, it apparently contributes significantly to parental involvement. Highly-educated parents may be more familiar with the process and content of schooling, have greater information resources at their disposal, and feel more at ease in relating to school personnel (Bridge, 1978).

In summary, parent involvement in Catholic high schools may be uneven in spite of parents' exercise of choice in sending their child, the organizational advantages enjoyed by Catholic schools that are presumed favorable toward involving parents, and community membership based on common values that extends beyond the school and provides a context for social

cohesion. Even when parent involvement is frequent, the content and the form may differ based on parents' characteristics.

How parent characteristics and school organizational factors interact to influence parent involvement is not clear, especially for middle and lower-income minority parents who send their children to inner-city Catholic high schools. Many parents are newcomers to private education, are not Catholic, (Schneider, 1987) and feel shy about participating in an institution they may not understand (Lightfoot, 1981). In addition, high schools differ from elementary schools in that parent participation may be more difficult in light of the newly developing autonomy and independence of teenagers. This discourages some parents from participating in school activities, especially when schools do not encourage parental participation.

Few studies have been conducted on parent involvement at the high school level although numerous studies have been made of parent involvement in elementary and junior high schools. It is not known whether Catholic inner-city high schools play effective roles in involving lower-income, inner-city parents in school life expected of private schools. Neither are the characteristics of parents who are most likely to be involved in these schools known.

In light of the divergent positions and theoretical perspectives discussed above, the following research questions emerged:

1. In what kinds of school-related activities are parents most frequently involved in inner-city Catholic high schools? How many parents actually participate in these activities? To what extent do parents take on a variety of parent involvement roles?

2. How do parents' level of educational attainment, reasons for choosing

the school, and the individual school chosen affect the degree and kind of parent involvement?

3. Is frequency of school participation related to church participation for families of different marital and religious backgrounds? How does the school participation of "religious" parents, that is, those who choose the school primarily for religious reasons, and single-parent Catholic families affect church participation?

In this study, parent involvement is defined as a typology having three dimensions: a) parent participation in school-related activities and taking on supervisory, governance and other roles, b) parents' providing advice or helping make decisions regarding school policy; and c) parent communication with teachers. Parents' reasons for school choice is represented as a typology having four dimensions: a) academic/curriculum, b) discipline, c) religion and values, and d) noneducational reasons such as safety and transportation. These dimensions are explained in the methodology section.

METHODOLOGY

The sample consists of five schools located in different metropolitan areas across the country (Table 1). They vary in size and other organizational factors. Some are owned and operated by religious orders, others by diocesan officials. Tuition ranged from $925 to $1,500 per year for 1985. College-admission rates vary among the schools from 55% to 98% of the graduating classes. The schools have strong ethnic representations and vary in gender composition. These schools were selected to be representative of inner-city Catholic high schools in general.

For purposes of identification, the schools are referred to by their predominant ethnic-gender group. The white working-class boys' and the low-

income Hispanic girls' schools have the highest proportions of low-income and Catholic students. These two "lower-income Catholic" schools stand somewhat in contrast to the three predominantly Black schools which serve a smaller proportion of families from lower-income and Catholic backgrounds.

(Table 1 about here)

The schools are part of an on-going study that began as a corollary to the National Catholic Educational Association's investigation of the impact of Catholic secondary schools on lower-income students (Benson, Yeager, Wood, Guerra, & Manno, 1986). The schools were selected from 106 low-income-serving (LIS) ones identified as particularly "effective", according to teacher reports, in serving the needs of lower-income students. They enroll a minimum of 20% of students from families below the federal poverty level ($10,000 in 1985 for a family of four). In Spring 1985, several university researchers, directed by the author, spent approximately two weeks in the schools collecting survey data, conducting interviews, and engaging in participant observation. One thousand seventy parents returned useable surveys, a response rate of 63%. The field researchers prepared extensive case study descriptions for each school (Bauch, Blum, Taylor, & Valli, 1985).

Goodlad's (1984) survey of public school parents' knowledge, perceptions, and satisfaction concerning the school and its curriculum, and parent involvement served as the basis for most of the questionnaire items. The items used to measure parents' goals were taken from an earlier National Catholic Educational Association survey of Catholic secondary school principals' and teachers' school goals (Yeager, Benson, Guerra, & Manno, 1985). Based on a review of the literature, additional items were added by

the research team to determine parents' reasons for choosing a Catholic high school, family structure, religion, and church participation.

Parent involvement items were collapsed to represent two dimensions of involvement: parent participation in school-related activities, and parent involvement in school decision making. A third dimension, parents' communication with teachers, is represented by a single item (Table 2). The reliability coefficients for parent participation and decision making were .97 and .91, respectively.

(Table 2 about here)

In conducting the analyses, parent involvement was measured in three ways in order to address the first research question: 1) frequency or rate of parent involvement in different kinds of school-related activities (activity focus); 2) total number of parents involved in a given dimension (parent focus); and 3) total number of parents involved in a specific category, subdimension or parent involvement role within the participation and decision making dimensions (role focus).

First, the frequency or rate of parent involvement in different kinds of activities (activity focus) was measured by determining whether (yes, no) parent involvement included any of the items representing the five different types or subdimensions of participation (i.e., helpers, homework monitors, attenders, board members, and teacher or teacher aides), or six areas of decision making (i.e., curriculum, finances, personnel, school policy, school goals, and home-school relations). Parents could select multiple responses within a similar category or subdimension. For example, if parents indicated they acted as helpers in all three ways listed in the questionnaire, a score of "3" was coded for helpers to represent three ways or kinds of helping

although only one parent was involved. Next, frequency or rate of involvement for constructs represented by more than one item was obtained by summing all response opportunities and calculating the number of actual responses as a percentage of the total. Parents were not asked to report the number of times they participated in these activities.

For communication, frequency of activity is the number of times parents reported talking with teachers during the last year as indicated by the response format ("none", "1-2", 3-5", "6-10", "more than 10"). No effort was made to distinguish participation, decision making, or communication activities according to importance or amount of time required performing them.

Second, parent involvement was also measured by determining the actual number of parents involved (parent focus) in the activities comprising the three main dimensions--participation, decision making, and communication. This was an attempt to obtain some measure of intensity of involvement across the dimensions. Parents were designated as actively involved "participators", "decision makers", and "communicators" if they responded "yes" to three or more items representing the dimension or had three or more talks with teachers during a given year. Parents reporting "no" for all items in a dimension or who reported "yes" to only one or two items were classified as noninvolved for that dimension. For example, the dimension "participation" has 11 items or activities. Only parents reporting three or more activities or involvements were designated as active participators. The difference between the activity- focus measure and the parent-focus measure of parent involvement is that the former is a duplicated count of parent responses while the latter is an unduplicated count of respondents.

Third, to determine parent participation roles and areas of decision making in which parents most frequently participated, similar items were grouped to define specific categories or subdimensions, as described above (Table 2). These represent five different parent involvement roles. Parents were distinguished within the participation dimension as: helpers, homework monitors, attenders, board members, and teachers and teacher aides. Similarly, six decision areas were distinguished: curriculum, finances, personnel, school policy, school goals, and home-school relations. For these calculations, parents reporting involvement in at least one item for a particular category or subdimension within the participation and decision making dimensions (role focus) were designated as involved in the role designated by that category. For example, parents were assigned the role "helper" if they indicated one or more ways acting as helpers. Likewise, they were considered as offering the school advice in the area of "curriculum" if they indicated one or more of the six items comprising the curriculum decision-making category. Parents could then be designated as being active in one or more participation roles and decision-making areas. Thus, parents could be distinguished as highly (3 or more roles), moderately (1 or 2 roles) or not (0 roles) active in school-related activities by roles.

The role-focus measure is an aid in sharpening the focus on the kind of activities in which parents are involved by grouping similar ways of participating within a dimension, emphasizing the participation or decision-making categories or roles, and deemphasizing the actual number of different kinds of participations within the role. It differs from the activity-focus measure in which all participations were summed regardless of whether a response fell within a particular group of items or category in which parents

participated; and from the parent-focus measure in which each parents' participation was evaluated separately for each dimension, not category or role. For the parent-focus measure, parents were thus designated as "actively involved" in a specific dimension such as "participation" if they indicated involvement for three or more items within that dimension regardless of the number of different roles or categories represented by their responses.

Other variables examined to investigate the research questions include parents' primary reason for choosing the school, their level of educational attainment, family structure, religion, and frequency of church participation. The measurement of these variables is described below.

The reasons measure used in this study consists of the following four categories: academic and curriculum, discipline, religion and values, and noneducational reasons. Detailed explanations concerning the development of these measures can be found in an earlier paper by Bauch and Small (1986). Briefly, parents were asked to respond to several questions concerning their reasons for sending their child to a Catholic secondary school. In developing the constructs used in this study, parents' reasons are their most important or primary reason for choosing the school. Academic and curriculum reasons include college preparation, academic program offerings, and good teachers and teaching; discipline was a single response item; religion and values include religious instruction, shared value system with the school, and the school's openness to parents' ideas. Noneducational reasons include such items as safety, child's choice, transportation, location, and affordable tuition.

Parents' level of educational attainment was determined by asking the

respondents (76% of whom were mothers) to indicate on an 8-point scale the highest level of schooling completed. These were coded as follows: 1 = "completed eighth grade or less"; 2 = "had some high school"; 3 = "completed high school"; 4 = "completed technical, vocational, trade, or business school"; 5 = "had some college"; 6 = "graduated from a two-year college"; 7 = "graduated from a 4-year college or university"; 8 = "completed a post- graduate or professional degree". For the analyses, education was collapsed to represent three levels: 1 = "did not finish high school"; 2 = "graduated from high school, went to vocational school and had some college"; and 3 = "received a 2-year college degree or more".

Family structure was determined by asking for the number of parents of the child who lived in the home. For religion, parents were asked whether they were Catholic (yes, no). To determine church participation, both Catholic and nonCatholic parents were asked to select one of four response options to the question: "How frequently do you participate in church or other religious activities?" The four responses and their codes were: 1 = "weekly"; 2 = "monthly"; 3 = "a few times a year"; and 4 = "not at all". For the analyses, church participation was collapsed to represent two levels: "frequent participation" (1+2), and "infrequent participation" (3+4).

In order to analyze the first research question, distributional studies were conducted to determine the frequency or extent of parent activity (activity focus) in the three dimensions of parent involvement for the total group and by school -- participation, decision making, and communication; and the number of parents involved at different frequency rates in the categories examined (role focus).

In studying the second research question, three-way ANOVAS were

performed to determine the effect of the three independent variables, parents' educational level, primary reason for choosing the school, and the individual school chosen on the frequency of parent involvement (parent focus) for the three dimensions. This resulted from a 3 x 4 x 5 factorial design in which education was collapsed to represent three levels; and parents' primary reason for choosing the school was collapsed from 24 items into four constructs representing academic, discipline, religion and values, and other reasons (Bauch & Small, 1986). Each of the five schools was one level of the school variable. For purposes of measurement, "school" is a categorical designation for the set of parents at a particular school. It provides a convenient way of separating parents into subgroups for study and provides a basis for decisions and interpretations regarding the analyses.

Analyses were conducted to determine parents' mean educational levels and reasons for choosing the school in order to further examine the independent variables under investigation. In these studies, active or involved parents were compared to those not involved. As indicated above, to be classified as "active" or "high" parents needed to indicate three or more activities for participation, three or more topics of decision making, and three or more occasions in a given year of talks with teachers.

Distributional studies were employed in analyzing the third research question to determine how parents' reasons for choosing the school (i.e., religious vs. nonreligious reasons) and their frequency of school participation and communication were related to their frequency of church participation; also how this varied for Catholic single parents, Catholic two- parent families, nonCatholic single parents, and nonCatholic two-parent families. The purpose was to test the assumption that "religiously-

structured" Catholic schools (i.e., those serving approximately 80% or more Catholic families) are more likely to resemble functional communities since the vast majority of their members share religious compatibility with the school than those schools that are not religiously-oriented, especially for single-parent Catholic families who seem to have the greatest need for the additional social resources church participation provides.

RESULTS

Differences in Parents' Involvement in School-Related Activities

Frequency and kind of activities. In response to the first research question, Table 3 displays the results of the distributional studies indicating the most frequently reported activities by school (activity focus). For participation, the most frequently reported categories in which parents participate are as homework monitors (78.9%) and attending school meetings (76.7%). Parents less frequently act as school helpers (30%) and few serve as board members (12.4%) and as teachers or teacher aides (13.8%). The highest rates of overall parent participation are largely focused on activities related to student progress such as parents attending parent-teacher conferences and other parent meetings, and monitoring their children's homework. The higher-income nonCatholic Black schools appear to have a higher rate of parent participation than the other schools.

(Table 3 about here)

For decision making, there is a fairly low, even distribution of total group responses for each decision-making area. Again, the three higher-income nonCatholic Black schools appear to have more frequent parent involvement. Overall, parents reported that they most frequently offered their advice or help in the area of financial decisions (31.1%), particularly

fund-raising (not shown). Given the financial burdens under which most inner-city Catholic schools are presumed to operate (Guerra & Augenstein, 1986), it is surprising that this category, although it ranked highest, received fewer than one-third of all possible responses.

Separating parents into subgroups by school indicates fairly consistent patterns of participation at each school, but somewhat different decision-making patterns. Areas in which parents reported that their advise is sought in school decision making ranges from a low of 6% of parents at white working- class boys' school who report involvement in personnel decisions to a high of 49.2% of parents at the Black coed school who are involved in decisions about home-school relations. Decision making appears to be a more specific school- related phenomenon than does participation in other types of school activities.

Within school distributions across activities appear to be more varied than across school variations, particularly regarding participation activities. Participation in governance roles such as serving on boards and helping make school decisions, for the most part, is rare. Activities that take parents away from their working day such as helping at school or serving as teacher aides are infrequent. Attending school meetings and monitoring homework are the most frequent parent involvement activities, activities most closely related to a child's school progress. Parent involvement roles are primarily limited to these two areas over all schools. The extent to which parents participate in school governance and decision making roles appears to be less pervasive than participation roles.

Proportion of parents involved. The frequency rates of involvement of parents across the five schools by role are shown in Table 4. Although the

pattern of parent involvement by school is similar to that found in the preceding analysis, the percentage distribution provides a stronger basis for judging the extent to which all parents are active and permits another perspective in making within and across-school comparisons.

(Table 4 about here)

Overall, only 12.6% of parents do not participate in any school-related activities or participation roles. About one-third meet the criterion for "highly active" (i.e., involvement in three or more roles or categories of participation). Most parents fulfill one or two parent involvement roles, most likely as meeting attenders and homework monitors. As in the previous analysis, the Black coed school has the highest percentage of "highly active" parents (45.1%) while the Hispanic girls' and white working-class boys' schools are among the lowest in parent participation.

Even fewer parents perceive themselves active in giving advise or being consulted about school decisions. Overall, 50.8% report that they do not give advice or help make decisions concerning the school. Again, the Black coed school has the highest proportion of highly active parents in school decision- making areas (33.3%) while the two lower-income Catholic schools--the Hispanic and white working-class--have the lowest.

Table 5 reports the communication dimension of parent involvement. Relatively few parents (17.9%) had <u>not</u> talked to their children's teachers within the past year. The Black coed and Black boys' schools have the most frequent parent-teacher contacts with approximately 50% of parents reporting three or more talks a year compared to less than 32% of parents at the other three schools. These two schools also have the fewest "no shows". It appears that most parents come to school for the minimum of two or three parent-

teacher conferences a year which these schools schedule (Yeager, et al, 1985).

(Table 5 about here)

The across school patterns indicate that one school may emphasize some type of parent activity more than another by providing more opportunities for involvement than others. It also indicates that some schools apparently provide broader roles for parents in governance activities both by asking them to serve on parent committees and school boards and by seeking their advice concerning areas of school decision making. However, other factors influencing parent involvement may not be related exclusively to school factors such as providing for school meetings and parent teacher conferences. Consequently, additional analyses pertaining to parental characteristics were undertaken in addition to examining the school as possible sources of these differences.

Influence of Parent Characteristics and School on Parent Involvement

The three ANOVAS used to determine the effects of parents' reasons for choosing the school, their education, and the individual school chosen (independent variables) on the frequency (parent focus) of parent participation, decision making, and communication (dependent variables) are shown in Table 6. Decisions for statistical significance were made at the .05 level and below. In response to the second research question, several main effects were found for education and school indicating their separate influence on one or more dimensions of parent involvement. However, there were no significant two or three-way interaction effects.

(Table 6 about here)

For the participation dimension of parent involvement, parents' level of

educational attainment and the individual school chosen produced a main effect on parents' frequency of school-related activity (parent focus) while their reasons for choosing the school did not. Parents' with higher levels of educational attainment are more likely than those with lower levels to participate ($F = 4.74$; $p < .009$). Parents' participation in school-related activities is not dependent on their reasons for choosing the school. However, the specific school chosen has a significant effect on parents' participation ($F = 9.68$; $p < .001$).

Only the individual school chosen produced an effect ($F = 6.66$; $p < .001$) on the extent to which parents' advised or helped make school decisions. The higher income nonCatholic Black coed school contributed the most to this effect. Again, as observed in the distributional studies, this suggests that decision making is school specific. This dimension is apparently more directly related to the opportunities schools provide for the involvement of parents, as well as to parent initiative, than are the other two dimensions.

All three variables produced a main effect on frequency of parents' talks with teachers suggesting the influence of multiple factors on parent-school communications. Parents' educational level ($F = 3.52$; $p < .03$), parents' primary reason for choosing the school ($F = 3.21$; $p < .02$), and the individual school chosen ($F = 14.02$; $p < .001$) all produced a main effect. The greatest contributors to these effects are parents with high levels of education (2- year college degrees or beyond) who chose the school primarily for academic reasons. Again, the higher income nonCatholic Black coed school was the highest contributor to the effect of school on communication.

The pattern that emerges from the ANOVAS indicates that the school

chosen and parents' educational level are closely related. However, the absence of two or three-way interaction effects indicates that independent effects such as education were negated when combined with the school. Frequent participators at an individual school may not have the same high level of education as frequent participators at another school. A closer scrutiny of the two variables, school and education, is useful in determining their relationship to parent involvement.

Based on the entire sample, high participators and high communicators (i.e., parents with three or more involvements) had higher levels of education than those less involved. Parents who scored high on participation had a mean educational level of 4.26 indicating that they were more likely to have had some college. Those who scored low on participation, had a mean educational level of 3.73 indicating that they were not likely to have attended college. Similar educational attainment scores were obtained for high ($X = 4.25$) and low communicators ($X = 3.53$).

Schools with the highest percentages of active parents had the highest educational levels. For example, at the Black coed school where 52% of parents were participators, the mean educational level was 5.09 as compared to 3.51 at the white working-class boys' school where 29% of parents were classified as participators. This pattern was consistent for all schools.

Interestingly, regardless of a school's mean educational level, parent groups were stratified similarly at each school indicating that those with the highest levels of education at a school were the highest participators and communicators.

Parents' reasons for choosing the school appear to have an effect on communication. Parents who chose the school primarily for academic reasons

communicate with teachers more frequently than those who chose the school for discipline, religion and values and noneducational reasons. These parents are also more highly educated (Bauch & Small, 1986). They are also more likely found in schools with other more highly-educated parents. Thus, the effect of education, reasons, and school is confounded.

Furthermore, the 21 tests represented by the ANOVA provides no control over Type I error. Thus, some concern needs to be acknowledged about the possibility that the ANOVA results described are spurious. However, the results of the distributional studies presented earlier are consistent with the ANOVA results bolstering their acceptability. It is likely that there are other personal background factors related to parent involvement that were not tested here such as parents' educational aspirations for their children and other motivational factors which could heighten parent involvement. It is also probable that the effects of parent characteristics cannot be determined by the analyses chosen for this study.

Family Type, Parent Involvement, and Church Participation

Distributional studies were used to examine the third research question pertaining to the relationship between family type, parents' reasons for choosing the school and church participation. In the analyses previously shown, religious reasons for choosing a Catholic school were not significant in parent involvement. For a particular type of family, however, religious reasons may be important.

Since Catholic schools represent a religious community, school participation might be better understood by expanding its context to include church participation. Denominational compatibility and the need to seek additional family social resources when one parent is absent from the home

might be reflected in church participation as suggested by Coleman and Hoffer (1987). Therefore, the remaining analyses were centered around parent participators (parent focus) representing four family religio-structural types in order to determine the relationship between school and church participation for families of different types, especially those who chose the school for religious reasons.

The population for this study is especially appropriate for such analyses since over half the parents are Catholic (62%). Similarly, approximately half are single-parent families distributed about evenly between Catholics and nonCatholics. Previous analyses indicate that Catholics are significantly more likely than nonCatholics to choose the school for religious reasons (Bauch & Small, 1986).

Analyses (not shown) indicate that single-parent families are as likely to be school participators as are two-parent families regardless of religious denomination. In order to examine the relationship, then, between school and church participation for different type families and their reasons for choosing the school, four family types were compared. This was done to test the hypothesis that the single Catholic parent active in the school is more likely than other family types to be active in the religious community, especially if the parent chooses the school for religious reasons. Such parents may need help in filling the duties of the missing parent and is likely to seek the additional resources provided by a religious community.

Differences were found for family type, religious reasons for choosing the school, and frequency of church participation for frequent school participators (Table 7). Among the four family types displayed, single-parent Catholic families were the least frequent church participators.

Similarly, among families who choose the school for nonreligious reasons, single-parent Catholic families also are less likely than other family types to be church goers. For whatever reasons parents choose these Catholic schools, reasons for school choice seem to be unrelated to parents' frequency of church participation.

(Table 7 about here)

Interestingly, single Catholic parents who are active school participators, are less likely to be frequent church participators despite their reasons for choosing the school than nonCatholics. Family structure is a crucial negative factor in church participation for single-parent Catholic families in Catholic schools.

Thus, the expectation was not confirmed that active, single-parent Catholics who choose the school for religious reasons would be more likely than other family types to be church participators. Indeed, these families were the least likely to be active church goers.

DISCUSSION

The two perspectives introduced at the beginning of this paper, and additional information about the five schools obtained from observational studies (Bauch, et al, 1985), suggest certain conclusions and implications about family choice, school organizational advantages, and community membership. The findings will be discussed in the order in which the three research questions were explored.

Concerning the first research question, the majority of parent involvement activity resides primarily in communication with teachers, and participation in those areas most closely related to student progress: homework monitoring and attending school meetings. Parents are most

involved in activities that really count, that is, those that focus primarily on their children's immediate school performance. This may help explain in part why Catholic schools, especially those serving large proportions of lower-income and minority students are able to produce higher achievement scores than public schools (Coleman, et al, 1982; Greeley, 1982). Approximately one-third of all parents are highly active in parent roles related to school performance. From the perspective of family choice, many parents may choose Catholic schools, in part, because they want to be involved particularly in monitoring their child's academic progress. Many seek and find support for that role in the Catholic school.

In response to the second research question, parents' level of education plays a strong role in parent involvement as well as their choice of a particular school. Parents with similar levels of education tend to patronize the same school for similar reasons (Bauch & Small, 1986), thus accounting for the importance of the individual school chosen. Parents' level of education provides schools that may mandate parent involvement policies with an additional advantage in that parents with higher levels of education tend to be more responsive to such policies than those with lower levels of educational attainment.

For example, all schools in the study held parent-teacher conferences at least twice a year. Three of the five schools reported that they held parent- teacher conferences "every 2-3 months". Their was no relationship, however, between frequency of parent-teacher conferences and parents' participation in them. The white working-class boys' school reported holding conferences more frequently than the higher income Black coed school; however, the former's parent participation in conferences was lower than the

latter's. Other schools in the study followed a similar pattern related to socioeconomic status.

Schools with higher parent education levels were more successful in making greater demands on parents. The school which stands out in the study-- the Black coed school-- was particularly insistent about every parent's participation in parent-teacher conferences. They withheld students' progress reports until parents could come to the school and obtain them personally thus assuring that parents had contact with school personnel. Similarly, not all schools had active parent organizations; however, schools with the highest parent educational levels (the Black coed and Black boys' schools) had the most active parent groups, according to principal reports.

The white working-class boys' school and the Black coed school serve as contrasts in how the organizational context of the schools varied and how parents' educational levels and reasons for choosing the school play a role in parent involvement. The coed school was not only the smallest one studied, allowing for greater familiarity and ease of interaction due to its size, but also having a number of other organizational advantages that clearly contributed toward the higher rate of parent involvement. The school had been established through the efforts of a group of concerned parents highly organized and active previous to the school's founding. After the school began, these parents participated in a number of monitoring roles including providing tutoring services, interacting with other community organizations working toward neighborhood and city improvements, and working with school officials to ensure a broad-base of parent participation at school events. The school had a high academic focus. It was unique in its

two-tiered administrative structure in which the school "president" was responsible for community outreach and public relations programs while the school "principal" was responsible for the day-to-day operations of the school.

Parents were found in the school nearly everyday and felt welcomed. They communicated informally and easily with teachers and administrators. While the research team was in the school, a problem arose concerning students' coming late to class. The principal immediately implemented a solution suggested by one of the parents. Parent school relationships could be characterized as "cooperative" and mutually beneficial. Parents wanted the best education possible for their child and did a great deal of monitoring of their children and of the school, and the school enjoyed the support and benefit of a motivated and involved group of parents to assist in reinforcing school policy and discipline.

In contrast, the white working-class boys' school not only had the lowest rates of parent participation and communication, but it had the lowest parent education level and enrolled the largest number of students of all schools in the study. The school had a long tradition and reputation in its section of the city for providing an excellent job-entry preparation for students from working-class families. Upon graduation, potential employees were eagerly sought from this school by the business community. An all-boys' school, many of the students' fathers, grandfathers, and uncles had attended it. A high percentage of teachers had graduated from the school. The stable presence of the school in a socio-economically changing neighborhood counteracted an evident sense of insecurity and fear that often accompanies such change (Bauch, et al, 1985).

Parents in this working-class school expressed the importance to them of a sense of familiarity about the school. This was closely associated with with the teachers' "knowing the family" or frequenting the neighborhood playgrounds, which the teachers sometimes did, and with the neighborhood community in which the teachers lived. Parents express less concern about strictly academic-related matters as an important aspect of the school. Communication often centered around personal and family problems. There was not the same sense of necessity for parent school participation and communication.

The school had an elaborate curriculum tracking structure organized in such a way that teachers and school officials could resolve most school performance problems by simply moving students to another track level without involving parents, which they frequently did. The press for achievement was not nearly as great as it was at the coed school. Rather, the school emphasized religious and human relations values over academics and thus was uniquely different in this respect from the other four schools where academic reasons for choosing the school far outweighed nonacademic ones (Bauch & Small, 1986). While parent-school interactions at this school were certainly cordial, they were not frequent, and parents tended not to be involved. Parents at this school were more likely to place responsibility for their child's education on the school. In contrast to the coed school, parent-school relations could be viewed as "sympathetic" or "neutral." There appeared to be little demand on either side for parent involvement as it was measured in this study.

This brief excursion into two schools' organizational settings helps "explain" parent involvement in a way that statistical measures do not

permit. Ethnographic data can provide insight into why and how a school might have a particular stance or play a community role that affects parent involvement. At the same time, statistical measures make it quite clear that the characteristics of a school's clientele including their level of educational attainment and reasons for choosing the school are related to parent involvement.

Generally, a smaller proportion of parents in this study are active in decision making and accepting governance roles compared to participation in school-related activities that most directly influence their children's school performance. Clearly, decision making or the process of parent consultation, may be influenced by factors beyond the control of the individual school. Lack of participation in this area may be influenced by policies attributable to the larger archdiocesan "system" or religious community to which the school belongs. It is likely that the policy of these school "owners" provides only a limited role for parents in government and decision making. Most Catholic school boards only provide limited advisory roles for parents (Harper, 1980). In addition, school officials may be reluctant to solicit advice from the broader community of parents, particularly if parents seem to be satisfied with the school. While most private schools enjoy considerable organizational advantages attributable to their autonomy of government, Catholic schools may not have advanced to the point of affording parents a broader consultative role than these data suggest.

Concerning the last research question, single-parent Catholic families who choose the school for religious reasons are the least active in church although they are likely to be active in the school. Their perceptions about

their acceptance in the Catholic church is strongly suggested by the fact that their nonCatholic counterparts are more likely to be active in churches of other denominations. Other studies have shown that single-parent Catholics feel neglected by the Church (Hyer, 1987). Thus, the group for whom Catholic schools might offer the greatest "double benefit" of school-church interaction for families most in need, appears to benefit the least. For this group, the Catholic school provides a single institutional support.

In inner-city Catholic schools, community membership is a complex phenomenon. Only slightly over half (57%) the Catholics attending these schools report that they are active in the Church while somewhat more nonCatholics (65%) report that they are active in their respective churches. Since the school represents a denomination to which these latter families do not belong, religious community membership ordinarily would not overlap with the school.

Coleman and Hoffer's (1987) definition of the functional community in which participants interact outside the school within the broader religious community generally does not apply for this group. Interaction may occur in other locations such as in social situations, the workplace, nonCatholic as well as Catholic churches, and in the broader civic and economic community.

Rather than denominational incompatibility acting as a deterrent to parent involvement, denominational accommodation occurs through a set of shared family values that allows for, encourages, and respects the participation of all families. This accommodation supports parents in their child-rearing tasks, especially education, and emphasizes the importance of a child's school progress. The idealized close-knit interaction of

home-church- school is difficult to achieve in today's American society, even for the Catholic Church.

In conclusion, parent involvement is a plastic process both in reality and in attempts to measure it. Contextual factors related to the school's clientele such as their socioeconomic status, school history, the opportunities schools provide for participation, and the school's openness to parent involvement defy molding into a single analysis. Thus, it is difficult to conclude in what settings a particular type or frequency of parent involvement is needed, wanted, or beneficial. A variety of parent involvement patterns seem to characterize these schools, related primarily to the group of parents who have chosen the school and who most likely share common beliefs about the value of education for their children. The variegated picture of parent involvement that emerges at these schools provides some insight into how parent involvement mechanisms operate in inner-city Catholic high schools where primarily lower-income and lower-middle class, minority parents exercise choice of a private school.

REFERENCE

Alexander, L. 1986. Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Bauch, P.A. 1985. Parent involvement: Exploring roles for parents in curriculum and school improvement. Presented at the annual meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association, St. Louis.

Bauch, P.A., and T.W. Small. 1986. Parents' reasons for school choice in four inner city Catholic high schools: Their relationship to class, race, religion, and aspirations for child. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Association, San Francisco.

Bauch, P.A., I. Blum, N. Taylor, and L. Valli. 1985. Final report to the National Catholic Educational Association on a field study of five low-income-serving Catholic high schools. Washington, DC: Department of Education, Center for the Study of Youth Development, The Catholic University of America.

Becker, H.J., and J.L. Epstein. 1982. Parent involvement: A survey of teacher practices. The Elementary School Journal 83:86-102.

Benson, P.L., R.J. Yeager, P.K. Wood, M.J. Guerra, and B. Manno. V. 1986. Catholic high schools: Their impact on low income students. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.

Bridge, G. 1978. Information imperfections: The Achilles' heel of entitlement plans. School Review 86:504-529.

Chubb, J., and T. Moe. 1986. No school is an island: Politics, markets, and education. The Brookings Review Fall:21-28.

Cibulka, J, T. O'Brien, D. Zewe. 1982. Inner City private elementary schools: A study. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

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

Coleman, J.E., E.Q. Campbell, C.J. Holson, J. McPartland, A. Mood, F.D. Weinfield, and R.L. York. 1966. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Coleman, J., and T. Hoffer. 1986. Public and private high schools: The impact of communities. New York: Basic Books.

Coleman, J., T. Hoffer, and S. Kilgore. 1982. High school achievement: public, Catholic, and private schools. New York: Basic Books.

Comer, J. 1980. School power: Implications of an intervention project. New York: Free Press.

Epstein, J. 1986. Toward an integrated theory of school and family connections. Report No. 3. Baltimore: Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools, The Johns Hopkins University.

Good, T.L., and G.M. Hinkel. 1985. School processes in private and public elementary schools. Unpublished manuscript. Columbia: University of Missouri.

Goodlad, J.I. 1984. A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greeley, A. 1982. Catholic high schools and minority students. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Guerra, M., and J. Augenstein. 1986. Catholic high schools and their finances. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.

Harper, M. 1980. Ascent to excellence in Catholic education: A guide to effective decision making. Waterford, CT: Prentice Hall.

Henderson, A.E., ed. 1981. Parent participation--student achievement: The evidence grows. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hyer, M., 1987. Sharp decrease found among Catholics here going to confession. Washington Post, July 4, D16.

Jencks, C., M. Smith, H. Acland, M.J. Bane, D. Cohen, H. Gintis, B. Heyns, and S. Michelson. 1972. Inequality: A reassessment of the effects of family and schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Kagan, S.L. 1984. Parent involvement research: A field in search of itself. Report No. 8. Boston, MA: Institute for Responsive Education.

Kohn, M.L. 1969. Class and conformity: A study in values. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Leichter, H., ed. 1974. The family as educator. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Lightfoot, S.L. 1981. Toward conflict and resolution: Relationships between families and schools. Theory Into Practice 20:97-104.

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

Marjoribanks, K. 1980. Ethnic families and children's achievement. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Quie, A.H. 1987. More "choice" is key to public-school reform. Education Week 6, May 20.

Schneider, B.L. 1987. Educational choice for blacks in urban private elementary schools. In T. James & H. Levin, eds., Comparing public and private schools. New York: The Falmer Press.

Sewell, W.H., and R. Hauser. 1976. Causes and consequences of higher education: Models of the status attainment process. In W. Sewell, R. Hauser, and D. Featherman, eds., Schooling and achievement in American Society. New York: Academic Press.

Slaughter, D.T. and B.L. Schneider. 1986. Newcomers: Blacks in private schools. Final report to the National Institute of Education. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.

Vitullo-Martin, T.W., and J.A. Vitullo-Martin. 1973. The politics of alternative models to the public schools. Riverside, CA: University of California. ERIC Documents: ED 083 737.

Yeager, R.J., P.L. Benson, M.J. Guerra, and B.V. Manno. 1985. The Catholic high school: A national portrait. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association.

Table 1
School Demographic Characteristics

	Schools				
	Black Schools			Hispanic	White Working-Class Boys
	Boys	Girls	Co-ed	Girls	
Location	Mid-Atlantic	West	Midwest	East Coast	East Coast
Governance	Diocesan Owned/ Religious Order Operated	Diocesan Owned/ Religious Order Operated	Diocesan Owned and Operated	Religious Order Owned and Operated	Diocesan Owned/ Religious Order Operated
Enrollment	237	316	288	780	1070
Gender Composition	Boys	Girls	Mixed (Girls - 62%; Boys - 38%)	Girls	Boys
Ethnic Composition					
Black	94%	85%	99%	35%	34%
Hispanic	5%	15%	1%	55%	-
White	1%	-	-	10%	63%
Asian	-	-	-	-	3%
Median Income Range	$22,737	$18,617	$24,500	$16,101	$16,617
% Below Poverty Level	15.6%	28.5%	15.4%	45.9%	36.1%
Religion					
% Catholic	55%	48%	45%	79%	84%
Teacher-Student Ratio	1-11	1-19	1-17	1-18	1-23
Tuition (1985)	$1,500	$925	$1,125	$1,200	$1,200
College-Admission Rate (1984-1986)					
4 Year College	70%	35%	85%	59%	38%
2 Year College	9%	25%	13%	22%	17%
Total	79%	63%	98%	81%	55%

Table 2

Coding and Construct Development
for Parent Involvement

Dimensions	Question and Number	Original Response Categories and Coding	Construct Development
PARTICIPATION	13 (b)- Below is a list of ways in which parents might participate in school activities. Have you ever participated?	Coding Style: Yes=2; No=1 a. Acting as a teacher or substitute teacher b. Acting as a classroom aide or tutor c. Serving as a School Board, Advisory, or Parent Board Member d. Attending Parent Meetings e. Acting as a Guest Speaker f. Attending meetings to discuss local, social, and political issues g. Attending meetings to discuss other community problems h. Attending meetings to discuss school problems i. Helping with class trips j. Helping with extra-curricular activities k. Making sure homework is done	Coding Style: Yes=2; No=1 I. Helpers (i,j) II. Homework Montiors (k) III. Attenders (d,f,g,h) IV. Board Members (c) V. Teachers and Aides (a,b,e)
DECISION MAKING	12 (a)- Below is a list of areas about which parents may or may not advise and/ or help make decisions for this school.	Coding Style: Yes =2; No =1 a. Hiring & Firing of teachers b. Standards for student behavior (discipline)	Coding Style: Yes=2; No=1 I. Curriculum (c,e,f,g,j,k) II. Finances (d,n,o)

Dimensions	Question and Number	Original Response Categories and Coding	Construct Development
	Do you advise or help make decisions for this school?	c. The way students are graded d. How the school budget is spent e. What textbooks or other learning materials are used f. What subjects are taught g. How subjects are taught h. Hiring and firing of administrators i. Ways the school and parents work together j. The school's daily schedule k. The way religion is taught l. Setting school goals m. Setting admission policy n. How money is raised o. Setting teachers' salaries	III. Personnel (a,h) IV. School Policy (b,m) V. School Goals (l) VI. Home-School Relations (i)
COMMUNICATION Talks with Teachers	4 - During the last year about how many times have you talked to your child's teacher?	1- None 2- 1-2 3- 3-5 4- 6-10 5- 10 or more times	1-None 2-One or two 3-Three to five 4-Six or more

Table 3

Frequency of Parent Involvement in Different Kinds of Activities by School (Activity Focus)

	Schools					
	Black Schools			Hispanic	White Working-	
Activity	Boys	Girls	Coed	Girls	Class Boys	Total
PARTICIPATION						
Helpers	55 31.6%	48 29.6%	54 45.8%	99 24.7%	37 30.3	293 30.0%
Homework Monitors	137 78.9%	127 78.9%	106 86.2%	304 75.1%	103 84.4%	777 78.9%
Attenders	126 72.4%	122 75.3%	100 85.5%	309 76.9%	90 75.6%	747 76.7%
Board Members	17 9.8%	22 13.6%	24 20.2%	51 12.6%	8 6.6%	122 12.4%
Teacher/ Teacher's Aides	20 11.5%	24 14.8%	17 14.8%	59 14.7%	14 11.6%	134 13.8%
DECISION MAKING						
Curriculum	37 21.3%	56 31.5%	21 16.9%	121 28.9%	25 19.2%	260 25.4%
Finances	83 47.7%	55 30.9%	47 39.2%	103 24.6%	30 23.1%	318 31.1%
Personnel	15 8.6%	58 32.4%	11 8.5%	118 28.1%	8 6.0%	210 20.3%
School Policy	41 23.6%	56 31.3%	24 19.0%	117 27.9%	30 22.7%	268 26.0%
School Goals	36 20.7%	36 20.0%	33 25.6%	87 20.7%	25 18.8%	217 20.9%
Home/School Relations	73 42.0%	25 13.9%	64 49.2%	69 16.4%	42 31.6%	273 26.3%

Table 4

Proportion of Parents Involved in Participation Roles and Decision Making Areas by School (Role Focus)

Involvement	Schools					
	Black Schools			Hispanic	White Working-Class Boys	Total
	Boys	Girls	Co-ed	Girls		
Participation						
Not Active (0 roles)	24 13.8%	25 15.4%	10 9.0%	53 13.3%	10 8.5%	122 12.6%
Moderately Active (1-2 roles)	89 51.1%	84 51.9%	51 45.9%	228 57.0%	70 59.3%	522 54.1%
Highly Active (3 or more roles)	61 35.1%	53 32.7%	50 45.1%	119 29.7%	38 32.2%	321 33.3%
Total	174 100%	162 100%	111 100%	400 100%	118 100%	965 100%
Decision Making						
Not Active (0 areas)	71 40.8%	90 50.0%	52 40.3%	231 54.9%	82 62.1%	526 50.8%
Moderately Active (1-2 areas)	55 31.6%	36 20.0%	34 26.4%	86 20.4%	18 13.7%	229 22.1%
Highly Active (3 or more areas)	48 27.6%	54 30.0%	43 33.3%	104 24.7%	32 24.2%	281 27.1%
Total	174 100%	180 100%	129 100%	421 100%	132 100%	1036 100%

Table 5

Distribution of the Number of Times Parents Report Talking to Teachers

	Schools					
Talks	Boys	Black Schools Girls	Coed	Hispanic Girls	White Working-Class Boys	Total
	(n=172)	(n=183)	(n=132)	(n=432)	(n=134)	(n=1053)
None	7.5%	17.5%	6.1%	22.0%	30.6%	17.9%
One or two	39.0%	50.8%	46.2%	61.1%	52.2%	52.7%
Three to five	40.7%	28.4%	37.9%	14.8%	15.7%	24.5%
Six or more	12.8%	3.3%	9.8%	2.1%	1.5%	4.9%
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 6

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Degree of Parent Participation, Decision Making and Communication (n=909)

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	P
PARTICIPATION				
Main Effects				
Education	2	15.69	4.7	.009
Reason	3	3.11	.9	.420
School	4	32.04	9.7	.001
2-way Interactions				
Education x Reason	6	2.54	1.02	.595
Education x School	8	3.48	.77	.396
Reason x School	12	3.87	1.05	.301
3-way Interactions				
Education x Reason x School	21	3.55	1.07	.374
Residual	852	3.31		
Total	908	3.47		
DECISION MAKING				
Main Effects				
Education	2	3.23	1.19	.305
Reason	3	2.79	1.02	.381
School	4	18.10	6.66	.001
2-way Interactions				
Education x Reason	6	3.82	1.41	.209
Education x School	8	4.23	1.56	.134
Reason x School	12	4.00	1.47	.130
3-way Interactions				
Education x Reason x School	21	2.74	1.01	.450
Residual	852	2.72		
Total	908	2.80		
COMMUNICATION				
Main Effects				
Education	2	4.27	3.52	.030
Reason	3	3.90	3.21	.022
School	4	17.00	14.02	001
2-way Interactions				
Education x Reason	6	.88	.73	.629
Education x School	8	2.34	1.93	.053
Reason x School	12	1.52	1.25	.244
3-way Interactions				
Education x Reason x School	21	1.17	.97	.503
Residual	852	1.21		
Total	908	1.32		

Table 7

Distribution for Family Types of School Participators*
by Reasons for Choosing the School
and Church Participation

Church Participation	Family Types: Single-Parent Catholic	Single-Parent NonCatholic	Two-Parent Catholic	Two-Parent NonCatholic	Total
Religious Reasons					
Frequent	21 67.7%	10 83.3%	33 82.5%	9 75.0%	73 76.8%
Infrequent	10 32.3%	2 16.7%	7 17.5%	3 25.0%	22 23.2%
Total	31 100%	12 100%	40 100%	12 100%	95 100%
Non-Religious Reasons					
Frequent	24 46.2%	29 63.0%	43 70.5%	32 76.2%	128 63.7%
Infrequent	28 53.8%	17 37.0%	18 29.5%	10 23.8%	73 36.3%
Total	52 100%	46 100%	61 100%	42 100	201 100%

*Percentages represent only those parents who scored high on School Participation and also responded to questions concerning church participation and religion and family structure.