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Chapter 1

Introduction

In 120 A.D., Plutarch wrote, "Such fathers as commit their sons to tutors and teachers and themselves never witness or oversee their instruction deserve rebuke, for they fall short of their obligation." (Sandfort, 1987, p. 101).

Parent involvement in schools is of basic importance to the success of education (Henderson, 1987). Parents are children's first and most influential teachers (Sattes, 1984). The effects of parents and the home environment on the cognitive development of children are evident throughout the childhood years (Bauch, 1985; Davies, 1991; Gordon 1977; Moles, 1987). Parent involvement provides schools with the broad-based support necessary to educate children in today's society.

Parents and educators agree that parent involvement is advantageous and, in some cases, crucial to school success (Chavkin and Williams, 1985; Coleman et al., 1966; Henderson, 1981). Students benefit both personally and academically when parents are supporters of their endeavors and continually involved in their schooling (Sattes, 1984). Meaningful parent involvement has been correlated with student achievement, behavior, attendance, motivation and self-esteem (Gordon, 1978; Herman and Yeh, 1983; Sattes, 1984; Wagenaar, 1977). The quality and character of the relationship between home and school vitally affect the
education of a child and his success in school. Parental encouragement, home tutoring, and school participation affect the achievements, attitudes, and aspirations of children beyond student ability and socioeconomic status (Bloom, 1985; Epstein, 1987a; Gillum et al., 1977).

Today two decades of research serve as foundation for the inclusion of parent involvement policies in education. Parent involvement in schools and school and family cooperation have been addressed at the national, state, and local level. In 1985, President Reagan and his education advisors identified four ingredients necessary for excellence and improved education: teaching, curriculum, setting, and parents (Education Week, 1985).

Likewise, in 1991, President Bush addressed the importance of parent involvement in America 2000, An Education Strategy. He identified America's parents as demanding shareholders and cited their involvement as foremost to the implementation of the strategy and future school success. Harold Howe, a former United States Commissioner of Education, noted the need of a national educational goal recognizing the family as an educational institution and that schools alone could not provide the stimulation, support, and guidance needed by children (1993).

Federal initiatives directed toward parent involvement are evident. Programs such as Early Start, Head
Start and Chapter I include parent involvement components. The Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching (FIRST) provides competitive grants for the design and implementation of school/family/community partnerships (Epstein, 1991).

States, in turn, have moved from an awareness stage to the implementation of state-level policies and guidelines designed to encourage parent involvement in schools. Epstein (1991) reported the National Governors' Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers have initiated new projects on family and community involvement. Nardine and Morris (1991) found that state departments of education have also implemented programs and activities to encourage school/home connections. Included among these were Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Maine, Missouri, Oregon, South Carolina, Massachusetts, and Virginia. They also reported that twenty states have enacted parent involvement legislation.

State level initiatives have led to the framing of guidelines, passing of legislation, and mandates requiring districts and local schools to develop strategies to strengthen the home-school connection. Schools have been both required and encouraged to design their own programs which enhance parent involvement. Despite this, something in the basic structure of public education in America is keeping parent involvement in local schools from reaching

At the local level, current issues such as site-based management, shared decision making and schools of choice also necessitate high levels of parent involvement (Clinchy, 1989; Henninger, 1987; Taylor and Levine, 1991). Shared decision-making has the potential to be a key variable in developing motivation and commitment among educators and parents (Taylor & Levine). Likewise, school choice provides both opportunity and reason for concern in relationship to parent involvement in today's local schools (Nathan, 1989).

Some schools have successful parent involvement programs in place. The extent of parent involvement, however, continues to vary from school to school. Studies indicate school location and socioeconomic status have little influence on the desire of parents to become involved in their children's education (Ascher, 1988; Chavkin, 1989; Schaefer, 1971). The importance of parent involvement in the education of children is undisputed. Low-income parents can and want to help with the schooling of their children, both at home and school, as much as middle and upper income parents (Ascher). Why then do some schools enjoy a higher level of parent involvement than do others?

Chavkin and Williams (1985) suggest that, as school leaders, principals fulfill key roles in determining the
extent to which parents are involved in schools and the level of effectiveness of that participation. Davies (1976) concluded that the individual school is the prime unit for educational planning and change, stating:

The interests of parents are most easily mobilized and sustained around the policies and practices of the schools their children attend...The final and most important impact of federal, state, and district forces affecting education is in the classroom and the schoolhouse (p. 54).

Written policies legitimize parent involvement and frame the context for school program activities, but the individual building principal provides the administrative leadership and support necessary for parent involvement to exist. The principal, as instructional leader and school-community liaison, has great influence over the importance placed upon parent involvement and the practices used to encourage it.

**Statement of the Problem**

The variance found in parent involvement among schools may be a result of the attitudes of building principals toward parent involvement.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the attitudes of elementary school principals toward parent involvement. The importance of parent involvement and the pivotal position of the principal in implementing effective parent involvement practices and programs make the
identification of attitudes a key factor in determining present variance among schools.

Significance of the Study

This study was significant because collaborative efforts between family and school are deemed necessary to insure quality education. Parents and educators agree that parent involvement is crucial to school success. Research supports that parent involvement, in large part, is dependent upon administrative support.

Considering the importance of parent involvement, the variance from school to school, and the dependency upon administrative support, the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement warranted study. The role of the principal in facilitating parent involvement appeared to be significant. It is believed that attitudes of principals directly influencing parent involvement can be identified.

This study was also significant because findings could prompt principals to initiate schoolwide assessment and improvement processes. Principals could involve representatives of their entire schools (faculty, staff, parents, students). These assessment and improvement processes could be used to establish the quality of school/family relations and guide principals toward the steps necessary to improve those relationships.

Finally, this study was significant because the role of the principal in the future development and implementation
of parent involvement could be more clearly defined. A more definitive description of the principal's role could assist in the selection and training of future administrators. A more definitive description of the role of the principal in parent involvement could also assist in the evaluation of future and present administrators.

**Limitations of the Study**

The study had the following limitations:

1. The study was limited to elementary school principals in the State of Virginia.
2. The data collection was limited to Winter 1993-94.

**Assumptions**

1. It was assumed that all survey participants were qualified to provide accurate responses.
2. It was assumed that all respondents were honest in their responses to the instrument.
3. It was assumed that the survey instrument accurately reflected the attitudes of the elementary principals.

**Research Questions**

This is a descriptive study of the attitudes of elementary principals regarding parent involvement practices. The study also includes elements of causal comparative research. The following questions guided the study:
Research Question 1. How strongly do principals believe in parent involvement in schools?

Research Question 2. Are the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools related to gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density?

**Hypotheses**

Given the statement of the problem and the findings from the review of literature, the following research hypotheses were established for testing in this study:

**H1.** There will be a significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the gender of the principal when controlling for age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

**H2.** There will be a significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the age of the principal when controlling for gender, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.
H3. There will be a significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the teaching experience of the principal when controlling for gender, age, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

H4. There will be a significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the educational background of the principal when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

H5. There will be a significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and school socio-economic status when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, size, and population density.

H6. There will be a significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and school size when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-
economic status, and population
density.

H7. There will be a significant relationship
between the attitudes of principals toward
parent involvement in schools and population
density when controlling for gender, age,
teaching experience, educational background,
school socio-economic status, and size.

Definitions

The following operational terms, as defined by Chavkin and Williams (1985), were used in the study:

1. **Parent Involvement**  Any of a variety of activities that allow parents to participate in the educational process at home or in school, such as information exchange, decision sharing, volunteer services for schools, home tutoring/teaching, and child advocacy.

2. **Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role**  Parents helping their own children at home with educational activities or school assignments.

3. **Audience Role**  Parents receiving information about their child’s progress or about the school. Parents may be asked to come to the school for special events (e.g., school play, special program, etc.).

4. **School Program Supporter Role**  Parents involved in coming to the school to assist in events (e.g., chaperoning a party or field trip, taking tickets at a
fund-raising dinner, or such activities).

5. **Co-Learner Role**  Parents involved in workshops in which they and school staff learn about child development or other topics related to education.

6. **Advocate Role**  Parents serving as activists or spokespersons on issues regarding school policies, services for their own child, or community concerns related to the schools.

7. **Decision-Maker Role**  Parents involved as co-equals with school staff in either educational decisions or decisions relating to governance of the school.

**Organization of the Study**

The study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter contains an introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, and the significance of the study. Chapter One also includes the limitations of the study, assumptions, research questions and hypotheses. Definitions of terms and the organization of the study conclude Chapter 1. Chapter Two provides a review of related literature. Chapter Three contains the study design and procedures. An analysis of the data is included in Chapter Four. The final chapter, Chapter Five, consists of a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

Though parent involvement practices are abundant and diverse, studies clearly indicate collaborative efforts between home and school are advantageous in the education of children (Benson, 1979; Gauthier, 1983; Leler, 1983; Zerchykov, 1984). Parent-school partnerships facilitate learning and benefit not only children, but parents and schools as well. Both educationally and personally rich experiences can be made available to children by involving parents in the schooling process. Involvement, in turn, helps parents become knowledgeable about the overall school operation and more effective in working with their own children (Herman and Yeh, 1983; Stough, 1982). Schools are strengthened by a more informed parent clientele whose goals and interests closely parallel those of educators (Cioffi, 1982; Lloyd, 1984).

History of Parent Involvement

The earliest of the English private schools, which were called "public" schools, began in the 14th century (Coleman, 1987). Supported by endowments and tuition fees from parents, these elite boarding schools came to be known as "public" schools in contrast to the other principal means of early schooling, the private tutor (Coleman). The education
of all other children was fully lodged in the family and was an education of the productive activities and trades of the household or a neighboring household.

The private tutor was an appendage of the family for the upper status family. Since instruction was provided in the home, parent involvement was automatic. The boarding school, however, constituted a sharp disjunction as education activities were transferred from the household to a setting which brought together boys from many families for instruction (Coleman, 1987). Until this time, parent involvement was most basic in nature. The most basic involvement of parents was, as it remains today, that of providing for their children's food, health, safety, shelter, clothing and well-being (Epstein, 1987b).

In Colonial America, the Pilgrims insisted education be taken care of by parents. As early as 1642, however, the General Court of Massachusetts came to the conclusion that many parents were neglecting this responsibility (Pulliam, 1987). Therefore, the court ordered every town to require that all parents and masters undertake the education of their children (Pulliam). This provision did not work well and so, in 1647, the General Court passed the now famous Old Deluder Satan Act which required every town to set up its own school or support a school in the next larger town.

Even though the English private schools began in the 14th century and Colonial America's attempt to provide for
education took place in the 1600s, mass state-supported schooling did not begin until the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Coleman, 1987). Thus, throughout history, mass formal education occupies less than a century. Children were schooled by, in, or near their families. In the United States, this largely remained the case through the 1940s (Comer, 1986).

During the period up to 1940, the relationship of parent involvement and the schooling process was possible, in large part, because the United States was predominantly made up of rural areas and small towns (Comer, 1986). Television was non-existent and transportation limited. Cultural uniformity prevailed and trust and mutual respect between parents and school were taken for granted (Fantini, 1980). The principal economic activities were within the household or the neighboring households. The economy was a nearly subsistent one and capable of absorbing those students who did not attend or dropped out of school (Comer). The family was the basic building block of the entire structure of the social and economic organization during this time (Coleman, 1987).

World War II brought technological and scientific changes which, in turn, brought about social changes, including changes in the relationship between home and school (Comer, 1986). Economically productive activities moved outside the home and family. Transportation,
communication, and technological opportunities encouraged men to leave the farm (Coleman, 1987). School staff members no longer had to live near their schools and television presented visual information from around the world directly to children (Comer). These changes decreased the level of trust and agreement which had, heretofore, been present between home and school.

Throughout the history of education, parent involvement has played a primary role. Individual parent involvement is not new, nor are organized efforts. By 1956, directors of volunteer programs were placing lay citizens in classrooms to help students with reading and language (MacDowell, 1989). MacDowell also reported that, as early as 1964, the Ford Foundation issued a grant to the Public Education Association, an advocacy group comprised of citizens, and by 1985, an estimated 4.3 million parents and other interested citizens were providing volunteer services in schools on a regular basis.

Significance of Parent Involvement in Schools

The literature on the importance of home and school relations is consistent. There is general agreement that parent involvement in schools is fundamental to school success. In 1983, the now famous Nation at Risk report, issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, reminded parents that the education of children
begins at home and called on parents to actively participate in schools and their children's learning.

Purkey and Smith (1983) and Fullan (1985) included parent involvement in lists of critical organizational variables for effective schools. In 1984, The National Education Association announced a program which involved parents in learning activities at home. It stated that the focus on excellence in education first begins at home and then extends into the school.

In America 2000, An Education Strategy, Former President George Bush stated that America's parents were foremost to the plan's implementation and future success. Former United States Department of Education Secretary, William Bennett (1985), believed parent involvement to be the only prospect for real improvement in public school systems. Former Secretary Terrel Bell and former Secretary Shirley Hofstedler agreed that parent involvement was the key to excellence in education (Education Week, 1985; Moles, Wallat, Carroll, & Collins, 1980).

The idea of home-school partnership was predicated on the belief that a child's education should be shared between the home and school. Parents are regarded as key players in the process of students' learning. Education begins before formal schooling and parents are recognized as children's first educators. Sara Lawrence Lightfoot (1978) stressed
the importance of building positive alliances between home and school, stating:

Productive collaborations between family and school will demand that parents and teachers recognize the critical importance of each other's participation in the life of a child. This mutuality of knowledge, understanding, and empathy comes not only with the recognition of the child as the central purpose for the collaboration, but also with a recognition of the need to maintain roles and relationships with children that are comprehensive, dynamic, and differentiated (p. 220-221).

Not only do researchers and educational leaders believe parent involvement to be significant, but parents and educators also concur. For more than a decade the Gallup Poll results have confirmed the desire and willingness of parents to work in schools (Moles et al., 1980). Epstein (1983a) found parents attitudes toward parent involvement to be favorable, regardless of ethnic background or educational level.

Purnell and Gotts (1985) reported that the majority of elementary and secondary teachers surveyed felt that school and family interaction was essential for maximum educational achievement. They went on to report that teachers believe students do better if parents are involved at all grade levels. The presence of parents in the classroom can enrich the learning environment and strengthen the home-school relationship. Fantini (1978), recognizing the dual
responsibility of the home and school in the education and socialization of the child, stated:

In an attempt to continue the socialization of the young, both the home and school must work together to assess where the learner should be at any given time by evaluating his or her strengths, style of learning, and the like...In designing a program compatible with the learner, parents and teachers begin to consider their mutually complementary roles (p. 4).

Communication between parents and teachers advances assessment and the learning process.

In a National Education Association nationwide poll, Moles and others (1980) reported that two-thirds of all teachers responding wanted more parent and public involvement in the schools. In 1993, a national Parent Teacher Association survey found that parents and teachers are quick to point out that children are more likely to do well in school when parents are involved (Elam, Rose, and Gallup).

Elam, Rose, and Gallup (1993) also reported that the 25th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools included a question which asked how important it is to encourage parents to take a more active part in educating their children. Ninety-six percent of the public said parent involvement was very important. This current poll revealed almost unanimity in demographic groups on the importance of encouraging parent involvement.
The 26th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallop Poll of the Public's Attitude Toward the Public Schools concluded that emphasis on the importance of parental knowledge and involvement in schools may attribute to greater public contact in schools. Elam, Rose, and Gallup (1994) reported gains in attendance at school meetings, plays, and athletic events. Parents also reported more frequent attendance at school board meetings and meetings dealing with problems related to their children and school.

Pre-School Learning

A growing body of research supports the premise that the early experiences of children at home are correlated with later success in school. Several longitudinal studies have confirmed that when parents are actively involved in the preschool experience, success in school is more likely. As supporters of their children's learning at school or as primary home teachers, the benefits of parent involvement in preschool experiences continue through high school graduation. One such longitudinal study was conducted by Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) (Gotts, 1980). The Home Oriented Preschool Education (HOPE) program was conducted in 1968-71 with families in southern West Virginia (Sattes, 1984). Children aged three to five years were randomly selected to be in one of three groups. Two of the groups were intervention or experimental groups and visited weekly by a paraprofessional who helped and encouraged
learning between parent and child. In a 1975 follow-up study, Sattes reported AEL found significant differences between the children who had received home visits and those who did not. The visited children had higher school attendance rates, higher grade point averages, higher basic skills scores, and fewer grade retentions.

In another study, Burkett (1982) found that home intervention impacted the achievement of preschool children. Significant differences were found in achievement scores of children visited weekly by trained and experienced paraprofessionals and the achievement scores of children not visited except for pre and post testing. Berrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, Barrett, Epstein, and Weikart (1984) reported the children involved in the Perry Preschool Program study, conducted by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, had better grades, fewer failing grades, and fewer absences in elementary school. The children attending the Perry Preschool were visited once a week and parent involvement was encouraged. Throughout their school careers, the Perry Preschool children required fewer special education resources and had more positive attitudes toward school. They were also more likely to graduate from high school and continue their education after graduation (Berrueta-Clement et al.).

Home-based learning is one of the most effective and efficient ways for parents to spend time with their children
(Ascher, 1988). Single and working parents are not always afforded the flexibility necessary to participate in at-school learning. Preschool parenting and parent involvement suggestions offer a way to improve both school-based participation, home-based learning, and future school success (Ascher).

Research supports that the early learning experiences of children at home with parents are correlated with later success in school. Achievement scores, higher grades, fewer retentions, and better attendance are all benefits of the preschool experience and parent involvement. Whether parents are supporters of learning or actual tutors, children and parents are more likely to have positive attitudes and experiences in school through graduation when early intervention has taken place.

**Student Achievement**

Since most schools, at one time or another, measure their effectiveness by student achievement, parent involvement practices influencing student achievement deserve recognition. One of the earliest studies to examine school, teacher, and family variables associated with achievement, was the Coleman report. Nedler and McAfee (1979) reported Coleman's conclusion that the single most important factor in student achievement was the home background of the child.
In a sample of 5,000 children, Douglas found that parent involvement was far more important than the quality of schools (Schaefer, 1971). In Challenges for School Leaders, the American Association of School Administrators (1988) reported Dorothy Rich, founder and director of the Home and School Institute in Washington, D. C., indicated priority should be given to involving parents in the learning of their children. A leader in the development of at-home learning activities, Rich believes learning begins in the home and that the learning which takes place in the home directly impacts the learning which occurs in school. Rankin reported that children who are high achievers in school are much more likely to have interested and involved parents (Linney and Vernberg, 1983).

Mize (1977) reported gains of up to twelve months in reading when parents were actively involved in Project STEP (Systemmatic Training for Effective Parenting). One group of parents spent an average of one and one-half hours each week reading to their children or listening to their children read. A second group of parents spent only six minutes every two weeks. Children who spent more time reading or being read to by their parents showed significant gains in reading.

In Michigan, Gillum, Schooley, and Novak (1977) conducted a study of three school districts. The study involved parents in performance contracts. They found that
the district with the most comprehensive parent program scored the greatest gain. Data gathered from 135 schools by Gillum et al. indicated a positive relationship between high reading and math scores and a supportive environment in which parents were involved.

In 1975, Bittle reported daily communication with parents resulted in dramatically improved test scores in spelling. When a recorded phone message was made available to parents, every child (except those already scoring 100%) dropped in the average number of spelling test errors. Smith and Brache (1963) conducted a study in which parents attended discussion groups that emphasized the importance of school in preparing to get a job in a technologically oriented society and the importance of parents in setting an example. Parents were asked to read daily to their children, to listen to their children read, and to provide a routine "quiet" time at home for reading and study. They were also asked to be sure that their children had proper school supplies. Over the program's five-month duration, children showed overall gains of 5.4 months in reading compared to 2.7 months in a comparison school not communicating with parents on a daily basis.

Though the conducting of program comparisons is difficult, as is the process of identifying the kinds of involvement that produce the most positive results, reviews of research found parent involvement of almost any kind to
improve student achievement (Epstein, 1983b; Gordon, 1978; Henderson, 1981; Herman and Yeh, 1980; McKinney, 1975). An equally strong case for strengthening parent partnerships in order to advance student achievement was made by Gordon and Breivogel (1976). They concluded:

Significant proportion of the difference in achievement levels of children in the public schools is a function of non-school variables... If legislators, citizens, teachers, and parents are concerned with the total development of the child, including the academic, they cannot afford to ignore what is taking place in the home. They must deal with the contribution of the home in an organized way (p. 9-10).

Meaningful parent involvement significantly impacts achievement. High achievement gains occur when parents commit themselves to the learning process as teachers, supporters, and/or reinforcers (Olmsted and Rubin, 1982). Whether the literature under review pertained to the relationship of parent involvement and educational leaders and researchers or parents and teachers, a common conclusion could be reached. It seems a major result of parent involvement is the salutary effect on the achievement of the student.

**Student Behavior**

A second condition, closely related to parent involvement practices, is student behavior. Time and attention focused on disruptive behavior takes from class instruction. Good classroom management skills can reduce
disruptive behavior, but parents, more so than teachers, control important behavior reinforcers.

In a follow-up study, Gotts (1980) found children who had been involved in a home-based activities program with their parents differed significantly from their peers in school behavior. The children who, at preschool age, had been involved in home activities with their parents, were found by their teachers to be better behaved in junior high. Teachers reported less disorganized behavior, more organized behavior, and fewer behavior problems among the children who had been involved with their parents in the preschool activities program (Gotts).

The use of home-based reinforcement systems and daily reporting have been found to considerably reduce disruptive behaviors (Barth, 1979). Daily checklists sent to parents were also found to be effective in increasing the number of accurately completed class assignments and in the amount of time spent in appropriate social behaviors (Edmund, 1969). Cioffi (1982) included a study by Hornbuckle in his review of literature. In the study, 8000 parents throughout 44 schools served as members of school advisory committees. As a result of improved communication between home, students, and schools, the number of suspensions was reduced. Epstein, in a forthcoming work, included respect for parents and an awareness of the importance of school in a list of expected benefits of parent involvement.
Student Attendance

Student attendance and achievement are highly correlated. Time-on-task is generally accepted as desirable classroom behavior and a predictor of achievement. Students' presence in class, therefore, is critical. Several studies addressed attendance and found schools involving parents effectively corrected attendance and problems related to attendance (Fiordaliso, Lordeman, Filipczak, & Friedman, 1977; Parker & McCoy, 1977; Sheats & Dunkleberger, 1979).

Cioffi (1982) described Simmond's report of Project FAME (Family Activities to Maintain Enrollment). The project targeted students who were likely to drop out of school. Not only did student attendance improve because of the program, but 79 percent of the parents reported that their children would probably continue their education because of their involvement in FAME (Sattes, 1984).

In Houston, student attendance improved after parents began attending parent-teacher conferences. Though the main focus of the conferences was student achievement, improved attendance became a profitable by-product (Cioffi, 1982). In another study by Duncan (1969), counselors met individually with all parents during the summer before their children were to enter junior high. After three years, these students were compared to the class who had entered the year before without parent conferences. Average daily attendance
was different at the .001 level of significance, favoring the group whose parents had been seen individually by counselors (Sattes, 1984).

When parents become involved, they feel more responsible for getting their children to school. As children become academically successful, they are more motivated to attend school. Reported changes in both student and parent attitudes toward school and toward learning produce a home climate where regular school attendance becomes an expected behavior (Cioffi, 1982; Duncan, 1969; McDill, Rigsby, and Meyers, 1969).

Motivation

Like attendance, motivation is related to student achievement. Parent involvement has a positive effect on students' attitudes toward learning. Children who experience success in school come to view it more positively. Success is a major contributor to motivation (Sattes, 1984).

Improved student attitudes are reported in several studies. Gray (1981) reported parent involvement reinforces student learning which, in turn, improves motivation and the quality of education for the child. The Project PAL (Parents and Learning) program in New Mexico produced an increase in positive attitudes toward school and learning (Bush, 1981). A part of a Title I program, parents became involved in learning activities with their children at home.
Not only did classroom performance improve, but excellent gains were made in speech and language development.

Data collected by the Home and School Institute (1983) found that even short term programs encouraging parent involvement promoted feelings of success among students. Increased parent involvement and initiations of interaction between home and school increased students' readiness to do homework and this positive change accelerated as feelings of success built. Also reported, were enthusiastic responses from parents and students toward family learning activities.

Other studies support the positive relationship between parent involvement and student motivation. Mize (1977) reported that Project STEP students, when rated by their teachers and themselves, viewed themselves as having more positive attitudes toward school and as being more motivated to learn. Henderson (1987) concluded that building a strong learning environment at home, which includes holding high expectations and encourages positive attitudes toward education, translates into school performance and motivation to succeed.

No study revealed negative implications related to parent involvement and student motivation. Family attitudes seem to influence a students' desire to learn and more. Olmstead, Rubin, True, and Revicki (1980) described a parent involvement program which utilized three models: the parent impact, the school impact, and the community impact
approaches. Central to these models and approaches was the "belief that children learn from modeling and that as they see their parents in influential roles vis-a-vis the school and community, their motivation is enhanced and is reflected in their actual achievement" (p. 11).

Parent support for learning is directly related to student motivation and goal-setting. Success breeds success. Success is an important contributor to motivation and motivation is an important contributor to success. Students who experience success in school come to view school more positively.

**Self-Esteem**

The final factor relative to students and the significance of parent involvement in schools is self-esteem. Thus far, parent involvement has been shown to result in increased achievement, improved attendance, student behavior and motivation. Closely tied to these positive results is the concept of self-esteem.

In a study of fifth and sixth graders who had behavior problems, a parent-counseled group scored more favorably on three measures of self-concept than did a control group who received no counseling (Hayes, Cunningham, & Robinson, 1977). Mize (1977) and Cioffi (1982) also reported that as the academic expectations of parents increased, students' self-perceptions improved. In Project ACT (Accountability in Citizenship Training), teams of parents, teachers, and
students worked together to reduce inappropriate student behaviors (Cioffi). Peer parents made home visits. The fifth, sixth, and seventh graders involved in the program showed, not only improved self-esteem, but also improved attendance at school.

Sometimes improved self-esteem is a by-product of improved achievement. Significant gains in self-concept have been documented from parent involvement programs with low-achieving students. Mize (1977) concluded, from a study by Brookover, that increased academic expectations of parents resulted in improved self-esteem among students. Similarly, Cioffi (1982) reported that students in grades three through six who received tutoring from their parents in the school setting showed achievement gains as well as improved self-esteem.

Parent involvement has a positive effect on children's self-esteem and their attitudes toward learning. Parents, teachers and students working together to address behavior problems can positively impact self-concept. Increased academic expectations among parents and improved student behavior result in students developing a more positive self-esteem.

Parent Behaviors and Attitudes

Parents support schools by providing volunteer assistance, cooperating in home learning, acting as "audience" for programs, serving as members of governing
bodies, and/or by taking part in the decision making process by providing input on school policy. These roles, though not all directly affecting the parents' own child, benefit all children and the school as a whole. Parents are also beneficiaries.

Alden (1979) found school volunteer programs promoted positive changes through personal participation for parent volunteers. An increased understanding of children, more knowledge of their own child's education, and an enhancement of the parent-child-teacher relationship occurred. Other studies confirm parent attitudes and behaviors change as a result of involvement with their children's learning experiences. Gordon, Olmsted, Rubin, and True (1978), analyzed data from ten Follow-through programs. They found a measure of Desirable Teaching Behaviors occurred significantly more often among Follow-through parents than non-Follow through parents. These desirable behaviors were significantly related to children's performance on reading and math tests. Herman and Yeh (1983) and Stough (1982) surveyed parents and found those who participated in schools expressed higher levels of satisfaction with both the school and their own children's achievement. McKinney (1975) reported parents who trained as tutors had significantly more positive attitudes toward school after their involvement in the program. They differed significantly from control group parents who did not train as tutors.
To review, research clearly supports that parent attitudes and behaviors are influenced by involvement with schools. Parents' positive attitudes get communicated to children and serve to shape a child's school performance. Parent involvement produces changes in parents. Parents who are involved view schools more positively than parents who are not involved. Some programs involve parents directly in home-learning or as tutors. Other programs involve parents in a support role or in an audience role rather than a direct teaching role. Regardless of the role, a more informed and participatory parent populace translates into school, student, and parent beneficiaries.

In summary, there is a close connection between parent involvement and preschool learning, student achievement, improved attendance, behavior, motivation, and self-esteem. Those parent activities which directly involve the child were seen as having considerable influence on cognitive development and social behavior. As Gordon (1977) found, the home is important. It is basic to human development and the early years, in particular, are important for lifelong development. Attendance and achievement are intertwined. As attendance improves, so does achievement. Increased achievement results in improved attendance. Behavior, motivation, and self-esteem are related. As disruptive behavior diminishes, motivation and self-esteem increase. School success is dependent upon a combination of factors.
Many of these factors, such as achievement, behavior, attendance, motivation and self-esteem, are directly related to, and in large part, dependent upon parent involvement.

**Parent Involvement Programs**

The inclusion of parent involvement policies in education is research based. The importance of parent involvement and the home/school/community link have been recognized at all government levels. Legislation and mandates have addressed the need for increased parent involvement and home support in education.

**National Level**

Policy makers at both the federal and state levels have impacted parent participation in schools. The passage of the landmark "Elementary and Secondary Education Act" in 1965 marked a new beginning for parent involvement (Pulliam, 1987). Congress made parent involvement mandatory in several federal programs. Among these were Title I, Headstart, and P.L. 94-142 (the "Education for All Handicapped Children Act"). The National Education Association, the National School Volunteer Program, and the National Parent Teacher Organization have also addressed the issue of parent involvement by publishing parenting guides, providing resources, and offering suggestions on how and why involvement is important to education (Williams and Chavkin, 1989).
Epstein (1991) described two federal initiatives with promising parent involvement components. The first, Chapter I, is a federally funded program aimed at providing remediation for underachieving students. This program emphasizes and specifies the importance of family involvement. Chapter I has always required parent involvement, and the Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Amendments of 1988 reaffirmed this commitment (D'Angelo and Adler, 1991). New regulations governing Chapter I broaden the definition of parent involvement. Regulations also require programs to assess their effectiveness in increasing parent involvement.

A second federal initiative reviewed by Epstein (1991) are the competitive FIRST (Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching) grants. These grants encourage creative and innovative planning at the local level. Grants are awarded localities for designing, planning and implementing school programs which discover new possibilities for school/family/community partnerships.

Other federal initiatives include Head Start, Home Start, and Follow-through. Historically, the emphasis of parent involvement components in such programs, has been on teaching parents how to teach their children (Gordon, 1975; Weikart and Lambie, 1970). In the final report from the National Institute of Education on the Study of Compensatory
Education (1978), parent involvement was described as taking one of two forms:

Parents may play a direct role in the education process by acting as teachers or as learning aides, or they act in an advisory or decision making capacity to the agency providing services. Most research studies have focused on the first role, noting that parents may be quite effective partners in their children’s education (p. 4).

Upon investigation of Head Start programs, Mowry (1972), reported that early childhood intervention programs made a difference. He also reported that programs with strong parent involvement were more successful than programs with less participation. A companion to the center-based Head Start program was the compensatory educational home-based program called Home Start. Deloria, Loelen, and Ruopp (1974) studied 15 pilot Home Start programs from 1972-75 and found that parents were seen as the major means of helping children.

Since the 1980’s, there has been a movement toward the development of family support systems for families and assistance in obtaining economic help and social services (Snow, 1982; Weisbourd, 1983; Welsh and Odum, 1981; Powell, 1986; Rundall and Smith, 1985). A promising development at the federal level is the support by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement for a new five-year Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children’s Learning. Epstein (1991) reports that the center will
extend the research and development agenda on the partnerships among and between those institutions which most effect children's learning from birth through adolescence. This investment attests to the federal government's recognition that the joint role of families, schools, and communities is an important and valued one.

Today a number of national organizations encourage partnerships between home, school, and community. The National Governor's Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers have initiated projects centered around family and community involvement. Epstein (1991) reports that the National Association of State Boards of Education has published a booklet entitled Partners in Educational Improvement: Schools, Parents, and the Community. Likewise, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) held a conference and issued a report on what states can do to promote parent involvement (Epstein). ECS continuously monitors progress in parent involvement through its All Children Can Learn Program, as well as other programs.

Parent involvement in the education of children has and continues to be addressed at the national level. The federal government has included parent involvement components in several compensatory education programs. National organizations have also recognized the importance of parent involvement and have taken initiatives which
encourage effective partnerships between home, school, and community.

State Level

State level legislation, policies, programs, and staffing are essential to parent involvement as they provide guidelines and legitimize the requirements districts and local schools use when setting their own policies and plans involving parents (Epstein, 1991). In a study of states and parent involvement activities, Epstein reported that 20 states have enacted parent involvement legislation. She went on to report that nine states (Hawaii, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Nevada, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Vermont) devote one or more full time staff members to parent involvement for each 100,000 students.

Four states (Missouri, Oregon, South Carolina, and Massachusetts) have explicit statutory mandates to ensure state-wide parent involvement programs (Epstein, 1991). In Missouri, the Early Childhood Development Program requires family support services and parent involvement education be provided in every school district. Oregon enacted extensive legislation concerning parent involvement. The state department of education in Oregon administers state supported and approved programs which help families more effectively foster their children’s cognitive, social, and physical development (Epstein).
A 1985 school reform law in Massachusetts includes a provision for School Improvement Councils at the building level, with direct grants of money on a per student basis to be used to establish innovation programs and support community or parent involvement programs (Davies, 1991). Davies also reported that a comprehensive education reform act was passed in 1976 in South Carolina that mandated School Improvement Councils for every building in the state. The council consists of at least two parents elected by parents and members representing community organizations.

Other State programs, such as Active Parenting in Tennessee and New Jersey's SchoolWatch, Inc. have helped parents define their role in school improvement efforts and encouraged greater involvement to improve quality education (Lueder, 1989; Silvestri, 1989). Schoolwatch, Inc. is a nonprofit statewide coalition with the principal objective of intensifying parent involvement through publications and technical assistance. Davis (1989) reported the California State Board of Education adopted a policy to ensure collaborative partnerships between family and school in which administrators (school principals) were ordered to increase parent involvement.

In view of the magnitude of societal problems, as well as concerns with regard to family life, the recommendation that state boards of education, in coalition with parents, educators, and the business community develop parenting
education curricula has been made (Tyree, Vance, and Boals, 1991). While some learning in school may not be utilized, most students do eventually become parents. Many receive no formal training. Tyree, Vance, and Boals went on to report that public school cooperation with state agencies which deal with parenting is necessary in order to coordinate services provided by other organizations and institutions.

Some states claim that federal regulations are sufficient to promote parent involvement, but many have taken the steps necessary themselves. Parent involvement is supported at the state level in many states. With the strategic application of legislation, policies, and guidelines, and the judicious allocation of state and federal funds, states have demonstrated their recognition of the importance of parent involvement and their commitment to it.

Local Level

Parent involvement is recognized as significantly important to the educational process of children. Researchers and educational leaders, as well as teachers and parents agree. Local school districts have been both required and encouraged to promote parent involvement. Many have responded and experience high levels of parent involvement.

There are 15 to 20 city-wide parent/citizen educational support and monitoring groups in different cities in the
country that provide information and services to parents and promote public awareness and support of public schools across the country (Davies, 1991). The Parent Teacher Association (PTA) is the oldest and, by far the largest vehicle for parent involvement at the local level. The Philadelphia Parents Union, the Public Education Association in New York City, and the city-wide Education Coalition in Boston are also examples of local efforts which advocate parent involvement and home/school partnerships (Davies).

In the Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS), parent involvement is not new. In 1978, the district submitted a proposal and was awarded a grant to enhance parent involvement (Warner, 1991). The result was the establishment of Parents in Touch, a multifaceted system-wide parent involvement program which is still in place today. Emerson School in Rosemead, California used appropriate recognition and constant communication to reach a high level of parent involvement (Davis, 1989). Similiarly, Houston initiated the FailSafe program which connects schools and families, organizes parent/teacher conferences, and allows families to borrow school computers for home use (Epstein, 1991).

Even though parent involvement is recognized as significantly important to the educational process of children and federal mandates coupled with state-wide efforts are in place, great variance in parent involvement
continues at the local level. Some factors exist over which schools have little control. Today's parents are often preoccupied with the distractions and demands of daily life (Brandt, 1989). Burdened by low-income, custodial care, inflexible work hours, and language barriers, parents are unable to attend school activities or participate in the schooling of their children on a regular basis (Ascher, 1988).

Davis (1989) found many parents suffer from low self-esteem; others did not experience success in school themselves and therefore lack the knowledge and confidence to help their children. Boyer (1989) found, in a national survey, American teachers are greatly concerned that children are not receiving support from their parents.

Ascher, however, reported low-income urban parents can and want to participate in the education of their children as much as middle class parents (1988). She went on to report that often single parent participation is hampered by inflexible leave policies and child-care responsibilities. Many school officials tend to decide in advance that single and low-income working parents cannot be approached or relied upon. They are not expected to observe in the classroom of their children, attend meetings, or provide effective help with home learning activities (Ascher).

The social, economic, linguistic, and cultural practices of parents are all too often presented as areas of
concern or as problems. Finders and Lewis (1994) encourage a reexamination of our assumptions about parents and the absence of some parents from school related activities. They concluded educators may find their interpretations of parents who care may simply be parents who feel comfortable at school and who experienced success during their own schooling.

In the early Seventies, educators began to implement forms of school-based management in an effort to respond to the changing characteristics of the communities and neighborhoods served (Taylor and Levine, 1991). Participation in decision making was seen as a key variable in developing motivation and commitment. Site-based, or school-based management is a form of school district organization that makes the individual school the unit where a significant number of decisions about school and the schooling process of children take place.

As early as 1975, Scribner and Stevens (1975) stated that the hope for the reform of the public school rested with the public and, in particular, parents. They concluded that:

Parents must believe they are capable of governing schools, able to select teachers and principals, worthy of making the decision as to how their children will be educated...parents have yet to take their ultimate role, their ultimate responsibility: to control their schools as a piece of their government (p.123-124).
This is a compelling argument for the involvement of parents in education as their potential power for reformation is, as yet, unrealized.

Lindle (1989) reported educators are mistaken if they think parents do not care. Her research showed parents of all races and social classes want to help their children if they can, but many do not know how. Data from parents in economically depressed communities reported they needed the school’s help to know what to do to help their children (Epstein, in press).

To review, parent involvement has been addressed at the national, state, and local level. Legislation at the national and state level has mandated parent involvement. Federal initiatives have encouraged parent involvement, as well as school/family/community partnerships by offering competitive grants and funding for innovative, growth-oriented programs involving parents. At the local level, however, parent involvement continues to vary. The desire of parents to be involved in the education of their children crosses socio-economic and geographic boundaries. Educators are also reported to desire higher levels of parent involvement. The emergence of site-based management provides new possibilities for increasing parent involvement.
Role of the Principal

Effective parent involvement programs depend on both parents and schools. Administrators, teachers, and parents must believe that parent involvement is important and work together. Responsibility for initiating parent involvement often falls on the school. Schools need to provide opportunities for meaningful parent participation.

Principals occupy a strategic position in the school's organizational structure for developing and maintaining a school climate conducive to parent involvement. As instructional leader and site-base manager, the principal has the opportunity to role model behaviors which forge strong links between parents, school, and the community (Seeley, 1989).

Research indicates that effective schools have effective leadership (Hodgkinson, 1982; Maryland Department of Education, 1978; Persell, 1982). This leadership is usually provided by the building administrator. One summary of effective schools notes that "the most important single factor in school improvement is the leadership of the individual school principal" (Hodkinson, 1982, p. 2). Principals, in cooperation with other school and community agencies, can model their concern for parents and provide valuable information and ideas to parents which could help them in their roles of provider and first teacher. Parents
and the community, in general, look to the school principal for leadership, support, and guidance.

Of particular importance, is the opportunity afforded each individual school to impact the level of parent participation among the single and low-income parents. Ascher (1988) concluded that many school officials predetermine the level of parent involvement and expect a lower level of participation from single and low-income parents. The building principal sets the tone of the school. Parents and teachers alike tend to rely on the building principal to role model certain behaviors, as well as identify and emphasize areas of importance related to parent involvement.

Davies (1976) reported that the individual school is the prime unit for educational planning and change and that the interests of parents are most easily mobilized and sustained around the policies and practices of the schools their children attend. The school principal emerges as the natural leader to promote such change and the participation of parents. Fox (1973) described the leadership role of the principal as a powerful one, embodying the authority to initiate new programs.

It is reasonable to conclude that, in large part, parent involvement may be a direct result of the leadership of the principal. Empirical investigations suggest that principals play a crucial role in determining the amount of
and the effectiveness of parental participation (Goldring, 1986). Jacobsen et al. (1973) reported the quality of an elementary education program is dependent upon the leadership abilities possessed by the principal. Research studies concluded that both the functioning and influence of parent advisory committees were dependent upon the attitudes of principals toward these committees (Goldring). Committed leadership is critically important to effective parent involvement programs.

While written policies legitimize attempts, parents generally await guidance and direction from educators. The building principal is provided substantial opportunities for creating and maintaining cooperative support through parent involvement (Goldring, 1986). Strong school governance and increased understanding and appreciation for school policies and the decision-making process are possible through cooperative parent-school efforts (Goldring). An excerpt from a United States Senate Select Committee (Phi Delta Kappa, 1973) described the leadership role of the principal thusly:

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He is the person responsible for all the activities that occur in and around the school building...he is the main link between the school and the community and the way he performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school (p. 122).
Schmieder, McGrevin, and Townley (1994) suggested that the role of the principal demands a creative, enthusiastic, uniting, and collaborative approach to leadership. They also reported that superintendents believe principals must bring together a wide variety of people, both internal and external, in order to establish a vision, develop a strategy, and plan to meet the needs of students. With the current emphasis on site-based management and the mutual dependency between parents and schools mandated by such management, the role of the principal increases in significance. A new type of accountability is developing as parents are being asked to take a greater part in the decision-making process (Seeley, 1989). A new paradigm for parent involvement is evolving and the role of the principal is strategic.

Summary

There is strong evidence that parent involvement closely parallels student achievement, behavior, and attendance. Research indicates the single most important factor in student achievement is the home background of the child. Parent involvement was found to be more important than the quality of schools. A second condition closely related to parent involvement practices is student behavior. Parents, more so than teachers, control important behavior reinforcers. Teachers reported less disorganized behavior,
more organized behavior, and fewer behavior problems among children whose parents were involved in their education.

Student attendance and achievement are highly correlated. Several studies addressed attendance and found schools involving parents effectively corrected attendance and problems related to attendance. As parents became involved and more responsible for getting their children to school, attendance improved. As attendance improved, children became more successful academically.

Motivation and self-esteem are also related to parent involvement. Parent involvement reinforces student learning which, in turn, improves motivation and the quality of education for the child. Family attitudes seem to influence the desire of the student to learn. Increased parent involvement and initiations of interaction between home and school increased the readiness of students to do well. This positive change accelerated as feelings of success built.

Self-esteem is a by-product of motivation and success. Significant gains in self-concept have been documented from parent involvement programs with low-achieving students. Increased academic expectations of parents resulted in improved self-esteem among students. Studies indicated students who received tutoring from their parents at home and in the school setting showed achievement gains as well as improved self-esteem.
Parent involvement benefits the parent, as well as the child. School volunteer programs promoted changes through personal participation for parent volunteers. An increased understanding of children, more knowledge of the education of their children, and an enhancement of the parent-child-teacher relationship occurred when parents became involved in school.

Schools were also found to benefit. As parents viewed policies and programs more favorably, they tended, in general, to be more satisfied and supportive of their respective schools. Parent involvement produces changes in parents. Whether the parent was involved in an active or supportive role, a more informed and participatory parent populace translated into school, student, and parent beneficiaries.

Though parent involvement has been recognized as critical to education and has been addressed at the national, state, and local level, variance continues among schools. Research studies indicate the desire of parents to be involved in the education of their children crosses socio-economic and geographic boundaries. Responsibility for initiating and supporting parent involvement often falls on the school.

As instructional leader, community-school liaison, and site-based manager, the role of the building principal was identified as critical in the establishment and perpetuation
of programs encouraging parent involvement. It is the building principal who role models, provides the leadership, support, and guidance necessary for effective parent involvement practices and programs to exist.

Each individual school is afforded the opportunity to impact the level of parent involvement enjoyed by that school. The significance of the role of the principal in facilitating parent involvement warrants study. The identification of principal attitudes may contribute useful information to present principals, school systems, educators, and to future administrators.
CHAPTER 3
Methods and Procedures

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the attitudes of elementary school principals in Virginia toward parent involvement. This chapter describes the procedures followed in the study. The research design, population identification and sample selection are included, as well as a description of the instrument used in gathering the data and procedures followed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the data analysis procedures.

Research Design

This study is a combination of both descriptive and correlational research designs. Descriptive research involves the collection of data in order to answer questions and/or test hypotheses (Long, Convey, and Chwalek, 1988). Correlational research involves the collection of data in order to investigate the degree to which relationships exist between certain variables. The goal of the study was to describe what actually exists, as well as examine relationships between selected variables. No effort was undertaken to manipulate the variables or influence the findings through intervention.
Instrumentation

The instrumentation for this study is described in stages. The first stage discusses the initial development of the instrument. The second stage addresses the validity of the initial instrument. The pilot instrument is then described. The fourth stage discusses the pilot study and procedures followed. The fifth and final stage describes the validity and reliability procedures conducted on the final instrument.

Initial Instrument

An extensive review of literature on parent involvement in schools was conducted. Having established the merit in identifying and analyzing the attitudes of elementary principals toward parent involvement in schools, available instruments were reviewed. The review of instruments included, but was not limited to, the School Climate Survey designed by Kelley, Glover, Keefe, Halderson, Sorenson, and Speth and published by the Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments in 1986 and the Parent Involvement Questionnaire by Williams and Chavkin which was published by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory in 1981. Due to the lack of previous research on the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement and, consequently, the limited number of published instruments directly related to the topic, the researcher ascertained an instrument tailored to meet the needs of study was required.
Validity of the Initial Instrument

The Parent Involvement Inventory was developed by the researcher in collaboration with educational administrators, teachers, and parents. Two experienced researchers were also consulted during the initial development process. The panel of experts reviewing the initial Parent Involvement Inventory included both a Tennessee and Virginia elementary principal, a parent involvement senior consultant/trainer, an elementary teacher, a Parent Teacher Association president, and two parents currently involved in the education of their children. A list of the names of the panelists is included in Appendix A. Each panelist was asked to answer predetermined questions related to the questionnaire. The wording of the statements, relevancy, statement clarity and conciseness were all evaluated. Format and readability, as well as the length of the instrument were examined. Panelists were encouraged to include their own comments and suggestions. A copy of the evaluation form is included in Appendix C.

Validity equates to truth. Content validity is the degree to which an instrument measures that which it is intended to measure (Borg and Gall, 1983). The intent of this study was to measure the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools.

Content validation is frequently determined by a panel of experts who are recognized for their knowledge of the
subject. Validation procedures of the initial instrument included, but were not limited to, the careful analysis and review of responses of panelists to a set of predetermined questions, as well as a review of all comments and suggestions.

**Pilot Instrument**

The pilot instrument consisted of 50 statements related to parent involvement in schools. Items were chosen to reflect the purpose of the scale and were stated clearly and simply. Redundancy was employed in order to express similar ideas in different ways.

The researcher guarded against ambiguity, double negatives, and double barreled items. An attempt was made to structure items describing specific attitudes and behaviors rather than general attributes in order to reduce bias, ambiguity, and confusion. Both positively and negatively worded statements were included to prevent response set.

A four point Likert scale was selected to determine the extent to which principals agreed or disagreed with the statements regarding parent involvement in schools. According to DeVellis (1991), a good Likert scale states item opinions, attitudes, beliefs, and other constructs being studied in clear terms. Respondents were asked whether they (1) strongly disagreed, (2) disagreed, (3) agreed, or (4) strongly agreed with the statement.
Pilot Study

Following approval from the Institutional Review Board, the pilot instrument was administered to fifty principals from the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Principals were asked to complete the questionnaire and then evaluate the survey instrument by answering a predetermined set of questions. They were encouraged to include comments and suggestions. The time necessary for completion was also noted.

The administration of the pilot instrument served several purposes. The researcher desired to reascertain that the wording of the instrument is clear and understandable. The evaluation of the overall format, readability and clarity of statements was again made possible. The researcher was also able to establish an approximate time frame in relationship to the period of time necessary for the completion of the instrument. A copy of the cover letter, as well as the set of evaluation questions is included in the appendices. The cover letter and evaluation questions can be found in Appendix D.
The findings and comments from completed evaluations of the pilot instrument were compiled and carefully analyzed. Data from the pilot instruments were analyzed using SPSS/PC+. A frequency chart procedure was conducted using SPSS/PC+ to determine frequencies of responses. Descriptive statistics were generated to produce an overall picture of the questionnaire responses and obtain a composite picture of respondent characteristics. Mean scores were ranked for the purpose of identifying those items which received the strongest positive and negative responses.

**Reliability and Validity of the Final Instrument**

The usefulness of an attitude scale depends upon its properties. A useful scale, at minimum, must be reliable or yield consistent results. It must be valid to the extent it measures that which it is supposed to measure. Cronbach's Alpha is the procedure most commonly used to establish reliability coefficients thereby determining internal consistency or reliability. Norusis (1988) stated that Alpha is based on the average correlations of items within a test, if the items are standardized to a standard deviation of 1; or, if the items are not standardized, on the average covariance among items on a scale.

Cronbach's Alpha procedure was conducted on the pilot instrument. Using the SPSS/PC Statistical Software Package, a determination was made as to the relationship of individual items with other items on the scales. An
inspection of the item/total statistics was made to ascertain whether or not item deletion was warranted.

Criteria for the deletion of items included (1) items on the total scale which, when deleted, increased the coefficient alpha of the total scale beyond the obtained value for the total scale, and (2) items on the total scale having an initial item total score correlation of less than .55. The reliability coefficient provided by Cronbach’s Alpha procedure (raw score) for the total scale was .8014 and standardized item alpha was .8045. The split-half reliability procedure conducted on the final instrument revealed an alpha for part 1 of .6652 and an alpha for part 2 of .7287. Equal Length Spearman-Brown indicated a reliability coefficient of .6998, Guttman Split-Half indicated .6954, and the Unequal Length Spearman-Brown revealed a coefficient of .6998.

Having addressed the issue of content validity, as well as instrument reliability, the researcher again carefully reviewed and analyzed all findings and conclusions. Format and clarity of directions were re-evaluated. Statement clarity, conciseness, readability, and relevance were reviewed. The final instrument was professionally printed and prepared for mailing.

Population

The population for this study consisted of all public school elementary principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia
as recorded by the Virginia State Department of Education. The Virginia Directory of Public Schools, 1992-93 was used to assemble the sampling frame. The directory listed 1,142 elementary principals for the 1992-93 school year.

**Selection of Sample**

Following the identification of the population, a sample was drawn. A random sampling procedure was employed. In order to obtain a sample estimate of plus or minus 5% with a 95% degree of confidence, a sample size of 284 was needed. Of the elementary school principals surveyed, 284 must return the questionnaire in order to accurately represent the population of 1,142 elementary principals in the State of Virginia. To insure an appropriate number of responses, 700 principals were sent questionnaires, thereby allowing for an acceptable 40% return rate. Data from returned questionnaires were analyzed using SPSS/PC+.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The initial step completed for this study was conducting a review of literature to ascertain whether sufficient research data could be located to support the study. Instrumentation was then addressed. The questionnaire method was utilized. Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University.
Following the selection of schools, survey instruments were mailed to the selected principals. A cover letter encouraging participation and expressing appreciation accompanied each instrument. Self-addressed stamped questionnaires were utilized to simplify return. Following a period of one month, a second mailing to non-respondents took place. A copy of the initial cover letter is included in Appendix F. The survey instrument is included in Appendix E. In addition to a copy of the initial cover letter, a copy of the follow-up cover letter to non-respondents is included in Appendix G.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data collected from the survey were analyzed in several ways. Descriptive statistics were generated to produce an overall picture of questionnaire responses and obtain a composite picture of respondent characteristics. Item means were ranked for the purpose of identifying those items which received the strongest positive and negative responses.

Standard deviations were used to identify items with the greatest variation in responses. These items were broken down by demographic variables to determine which factors, if any, accounted for the response variance. A principal components factor analysis was conducted in order to identify and label underlying constructs.
Multiple regression was used to demonstrate relationships between dependent variables and the set of predictor variables. The information obtained from each profile sheet (school and principal) was summarized and presented in table format. Inferential statistics were used in an attempt to generalize the results to the entire state of Virginia.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses were tested in the null form as indicated below:

\( H_01 \). There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the gender of the principal when controlling for age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

\( H_02 \). There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the age of the principal when controlling for gender, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

\( H_03 \). There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the teaching
experience of the principal when controlling for
gender, age, educational background, school
socio-economic status, size, and population
density.

\[ H_4 \]. There will be no significant relationship
between the attitudes of principals toward
parent involvement in schools and the educational
background of the principal when
controlling for gender, age, teaching
experience, school socio-economic status,
size, and population density.

\[ H_5 \]. There will be no significant relationship
between the attitudes of principals toward
parent involvement in schools and school socio-
economic status when controlling for gender,
age, teaching experience, educational
background, size, and population density.

\[ H_6 \]. There will be no significant relationship
between the attitudes of principals toward
parent involvement in schools and school size
when controlling for gender, age, teaching
experience, educational background, school
socio-economic status, and population
density.
There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and population density when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, and size.
CHAPTER 4

Presentation of Data

Introduction

The variance found in parent involvement among schools may be a result of the attitudes of building principals toward parent involvement. The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the attitudes of elementary school principals toward parent involvement. Chapter 4 contains the data analysis for the study.

Analysis of Data

The population for this study consisted of all public school elementary principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia as recorded by the Virginia State Department of Education. Data were gathered during the period of November 1993 through February 1994. Two hundred seventy-six survey instruments were received from an initial mailing of 700 for a return rate of 39.4%. A second mailing to non-respondents resulted in the receiving of an additional ninety-five surveys. This brought the combined and final return total to three hundred seventy-one surveys which resulted in an overall return rate of 53%.

Demographic Data

Demographic data were obtained from 11 items on Part II of the Parent Involvement Inventory which focused on
demographic and professional information. Data were obtained regarding age, gender, number of years as an elementary principal, last year as a classroom teacher, number of years as an elementary teacher, undergraduate major, and highest level of education attained. In addition to individual principal data, other demographic variables focused on the number of students in school, population density, percentage of children on free or reduced lunch, and Chapter I designation.

Item 1 on the data sheet asked the respondents to indicate their age. Of the 371 principals responding, 43% fell within the age range of 45 or younger. Only 2.7% were under age 35 and 10.4% were over age 56. Overall, the majority, or 71.8%, were age 50 or younger. Basic descriptive statistics revealed a mean of 47, a median of 46, and a standard deviation of 6.51. Data depicting age classifications are found in Table 1.

Item 2 on the data sheet asked respondents to indicate their number of years as an elementary principal. The majority of the respondents, 160 or 43.2%, reported less than 5 years experience, followed by the 6-10 year range for 84 respondents or 22.79%. Only 13 respondents or 3.5% reported more than 25 years experience as an elementary principal. Basic descriptive statistics revealed a mean of 9, a median of 6, and a standard deviation of 7.76. Data are presented in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 or Under</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and Over</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Missing Cases = 6.
Table 2

**Number of Years as Elementary Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Principal</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years or Less</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Missing Cases = 1.
Item 3 on the data sheet asked respondents to indicate their last year as a classroom teacher. Of the 371 principals who responded, 113 or 30.5% fell in the 6-10 year range with almost equal representation in the under 5 years with 59 or 15.9%, the 11-15 years out of the classroom with 53 or 14.3%, and the 16-20 years with 50 respondents or 13.5%. The fewest number of respondents fell in the 25 and over category with only 25 or 6.8%. Basic descriptive statistics revealed a mean of 14 years, a median of 16 years, and a standard deviation of 7.80. Data are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Year as Teacher</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years Ago or Less</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 1.
Item 4 on the data sheet asked respondents to indicate their number of years as an elementary teacher. The majority of respondents, 114 or 31.4%, fell in the 6-10 years experience range. Only 13 or 3.5% respondents reported more than 21 elementary teaching experience and 46 or 12.7% reported no elementary teaching experience. Basic descriptive statistics revealed a mean of 8, a median of 7, and a standard deviation of 6.17. Data are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Number of Years as Elementary Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Teacher</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and Over</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 8.
Item 5 asked respondents to identify their undergraduate major. Over half, 197 or 53.1% were not elementary education majors. There were 174 or 46.9% who reported majoring in elementary education. Data are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Major</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 0.

Item 6 on the demographic and professional information sheet asked respondents to report the number of students in their respective schools. The majority of respondents, 159 or 43.0%, fell in the 251-500 students range. Of those responding, 59 or 15.9% reported fewer than 250 students and only 25 or 6.8% reported 751 or more students. Basic descriptive statistics revealed a mean of 459, a median
of 450, and a standard deviation of 210.19. Data are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Number of Students in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250 and Fewer</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-750</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751 and Over</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 1.

Item 7 asked respondents to identify the percentage of students in their schools on free or reduced lunch. The majority, 137 or 38.7%, reported fewer than 25% of their students were on free or reduced lunch. There were 125 cases or 35.3% which fell in the 25-49% range and only 33 or 9.3% fell in the 75-100% range. Valid cases numbered 354 with 17 missing cases. Basic descriptive statistics revealed a mean of 34, a median of 30, and a standard deviation of 23.86. Data are presented in Table 7.
Table 7

Percentage of Students on Free or Reduced Lunch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 17.

Item 8 asked respondents to identify whether or not their school was designated as a Chapter I School. The majority, 244 or 66.3%, responded yes. The remaining, 124 or 33.7%, respondents reported their schools were not designated as Chapter I Schools. Valid cases consisted of 368 with 3 cases missing. Data are presented in Table 8.
Table 8
Designation as Chapter I School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter I School</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 371 100.0

Note. Missing Cases = 3.

Item 9 on the data sheet asked respondents to categorize their schools as either rural or urban. Of the 370 valid cases, 173 or 46.8% reported their schools to be rural, while 181 or 48.9% reported their schools were urban. Data are presented in Table 9.

Table 9
Classification as Rural or Urban School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural or Urban School</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 371 100.0

Note. Missing Cases = 17.
Item 10 asked for gender classification. Of the 371 principals responding, 192 or 51.9% were male and 178 or 48.1% were female. There were no missing cases. Data are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Principals</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 0.

The final item on the demographic and professional information data sheet asked respondents to indicate the highest education level they had attained. Of the 371 principals responding, 130 or 35.3% reported their highest level of education was a masters degree. There were 135 or 36.7% who reported the masters plus 30 hours as their highest level attained. Fifty reported attaining the certificate of advanced studies. Only 52 or 14.1% responded they had attained the doctoral degree. There were 3 missing cases. Data are presented in Table 11.
Table 11

Highest Education Level Attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters + 30</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Advanced Studies</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 3.

Factor Analysis Procedures

Data from the study were initially subjected to factor analysis in order to discern the number of desired factors which could be derived from the responses to the survey data. The analysis procedure included three steps: (a) factors were condensed through principal components analysis to establish a starting point for rotation, (b) rotation of factors to achieve a more interpretable factor solution, and (c) labeling of factors. The principal components method for initial extraction of factor analysis was used. The factors were rotated using uncorrelated (varimax)
rotation. The varimax rotation is the most commonly used orthogonal rotation to a simple structure and one in which a variety of algorithms is used. The procedure attempts to minimize the number of variables which have high loadings on a factor and enhances the interpretation of factors. Only those principal component factors having an eigenvalue of 1 or more were subject to selection of a factor solution. The orthogonal solution accounted for as much of the total variance as possible, and therefore, resulting factors were interpretable and shared communality.

Factor Analysis

Principal data were initially factored using the SPSS/PC+ Statistical Software Package without a specified number of factors sought. The program extracted 4 factors with the varimax rotation converging in 3 iterations. The four-factor solution accounted for 37.8% of the variance. An additional factor analysis procedure was conducted specifying a five factor criteria. The five-factor solution converged in 7 iterations using the varimax rotation. The five-factor solution accounted for 42.7% of the variance.

The five-factor solution was selected as the optimal factor structure to explain the data because this solution provided for 42.7% of the variance, all
five factors were interpretable to some extent, and aspects of the four-factor solution could be identified in the five-factor solution. Table 12 contains the eigenvalues and percentages of explained variance for the principal components analysis for the five-factor solution of the survey instrument.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.495</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.377</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal factors 1 through 5 contain the following number of items: 1=7, 2=6, 3=5, 4=2, and 5=5. Table 13 depicts the pattern matrix for the 5 factor solution. The left-hand side contains the item numbers for the survey instrument. Items 11, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, and 28 loaded on Factor 1. Items 4, 6, 14,
24, 29, and 30 loaded on Factor 2. Factor 3 contained items 8, 13, 15, 16, and 17. Factor 4 contained items 20 and 26. Items 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10 loaded on Factor 5.

Table 13

Principal Factor Analysis

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.77768</td>
<td>.12875</td>
<td>.06774</td>
<td>.04083</td>
<td>.01024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.74156</td>
<td>.17826</td>
<td>.13244</td>
<td>.01687</td>
<td>.01024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.71768</td>
<td>.02690</td>
<td>.07252</td>
<td>-.09079</td>
<td>.05131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.63814</td>
<td>.35910</td>
<td>.08390</td>
<td>.06829</td>
<td>.16444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.55533</td>
<td>.11632</td>
<td>.09824</td>
<td>.14619</td>
<td>.13857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.50609</td>
<td>-.09375</td>
<td>-.13665</td>
<td>.28826</td>
<td>-.17678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.39652</td>
<td>.37082</td>
<td>.07493</td>
<td>-.12393</td>
<td>.17433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.05950</td>
<td>.69757</td>
<td>-.02476</td>
<td>.04530</td>
<td>.06268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.05796</td>
<td>.65546</td>
<td>.16951</td>
<td>-.16111</td>
<td>.15545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.27960</td>
<td>.64909</td>
<td>-.02030</td>
<td>-.06429</td>
<td>-.07354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.13392</td>
<td>.51226</td>
<td>.06515</td>
<td>.03194</td>
<td>.04705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.09100</td>
<td>.48651</td>
<td>.28718</td>
<td>-.02681</td>
<td>-.04469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.32573</td>
<td>.46716</td>
<td>.13475</td>
<td>-.03939</td>
<td>.03619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (Continued)
Principal Factor Analysis
Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.28596</td>
<td>-0.09740</td>
<td>0.68972</td>
<td>-0.12803</td>
<td>-0.05862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.22544</td>
<td>0.14041</td>
<td>0.59070</td>
<td>-0.05130</td>
<td>-0.12011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.07938</td>
<td>0.39066</td>
<td>0.59002</td>
<td>-0.00269</td>
<td>0.12659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.11370</td>
<td>-0.03622</td>
<td>0.51834</td>
<td>0.15649</td>
<td>0.04414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.26192</td>
<td>0.29170</td>
<td>0.50263</td>
<td>-0.00119</td>
<td>0.01733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.03679</td>
<td>0.01476</td>
<td>0.01165</td>
<td>0.81404</td>
<td>-0.25745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.00285</td>
<td>-0.09624</td>
<td>0.05449</td>
<td>0.73872</td>
<td>-0.10948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.12594</td>
<td>-0.07040</td>
<td>-0.0160</td>
<td>-0.32502</td>
<td>0.62006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.08886</td>
<td>0.04418</td>
<td>0.00657</td>
<td>-0.02947</td>
<td>0.58894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.12014</td>
<td>0.26372</td>
<td>0.14150</td>
<td>-0.01049</td>
<td>0.53534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11600</td>
<td>0.31330</td>
<td>0.00352</td>
<td>0.13931</td>
<td>0.44030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.12033</td>
<td>0.24030</td>
<td>0.00643</td>
<td>0.04583</td>
<td>0.43501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of Factor 1
Decision-Making

Factor 1 was related to parent involvement in school decision-making. It contained 7 items loading at least .50 and accounted for 18.3% of the variance.
Only item 25 was a reverse item. Table 14 presents the items in an abbreviated form similar to input into the statistical program. Factor 1 was labeled Decision-Making.

Table 14

**Characteristics of Factor 1**

**Decision-Making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Parent Should Participate in Staff Evaluation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Parent Eval of Teachers Useful</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parents Participation in Staff Hiring</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Parents Input Useful in Hiring Principals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Parents Choose Settings and Teachers</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Parents Do Not Have Evaluation Skills</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Parent Input Helpful in Grouping</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*

N=No

Y=Yes
Characteristics of Factor 2

Policy-Making

Factor 2 contained 6 items and accounted for 7.9% of the variance. None of the items were reverse items. Table 15 presents these items in an abbreviated form. Factor 2 included questions related to parent involvement in school policy-making and goal setting and was labeled Policy-Making.

Table 15

Characteristics of Factor 2

Policy-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Parent Assist in Establishing Goals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Parents Helpful in Curriculum Issues</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Parents Should Participate in Budget</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principals Should Try to Parents</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Principals Should Help to Overcome Participation Barriers</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Parents Should Initiate Establishing Goals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
N=No
Y=Yes
Characteristics of Factor 3

Home Tutor/Co-Learner

Factor 3 included items related to parent involvement in schools as home tutors/co-learners and contained 5 items. The 5 items accounted for 6.1 of the variance and are presented in Table 16 in an abbreviated form similar to the one utilized for statistical analysis purposes. Factor 3 was labeled Home Tutor/Co-Learner.

Table 16

Characteristics of Factor 3

Home Tutor/Co-Learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Parent Observations Should Be Required</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Principals Should Have Hotline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Principals Should Have Comfortable Reception Areas</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Parents Should Be Home Tutors</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Principals Should Encourage Parent Observations</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
N=No
Y=Yes
Characteristics of Factor 4

Socio-Economic Status

Factor 4 contained only 2 items and accounted for 5.4% of the variance. Neither of the items were reverse items and both dealt with socio-economic level. The items are presented in Table 17 in a similar format to that used for statistical analysis purposes. Factor 4 was labeled Socio-Economic Status.

Table 17

Characteristics of Factor 4

Socio-Economic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Easier to Involve Mid and Up Income Parents</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mid and Up Income Parents Are More Involved</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
N=No
Y=Yes
Characteristics of Factor 5

Parent Desire and Expertise

Factor 5 contained 5 items and accounted for 4.9% of the variance. Item 10 was a reverse item. Items are presented in Table 18 in a format similar to the abbreviated form for statistical purposes and not as they appeared in their entirety on the survey instrument. Factor 5 was labeled Parent Expertise and Desire.

Table 18

Characteristics of Factor 5
Parent Desire and Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Easy to Involve Low Income Parents</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parents are Comfortable at School</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parental Desire for Involv</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parents Have Expertise About Educ of Children</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parents Do Not Have Necessary Training</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
N=No
Y=Yes
The factor analysis was used to identify subscales. Items loading on a particular factor were then summed to produce a summated rating for each identified dimension. Items 11, 19, 21, 22, 25, and 27 and 28 loaded on Factor 1 and revealed an alpha of .7960. Items 4, 6, 14, 24, 29, and 30 loaded on Factor 2 with a subscale alpha of .6841. Factor 3 included items 8, 13, 15, 16, and 17 with an alpha of .6185. Items 20 and 26 loaded on Factor 4 and revealed an alpha of .7048. Factor 5 contained items 1, 2, 5, 9, and 10 with a subscale alpha of .6265. Weighted factor scores were not produced.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Factor Labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Home Tutor/Co-Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parent Desire and Expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis and Interpretation of Findings

Two research questions guided the study and seven null hypotheses were tested in the study. Research Question 1 acted as an umbrella seeking an overall measure of the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in school. Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were tested to answer Research Question 2.

Research Question 1

How strongly do principals believe in parent involvement in schools?

Research Question 1 was analyzed to determine how strongly principals believed in parent involvement in schools. Initially, data were subjected to a frequency distribution for each individual question on the survey based on a Likert scale ranging from 1 Strongly Disagree to a 4 for Strongly Agree. Further analyses were conducted utilizing the five factors derived from the principals component factor analysis with frequency distributions based on the factor groupings.

In addition to the individual question analysis and the frequency distributions for the five factors, an overall attitude score was obtained by producing a mean score for each factor. Attitude scores less than 1.5 were recoded 1. Scores greater than 1.49 but less than 2.5 were recoded 2. Attitudes scores greater than 2.49 and less than 3.5 were recoded 3 and scores
greater than 3.49 were recoded 4. This procedure placed overall attitude scores in four categories so that comparisons could be made to the Likert scale used in the survey instrument.

In analyzing individual questions, principal responses indicated agreement or strong agreement with Questions 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7. Question 1 focused on how strongly principals believed educators and parents have complementary expertise about the education of their children. According to the responses, 290 principals or 78.1% either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Question 2 stated that most parents, regardless of background, desire to be involved in the education of their children. Of the 370 principals responding to the statement, 312 or 81.4%, agreed or strongly agreed. Question 4, principals should take the initiative for getting parents to take an active role in the education of their children, responses indicated 334 or 90.1% of elementary principals agreed or strongly agreed. Question 6 stated that schools should develop creative ways to overcome barriers when parents do not participate in school events. Responses showed 343 principals or 95.1% agreed or strongly agree with the statement. Responses to Question 7, stating it is easy to involve middle and upper income parents in the school, also indicated agreement among principals.
Two hundred fifty-six respondents or 71.7% agreed or strongly agreed.

Principals also indicated agreement or strong agreement with Questions 8, 10, 13, 14, and 15. Question 8 dealt with encouraging parents to observe in the classroom. Of the 370 principals responding, 326 or 87.9% agreed or strongly agreed that principals should encourage classroom observations. Two hundred fifty-four principals or 68.5% agreed or strongly agreed with Question 10 which stated that most parents do not have the training necessary to take part in making school decisions. Three hundred fifty-nine or 96.7 agreed that schools should have comfortable reception areas (Question 13). Three hundred twenty-one or 76.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that parent input is useful in curriculum issues such as textbook selection (Question 14) and 265 or 71.0% agreed or strongly agreed with Question 15 which stated that schools should have a hotline for parents.

The final grouping of questions demonstrating agreement or strong agreement by principals included Questions 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26, and 30. Three hundred six or 82.5% indicated agreement or strong agreement with Question 17, parents should be home tutors. Two hundred twenty agreed with Question 18 which stated that parents should hold fundraisers to
support school needs. One hundred five or 28.3
strongly agreed with the statement. Two hundred
twenty-four or 60.4% of the respondents agreed or
strongly agreed with Question 20 which stated that
middle or upper income parents desire more parent
involvement than lower socio-economic parents.
Question 23 stated that principals should encourage
teachers to meet parents outside school hours if
necessary. Two hundred thirty-seven principals agreed
and 54 principals strongly agreed with the statement.

Question 24 involved parent participation in
budget planning. Two hundred eighty respondents or
76.3% agreed or strongly agreed. Two hundred seventy-
four respondent indicated agreement or strong agreement
with Question 26, it is easier to involve middle and
upper income parents in school than to involve lower
socio-economic parents. The final statement indicating
agreement among principals was in response to Question
30 which stated that parents should assist in the
establishment of the educational goals for the school.
Three hundred sixty-one principals or 97.3% agreed or
strongly agreed with the statement.

Frequency distributions of the five factors were
also analyzed to determine how strongly principals
believed in parent involvement in school decision
making. A mean score was produced for each factor.
Attitude scores less than 1.5 were recoded 1. Scores greater than 1.49 but less than 2.5 were recoded 2. Attitudes scores greater than 2.49 and less than 3.5 were recoded 3 and scores greater than 3.49 were recoded 4.

Factor 1 was labeled Decision-Making and included Questions No. 27, 19, 22, 28, 21, 25, and 11. Factor 1 focused on parent participation in teacher and staff evaluations and the hiring of principals. Also included were statements relating to the usefulness of parent input in grouping and choosing the classroom setting and teachers of their children.

Of the 349 valid cases, approximately 30% of the principals responding agreed that parents should be involved in school decision-making while the majority or 57.9% disagreed. Table 20 reflects the frequency distribution.
Table 20

Frequency Distributions for Factor 1
Parent Involvement in School Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 22.
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Agree

Factor 2 was labeled Policy-Making. Statements related to parent assistance in initiating and establishing goals were included, as well as parent involvement in the budget-making process. Also included were statements that principals should try to involve parents and help parents overcome participation barriers.

Of the 359 valid cases, 343 respondents or 95.6% agreed or strongly agreed that parents should be involved in school policy-making and goal setting. Frequency distributions of Factor 2 are reflected in Table 21.
Table 21

**Frequency Distributions for Factor 2**

**Parent Involvement in School Policy-Making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>359</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 12.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Agree
4 = Strongly Agree

Factor 3 was related to parent involvement in schools as home tutors/co-learners. Questions included the encouragement and/or requirement of parent observations in the school classrooms of their children and desirability of hotlines for parents. Also included was a statement related to the importance of comfortable reception areas for parents in school. A final item stated that parents should be home tutors for their children. Factor 3 was labeled Home Tutor/Co-Learner.
Of the 355 valid cases, an overwhelming majority, 321 or 90.4% of the principals responding agreed or strongly agreed. Frequency distributions are reflected in Table 22.

Table 22

Frequency Distributions for Factor 3

Parent Involvement in School as Home Tutor/Co-Learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 16.
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Agree
4 = Strongly Agree

Factor 4 was labeled Socio-Economic Status. It contained only two items. The first item stated that it is easier to involve middle and upper income parents in school than it is to involve lower socio-economic status parents. The second item stated that middle and
upper income parents desire more parent involvement than lower socio-economic parents.

Of the 364 valid cases, 281 or 77.2% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Frequency distributions for Factor 4 are reflected in Table 23.

Table 23
Frequency Distributions for Factor 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Status of Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 364 100.0

Note. Missing Cases = 7.
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Agree
4 = Strongly Agree

Factor 5 was labeled Parent Expertise and Desire. Five items were included in this factor. Statements relating to the expertise and desire of parents to be involved, the comfort level parents enjoy at school, and the ease of involving low income parents were
included. Another item stated that parents do not have
the training necessary to take part in making school
decisions.

Of the 361 valid cases, 258 or 71.4% of the
principals responding agreed or strongly agreed.
Frequency distributions for Factor 5 are reflected in
Table 24.

Table 24
Frequency Distributions for Factor 4
Parent Desire and Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing Cases = 10.
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Agree
4 = Strongly Agree

The third and final analysis to determine how
strongly principals believed in parent involvement was
the examination of an overall attitude score obtained
by producing a mean score for each factor. Attitude scores less than 1.5 were recoded 1. Scores greater than 1.49 but less than 2.5 were recoded 2. Scores greater than 2.49 and less than 3.5 were recoded 3. Those greater than 3.49 were recoded 4. Of the 318 valid cases, 265 or 83.3% of the respondents believed in parent involvement. Frequency distributions are displayed in Table 25.

Table 25

Frequency Distributions for Overall Attitude of Principals Toward Parent Involvement in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 318 100.0

Note. Missing Cases = 53.
2 = Disagree
3 = Agree
4 = Strongly Agree
Research Question 2

Are the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools related to gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, or population density?

Seven null hypotheses were tested and analyzed based on each of the five identified factors. The five factors identified were: Decision-making, Policy-Making, Home Tutor/Co-Learner, Socio-Economic Status, and Parent Expertise and Desire. The hypotheses were tested in the null form as indicated below.

H01. There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the gender of the principal when controlling for age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

In analyzing the data to determine if a significant relationship existed between the gender of the principal and the five identified factors when controlling for age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density, no significant relationships existed when testing at the .05 probability level. Since p is a test of the significance of \( b \) (the slope of the regression line), it also tests the significance of the contribution of a variable to the
equation given the variables already in the equation. The £ value for Factor 1 was .534, Factor 2 was -1.695, Factor 3 was -1.495, Factor 4 was -.227, and Factor 5 was 1.080.

Table 25 reflects the £, Beta, $r^2$, £, and £ value for each factor. No £ value was less than .05; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. Data are depicted in Table 26.

Table 26

Regression Coefficients and £ Tests of Significance

Showing the Relationship Between the Gender of the Principal and Each of the Five Parent Involvement Factors While Controlling for Age, Teaching Experience, Educational Background, School Socio-Economic Status, Size, and Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2489</td>
<td>.0349</td>
<td>.0303</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.5934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.5101</td>
<td>-.1102</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>-1.695</td>
<td>.0911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.4069</td>
<td>-.0933</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>-1.495</td>
<td>.1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.0365</td>
<td>-.0143</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>.8203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2776</td>
<td>.0683</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>.2810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Note: Factor 1 = Decision-Making
Factor 2 = Policy-Making
Factor 3 = Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role
Factor 4 = Socio-Economic Status
Factor 5 = Parent Expertise and Desire
$H_0$ 2. There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the age of the principal when controlling for gender, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

Data analysis indicated no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools in four identified factors (Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 4, and Factor 5) and the age of the principal when controlling for gender, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density at the established level of significance. The $t$ value for Factor 1 was $-1.170$, Factor 2 was $-.596$, Factor 4 was $1.577$, and Factor 5 was $.332$. There was a highly significant relationship between the age of the principal and Factor 3, Home Tutor/Co-Learner. The $p$ value for Factor 3 was $.0009$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 4, and Factor 5 and rejected for Factor 3. The negative slope ($b$) indicated that younger principals viewed parent involvement as home tutors and co-learners more positively than older principals. Table 27 reflects the $b$, Beta, $r^2$, $t$, and $p$ value for each factor.
Table 27

Regression Coefficients and t Tests of Significance

Showing the Relationship Between the Age of the Principal and Each of the Five Parent Involvement Factors While Controlling for Gender, Teaching Experience, Educational Background, School Socio-Economic Status, Size, and Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.0374</td>
<td>-.0667</td>
<td>.0303</td>
<td>-1.170</td>
<td>.2427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.0124</td>
<td>-.0338</td>
<td>.0193</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td>.5515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.0640</td>
<td>-.1835</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>-3.368</td>
<td>.0009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.0177</td>
<td>-.0873</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>.1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.0060</td>
<td>.0186</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.7399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Note: Factor 1 = Decision-Making
Factor 2 = Policy-Making
Factor 3 = Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role
Factor 4 = Socio-Economic Status
Factor 5 = Parent Expertise and Desire
H₀ 3. There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the teaching experience of the principal when controlling for gender, age, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

Data analysis indicated no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools in four identified factors (Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, and Factor 5) and the teaching experience of the principal when controlling for age, gender, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density at the established level of significance. The t value for Factor 1 was -.029, for Factor 2 was -.397, for Factor 3 was -.513, and for Factor 5 the t value was .342. Because no p value was less than .05, the null hypothesis was retained for Factors 1, 2, 3, and 5. The p value for Factor 4, Socio-Economic Status, however, was .0337. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for Factor 4. Analysis indicated principals with elementary teaching experience believed it equally easy to involve middle and upper income parents and lower income parents and also believed both groups desired to be involved in the education of their children. Data are depicted in Table 28.
Table 28

Regression Coefficients and t Tests of Significance
Showing the Relationship Between the Teaching Experience
of the Principal and Each of the Five Parent Involvement
Factors While Controlling for Gender, Age, Educational
Background, School Socio-Economic Status, Size, and
Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.0010</td>
<td>-.0018</td>
<td>.0303</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.2329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.0091</td>
<td>-.0247</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>-.397</td>
<td>.6920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.0640</td>
<td>-.0309</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>-.513</td>
<td>.6086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.0270</td>
<td>-.1300</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>-2.133</td>
<td>.0337*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.0060</td>
<td>.0210</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.7325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Note: Factor 1 = Decision-Making
Factor 2 = Policy-Making
Factor 3 = Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role
Factor 4 = Socio-Economic Status
Factor 5 = Parent Expertise and Desire
null hypothesis is retained for Factor 1, Factor 4, and Factor 5.

The p value for Factor 2, Policy-Making, was .0230. This value was significant at the .05 probability level. The p value for Factor 3, Home Tutor/Co-Learner, was .0010 and, therefore, highly significant. The null hypothesis was rejected for Factors 2 and 3. The positive slope of the regression line indicated principals majoring in elementary education responded more favorably to parent involvement in school policy-making and goal-setting, as well as parents as home tutors and co-learners. Data are presented in Table 29.
Table 29

Regression Coefficients and t Tests of Significance
Showing the Relationship Between the Educational Background
of the Principal and Each of the Five Parent Involvement
Factors While Controlling for Gender, Age, Teaching
Experience, School Socio-Economic Status, Size, and
Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7487</td>
<td>.1053</td>
<td>.0303</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>.1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6816</td>
<td>.1471</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>.0230*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8978</td>
<td>.2058</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>3.323</td>
<td>.0010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.0349</td>
<td>-.0137</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>.8284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.0281</td>
<td>-.0070</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.9133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Note: Factor 1 = Decision-Making
Factor 2 = Policy-Making
Factor 3 = Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role
Factor 4 = Socio-Economic Status
Factor 5 = Parent Expertise and Desire
There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and school socio-economic status when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, size, and population density.

Data analysis indicated no significant relationship between the attitude of principals toward parent involvement in schools in four of the five identified factors and school socio-economic status when controlling for gender, age teaching experience, educational background, size, and population density. The $t$ value for Factor 1 was .190, for Factor 2 was -.230, for Factor 4 was 1.051, and for Factor 5 was -.109.

The null hypothesis for Factors 1, 2, 4, and 5 was, therefore, retained. The $p$ value for Factor 3, Home Tutor/Co-Learner, was .003 and highly significant at the established .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected for Factor 3. The slope ($b = .0153$) indicated that principals of higher socio-economic status schools viewed parent observations in classrooms and parent involvement as home tutors and co-learners more favorably than principals of lower socio-economic schools. Data are presented in Table 30.
Table 30

Regression Coefficients and t Tests of Significance

Showing the Relationship Between School Socio-Economic Status and Each of the Five Parent Involvement Factors While Controlling for Gender, Age, Teaching Experience, Educational Background, Size, and Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.0112</td>
<td>.0303</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.8492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.0013</td>
<td>-.0133</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>.8185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.0153</td>
<td>.1634</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>2.924</td>
<td>.0037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>.0598</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>.2941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.0281</td>
<td>-.0070</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.9135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Note: Factor 1 = Decision-Making  
Factor 2 = Policy-Making  
Factor 3 = Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role  
Factor 4 = Socio-Economic Status  
Factor 5 = Parent Expertise and Desire
H₀ 6. There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and school size when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, socio-economic status, and population density.

When controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, socio-economic status, and population density, data analysis indicated no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools in four of the five identified factors and school size. The $t$ value for Factor 1 was .208, Factor 2 was .111. The $t$ value for Factor 3 was .914 and the $t$ value for Factor 5 was .228. At the .05 level of probability, the $p$ values for Factors 1, 2, 3, and 5 were not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for Factors 1, 2, 3, and 5. However, the $p$ value for Factor 4, Socio-Economic Status, was .0245 and therefore, significant. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected for Factor 4. The positive slope of the regression line indicated that principals of larger schools responded more favorably to statements related to the ease of involving all socio-economic status parents, and the desire of all parents, regardless of socio-economic background, to be involved in the education of their children. Data are depicted in Table 31.
Table 31

Regression Coefficients and t Tests of Significance
Showing the Relationship Between School Size and
Each of the Five Parent Involvement Factors While
Controlling for Gender, Age, Teaching Experience,
Educational Background, Socio-Economic Status, and
Population Density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2314</td>
<td>.0132</td>
<td>.0303</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.8355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9518</td>
<td>.0069</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.9121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8885</td>
<td>.0552</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.3612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5445</td>
<td>.1380</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>.0245*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3798</td>
<td>.0141</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.8198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Note: Factor 1 = Decision-Making
Factor 2 = Policy-Making
Factor 3 = Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role
Factor 4 = Socio-Economic Status
Factor 5 = Parent Expertise and Desire
H₀ 7. There will be no significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and population density when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, and size.

In analyzing the data to determine if a significant relationship existed between population density and the five identified factors when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, and size, no significant differences existed when testing at the .05 probability level for Factors 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. The t value for Factor 1 was 1.195, for Factor 2 was -.801. The t value for Factor 3 was -.398, for Factor 4 was -.077, and for Factor 5 was .647. Because no p value was less than .05, the null hypothesis was retained for Factors 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. There was no significant relationship between population density and the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and any of the five identified factors. Data are depicted in Table 32. Table 32 reflects the β, Beta, r², t, and p value for each factor.
Table 32

Regression Coefficients and t Tests of Significance
Showing the Relationship Between Population Density
and Each of the Five Parent Involvement Factors While
Controlling for Gender, Age, Teaching Experience,
Educational Background, Socio-Economic Status, and Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor No.</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3831</td>
<td>.0737</td>
<td>.0303</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>.2329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.1637</td>
<td>-.0490</td>
<td>.0229</td>
<td>-.801</td>
<td>.4239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.0748</td>
<td>-.0234</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td>.6905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.0086</td>
<td>-.0046</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.9383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.1144</td>
<td>.0390</td>
<td>.0416</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.5184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p<.05

Note: Factor 1 = Decision-Making
Factor 2 = Policy-Making
Factor 3 = Home Tutor/Co-Learner Role
Factor 4 = Socio-Economic Status
Factor 5 = Parent Expertise and Desire
CHAPTER 5

Summary, Findings, Conclusion, Recommendations, and Implications

Introduction

This chapter concludes the study. It contains a summary of the study, as well as a summary and discussion of the findings. The chapter also includes conclusions based on the findings. Recommendations and implications conclude the chapter and are based on the review of literature and the analysis of data.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools. Though the importance of parent involvement in schools is undisputed and the desire of parents to be involved surpasses socio-economic and geographic boundaries, at the local level, variance continues to be found in the level of parent involvement among schools. Parent involvement programs, as well as legislation are in place at the national, state, and local level.

The variance among schools may be a result of the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement. Therefore, their attitudes warranted study. The goal of this study was to describe what actually exists, as well as examine relationships between selected variables.
Two research questions guided the study and seven null hypotheses were formulated for the study and tested at the .05 level of significance. The degree of relationship existing between variables was tested using t tests for the significance of regression coefficients.

The population for the study consisted of the 1,142 public school elementary principals in the Commonwealth of Virginia as recorded by the Virginia Department of Education in the Virginia Directory of Public Schools. A sample size of 284 was necessary to obtain an estimate of plus or minus 5% with a 95% degree of confidence. A random sampling procedure was employed.

Data were collected during the Winter of 1993-94. A survey instrument was developed specifically for the study. Questionnaires were mailed to 700 elementary principals initially, followed by a second mailing to non-respondents. A total of three hundred seventy-one surveys were return which resulted in an overall return rate of 53%. The data were statistically analyzed with the SPSS computer statistical analysis program. The statistical test used to analyze the data was multiple regression.

Summary of Findings

The following findings are presented as the results of the data analysis and interpretation:

1. Factor analysis from the data resulted in the identification of five factors. These factors were labeled

Two research questions guided the study. Question 1 acted as an umbrella to determine how strongly principals believed in parent involvement in schools. Data were subjected to (1) a frequency distribution for each individual question on the survey instrument, (2) frequency distributions based on the factor groupings of the five factors derived from the principals component analysis, and (3) an overall attitude score obtained by producing mean scores for each of the four categories in the Likert scale.

2. The frequency distributions for each individual question indicated principals agreed or strongly agreed with 17 of the 30 survey statements. Those statements included: 1 (Educators and parents have complimentary expertise about the education of children.), 2 (Most parents, regardless of background, desire to be involved in their children's education.), 4 (Principals should take the initiative for getting parents to take an active role in the education of their children.), 6 (The school should develop creative ways to overcome barriers when parents do not participate in school events.), 7 (It is easy to involve middle and upper income parents in the school.), 8 (Parents should be encouraged to observe in their children's classrooms.), 10 (Most parents do not have the training necessary to take part in making school decisions.), 13 (Schools should have
comfortable reception areas available to parents.), 14 (Parent input is helpful in curriculum issues such as textbook selection.), 15 (Schools should have a hotline for parents.), 17 (Parents should act as home tutors assisting their children with school assignments.), 18 (Parents should hold fundraisers to support school needs.), 20 (Middle and upper income parents desire more parent involvement than lower socio-economic parents.), 23 (Principals should encourage teachers to meet parents outside school hours if necessary.), 24 (Parent participation in school budget planning is desirable.), 26 (It is easier to involve middle and upper income parents in school than to involve lower socio-economic parents.), and 30 (Parents should assist in the establishment of the educational goals for the school.).

3. The frequency distributions based on the five factor groupings indicated the majority of principals surveyed disagreed with statements related to parent involvement in School Decision-Making.

4. Results indicated a majority of the principals surveyed agreed or strongly agreed with statements included in Factor 2 which was labeled Policy-Making.

5. Data analysis revealed a majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with statements concerning parent involvement as Home Tutors/Co-Learners.
6. Results indicated principals agreed or strongly agreed with items included in Factor 4, Socio-Economic Status. Of the 364 valid cases, 77.2% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it is easier to involve middle and upper income parents than it is to involve lower socio-economic parents.

7. Frequency distributions for Factor 5, Parent Expertise and Desire, indicated a majority of the principals responding agreed or strongly agreed with the survey statements.

8. Overall attitude results indicated a majority or 83.3% of the principals surveyed agreed or strongly agreed in parent involvement in schools.

The second research question was addressed by testing and analyzing seven null hypotheses based on each of the five identified factors.

9. No significant relationship was found to exist between the gender of the principal and the five identified factors when controlling for age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.

10. No significant relationship was found to exist between the age of the principal and Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 4, or Factor 5 when controlling for gender, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density.
11. A highly significant relationship was found to exist between the age of the principal and Factor 3, Home Tutor/Co-Learner. The $p$ value for Factor 3 was .0009.

12. The results of the multiple regression analysis of the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the teaching experience of the principal indicated no significant relationship in four identified factors. Factors not indicating a significant relationship included: Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, and Factor 5.

13. Data analysis revealed a significant relationship exists between the teaching experience of the principal and Factor 4, Socio-Economic Status, when controlling for gender, age, educational background, school socio-economic status, size, and population density. The $p$ value for Factor 4 was .0337.

14. The results of the multiple regression analysis of the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the educational background of the principal based on the five identified factors indicated no significant relationship exists in Factor 1, Factor 4, and Factor 5.

15. Data analysis revealed a significant relationship between the educational background of the principal and Factor 2, Policy-Making.
16. Data analysis revealed a significant relationship between the educational background of the principal and Factor 3, Home Tutor/Co-Learner.

17. No significant relationship was found to exist between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in school and the socio-economic status of the school based on Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 4, or Factor 5 when controlling for age, gender, teaching experience, educational background, size, and population density.

18. Results indicated a significant relationship between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and school socio-economic status based on Factor 3, Home Tutor/Co-Learner. The p value for Factor 3 was .003.

19. The results of the multiple regression analysis of the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and school size based on the five identified factors indicated no significant relationship exists in Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, or Factor 5 when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, socio-economic status, and population density.

20. Results indicated a significant relationship between Factor 4, Socio-Economic Status, and the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and school size. The p value for Factor 4 was .0245.
21. No significant relationship was found to exist between the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement and population density based on Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, Factor 4, or Factor 5 when controlling for gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, school socio-economic status, and size.

Discussion of Findings

Davis (1976) reported that the individual school is the prime unit for educational planning and change. He stated that the interests of parents are most easily mobilized and sustained around the policies and practices of the schools at which their children attend. Current emphasis on site-based management, the mutual dependency between parents and schools mandated by such management, and the challenges of our changing society elevate the role of the building principal. Parent involvement policies and practices are dependent upon administrative support. The role of the principal is a pivotal one.

Overall results indicated principals, in general, believe in parent involvement in schools. More specifically, frequency distributions for individual survey items indicated elementary principals agreed or strongly agreed with 17 of the 30 statements related to parent involvement. Principals believed strongly that the school principal should take the initiative for getting parents to take an active role in the education of their children.
Likewise, principals indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that it is the responsibility of the school to develop creative ways to overcome barriers to parent involvement.

While strong agreement was indicated with the statement most parents, regardless of background, desire to be involved in the education of their children, principals indicated their belief that it is easier to involve middle and upper income parents and that middle and upper income parents desire more parent involvement than lower socio-economic parents. Frequency distributions for Factor 4, Socio-Economic Status, supported the indication that principals believe middle and upper income parents desire more parent involvement and are more easily involved than lower socio-economic parents. Unfortunately, the findings of Ascher (1988) that many school officials tend to decide in advance that low-income parents cannot be approached or relied upon is supported by the findings of this study.

Principals agreed or strongly agreed that comfortable reception areas should be available to parents in schools and that a hotline for parents was desirable. Respondents indicated that while they believed parent observations in classrooms were important, they did not feel that observations should be required of parents. Likewise, principals disagreed that parents should choose settings or teachers for their children. Analysis of Factor 3, Home
Tutor/Co-Learner, indicated principals agreed or strongly agreed that parents should be involved in home learning activities.

Strong agreement was indicated with statements related to parent involvement in curriculum issues, textbook selection, budget planning, and educational goal-setting. Analyses of Factor 5, Parent Expertise and Desire, and Factor 2, Policy-Making, supported these results. However, a majority of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that most parents do not have the training necessary to take part in school decision-making. Analysis of Factor 1, Decision-Making, revealed a majority of the principals surveyed disagreed that parents should be involved in school-decision making. Respondents disagreed that parent evaluation of teachers is useful. They also disagreed that parents should participate in staff evaluations and hiring. It seems parent involvement is welcomed at the policy-making and goal-setting level and is not believed to be valuable at the actual decision-making and implementation level.

The goal of this study was to describe not only what actually exists, but to examine relationships between selected variables, as well. To that end, data analysis procedures utilized multiple regression to determine significant relationships between the attitudes of elementary principals toward parent involvement in school
and gender, age, teaching experience, educational background, socio-economic status, size, and population density. Data analysis revealed no significant relationship between the gender of the principal and attitude toward parent involvement in the five identified factors.

No significant relationship was found between the age of the principal and attitude toward parent involvement in schools based on Factor 1 (Decision-Making), Factor 2 (Policy-Making), Factor 4 (Socio-Economic Status), or Factor 5 (Parent Desire and Expertise). However, in examining Factor 3 (Home Tutor/Co-Learner), a significant relationship was found. The younger the principal the more positive the attitude toward parents as home tutors and co-learners. Younger principals responded more favorably to statements related to parent observations in class, as well as home learning.

Results of the multiple regression analysis of the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the teaching experience of the principal indicated no significant relationship in Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, or Factor 5. Data analysis revealed a significant relationship between the teaching experience of the principal and Factor 4, Socio-Economic Status. Principals who had experience as elementary teachers responded more favorably to statements related to the socio-economic status of parents. Principals with elementary teaching experience were more inclined to
disagree with the statements that it is easier to involve middle and upper income parents and that middle and upper income parents desire more parent involvement than lower socio-economic parents than principals with elementary teaching experience.

Results of the multiple regression analysis of the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools and the educational background of the principal revealed no significant relationship based on Factor 1 (Decision-Making), Factor 4 (Socio-Economic Status), or Factor 5 (Parent Expertise and Desire). However, a significant relationship was revealed between the educational background of the principal and Factor 2 (Policy-Making). Likewise, a significant relationship was revealed between the educational background of the principal and Factor 3 (Home Tutor/Co-Learner). Principals who majored in elementary education responded more favorably to statements related to parent involvement in policy-making, as well as parent involvement as home tutors and co-learners.

No significant relationship was found between the attitudes of principals and school socio-economic status based on Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 4, or Factor 5. A significant relationship was revealed, however, in examining Factor 3 (Home Tutor/Co-Learner). The principals of schools with higher socio-economic status parents responded more favorably to statements related to parent observations in
classrooms and parent involvement as home tutors/co-
learners.

Results indicated no significant relationship in the
attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools
and school size in Factor 1, Factor 2, Factor 3, or Factor
5. A significant relationship was found in Factor 4 (Socio-
Economic Status). Principals in larger schools responded
more favorably to statements related to the desire of all
parents, regardless of socio-economic status, to be involved
in the education of their children. Principals in larger
schools also responded more favorably to the statement that
it is easier to involve middle and upper income parents than
lower socio-economic parents.

In examining the relationship between population
density and the attitudes of principals, no significant
relationship was found in any of the five identified factor
groupings. Whether the school was a rural or urban one did
not appear to be significant. Principals of rural and urban
schools responded similarly to the survey statements.
Conclusions

As a result of the findings, the following conclusions were drawn concerning the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools:

1. Principals, in general, believe parent involvement in schools is important.

2. Principals strongly agree they are responsible for initiating parent involvement.

3. Principals believe schools should develop creative ways to overcome barriers to parent involvement.

4. Principals feel it is easier to involve middle and upper middle income parents in school than lower socio-economic parents.

5. Principals believe middle and upper income parents desire more parent involvement than lower socio-economic parents.

6. Principals agree parents should have comfortable receptions areas in schools, as well as hotlines for parents.

7. Principals agree that parents should observe in the classroom of their children, but observations should be voluntary and not required.

8. Principals disagree with parent involvement in choosing the settings or teachers for children.
9. Principals support parent involvement in policy-making and goal-setting, such as budget planning and textbook selection.

10. Principals do not support parent involvement in school decision-making, such as staff evaluations and hirings.

11. The gender of the principal does not impact the attitude of the principal toward parent involvement.

12. Younger principals view parents as home tutors and co-learners more positively than older principals.

13. Principals with elementary teaching experience believe it is equally easy to involve lower socio-economic parents and middle and upper income parents. They, likewise, recognize the desire of lower socio-economic parents to be involved in school is equal to that of middle or upper income parents.

14. Principals who majored in elementary education support parent involvement in policy-making and as home tutors/co-learners, more so than principals who did not major in elementary education.

15. Principals of schools with higher socio-economic level parents support parent observations in classrooms, as well as parent involvement as home tutors and co-learners, more so than principals of schools with lower socio-economic parents.
16. Principals of larger schools view parent observations in classrooms, as well as parent involvement as home tutors and co-learners more favorably than principals of smaller schools.

Recommendations

As a result of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Superintendents and other administrative personnel responsible for hiring should carefully screen potential principals to focus on individuals displaying a high awareness of and caring attitude toward the importance of parent involvement in schools.

2. Administrative personnel should encourage principals to articulate their designs to initiate and overcome barriers to parent involvement in schools.

3. In-service and counseling should be provided for all principals, not only on the importance of involving all parents, regardless of socio-economic background, but also on issues related to the desire of lower socio-economic parents to be involved.

4. Principal preparation programs should include research findings and information related to the desire of all parents, regardless of socio-economic background, to be involved in the education of their children.

5. A prerequisite to principal certification should be elementary teaching experience.
6. Serious consideration should be given candidates with a background in elementary education when screening candidates for elementary principalships.

7. There is a need to study the scoring of the instrument to correlate with other measures of attitudinal scales.

8. A recommended study would be to replicate this project in the State of Virginia and compare the results with the data from the initial study.

9. A recommended study would be to replicate this project in other states and compare the results with the data from the Virginia study.

Implications

The following implications of the study on the attitudes of elementary principals toward parent involvement are presented:

1. The results of this study can supplement and provide additional information for current principal preparation programs.

2. As new principals enter elementary administration, a study focusing on the attitudes of this group could influence future principal preparation programs.

3. Additional study of the survey instrument and the underlying dimensions should be undertaken to ascertain if the subsidiary factors are strong enough to be isolated and used in future attitudinal studies.
4. The survey instrument could be used in middle and high schools to measure validation and determine if principals respond similarly.

5. An inherent purpose of this study was to stimulate and encourage further research on the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement and to bring the importance of parent involvement to the forefront.
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APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY INSTRUMENT
Dear Principal:

Thank you for participating in this statewide survey of principals' attitudes toward parent involvement. There are two parts to this questionnaire. In Part I, you are asked to respond to a series of statements reflecting your attitudes toward parent involvement. In Part II, you are asked to provide additional information about yourself and your particular school. You are not required to put your name on the questionnaire. Your responses to the items will be confidential. The identification number is for mailing purposes only.

PART I. ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS TOWARD PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Instructions: After reading each item, please indicate the degree to which you feel the statement is true. Please read each choice carefully and CIRCLE the appropriate response. Your choices are:

1 Strongly Disagree
2 Disagree
3 Agree
4 Strongly Agree

1. All parents should be actively involved in the education of their children.  
2. Principals should take the initiative for getting parents to take an active role in the education of their children.  
3. Principals should provide teachers with guidelines about parent involvement.  
4. Teachers should take the initiative in getting parents involved in education.  
5. Parents need to provide principals with ideas about how they can become involved in school.
6. Most parents are comfortable when they come to the school.

7. Educators and parents have complimentary expertise about the education of children.

8. Every school should have an organized parent involvement program in place.

9. Most parents, regardless of background, desire to be involved in their children’s education.

10. It is difficult to get working parents involved in the school.

11. The school should develop creative ways to overcome barriers when parents do not participate in school events.

12. It is easy to involve middle and upper income parents in the school.

13. Parent involvement in schools should be the responsibility of the parents.

14. Parents should be encouraged to observe in the classrooms.

15. The school should accommodate parents whose schedules prevent participation in school activities.

16. It is difficult to get low income families involved in their children’s school.

17. Most parents do not have the training necessary to take part in making school decisions.
18. Parent input is helpful in grouping children for instruction.

19. Principals should post hours when parents can come in to talk.

20. Principals should return all parent phone calls promptly.

21. Schools should have posted signs welcoming parents and visitors.

22. Schools should have comfortable reception areas available to parents.

23. Parent input is helpful in curriculum issues such as textbook selection.

24. Schools should have a hotline for parents.

25. Parents should be required to observe in their children's classroom.

26. Schools should practice an open door policy so that parents are welcome at all times.

27. School newsletters should be sent home regularly.

28. Teachers should be trained in how to work with parents.

29. Parent/teacher conferences should be required on a regular basis.

30. Parents should act as home tutors assisting their children with school assignments.
31. Parents should hold fund-raisers to support school needs.

32. Parent input in the evaluation of teachers would be useful.

33. Principals should offer to sit in/or mediate at meetings with parents.

34. The school should provide in-service opportunities to help train teachers on how to work with parents.

35. Principals should encourage teachers to consult them if they are having difficulty dealing with a parent.

36. Parents should conduct school public relations activities in the community.

37. Middle and upper income parents desire more parent involvement than lower socio-economic parents.

38. The school should confer with parents on the choice of classroom settings and/or teacher.

39. Parents should participate in staff hiring decisions.

40. Principals should encourage teachers to meet parents outside school hours if necessary.

41. Parent participation in school budget planning is desirable.
42. Parents do not have the necessary skills to evaluate teachers.  1  2  3  4

43. Principals should encourage parents to act as audience for school performances.  1  2  3  4

42. Parents should assist in the establishment of the educational goals for the school.  1  2  3  4

43. Principals should include parents in the evaluation of school programs.  1  2  3  4

44. Parents should participate in the evaluation of school staff.  1  2  3  4

45. Parent input is useful in decisions regarding the hiring of school principals.  1  2  3  4

48. Parents should act as advocates by initiating school policy changes.  1  2  3  4

49. It is easier to involve middle and upper income parents in school than to involve lower socio-economic parents.  1  2  3  4

50. Parents, teachers, principals, and students should be co-learners in all schools.  1  2  3  4
Part II. DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

Instructions: The following items are designed to gather information on your background characteristics and those of your school. Please read each item and respond appropriately.

Please write your answers in the spaces provided.

1. Your age: _____

2. Number of years as an elementary principal: _____

3. Number of years in present position: _____

4. Last year as a classroom teacher: 19____

5. Number of years as an elementary teacher: _____

6. Undergraduate major: _____

7. Graduate major: _____

8. Year last degree earned: _____

9. Number of students in your school: _____

10. Grades housed in your school building: _____

11. Estimate the average income of the parents in your school: _____

12. Is your school designated a Chapter I school? _____

Please check the appropriate response for each item.

13. Gender: ___Male   ___Female

14. Highest educational level attained:
   ___Masters   ___Masters+30   ___Specialist
   ___Doctorate

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!
May 10, 1993

Dear Friend,

Thank you for consenting to evaluate the attached questionnaire on the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools. Please review all statements carefully. Clarity, conciseness, readability, and relevance should be addressed. The researcher has attempted to guard against ambiguity and double barreled items. Kindly check to see that both positively and negatively worded statements are included to prevent response set.

Upon completion of your review, please evaluate the overall format of the instrument. Your comments and suggestions are encouraged and welcomed. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Brittle

1. Statement clarity
2. Statement conciseness
3. Statement readability
4. Statement relevance
5. Overall format
6. Directions

COMMENTS and SUGGESTIONS:
APPENDIX D

PILOT INSTRUMENT ASSESSMENT FORM FOR ADMINISTRATORS
June 10, 1993

Dear Administrator,

Thank you for consenting to respond to the attached questionnaire on the attitudes of principals toward parent involvement in schools. As a doctoral candidate at East Tennessee State University, I am in the process of perfecting the instrument which will be used in my study. Your input will be greatly appreciated and your anonymity assured.

Upon completion of the questionnaire, please evaluate the directions and overall format of the instrument. Your comments and suggestions are encouraged and welcomed. I also ask that you estimate the time required to complete the inventory. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Linda Brittle

1. Statement clarity, conciseness, readability, and relevance _____________________________
2. Directions_____________________________________________________________________
3. Overall format___________________________________________________________________
4. Estimated time required for completion___

COMMENTS and SUGGESTIONS:_____________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Dear Principal:

Thank you for participating in this statewide survey of principals' attitudes toward parent involvement. There are two parts to this questionnaire. In Part I, you are asked to respond to a series of statements reflecting your attitudes toward parent involvement. In Part II, you are asked to provide additional information about yourself and your particular school. You are not required to put your name on the questionnaire. Your responses to the items will be confidential. The identification number is for mailing purposes only.

PART I. ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS TOWARD PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Instructions: After reading each item, please indicate the degree to which you feel the statement is true. Please read each choice carefully and CIRCLE the appropriate response. Your choices are:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Agree
4 = Strongly Agree

Item:

1. Educators and parents have complementary expertise about the education of children. 1 2 3 4

2. Most parents, regardless of background, desire to be involved in their children's education. 1 2 3 4

3. It is difficult to get working parents involved in the school. 1 2 3 4

4. Principals should take the initiative for getting parents to take an active role in the education of their children. 1 2 3 4

5. Most parents are comfortable when they come to the school. 1 2 3 4

6. The school should develop creative ways to overcome barriers when parents do not participate in school events. 1 2 3 4

7. It is easy to involve middle and upper income parents in the school. 1 2 3 4

8. Parents should be encouraged to observe in their children's classrooms. 1 2 3 4

9. It is easy to get low income families involved in their children's school. 1 2 3 4

10. Most parents do not have the training necessary to take part in making school decisions. 1 2 3 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Parent input is helpful in grouping children for instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Principals should post hours when parents can come in to talk.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Schools should have comfortable reception areas available to parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Parent input is helpful in curriculum issues such as textbook selection.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Schools should have a hotline for parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Parents should be required to observe in their children’s classrooms.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parents should act as home tutors assisting their children with school assignments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Parents should hold fundraisers to support school needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Parent input in the evaluation of teachers would be useful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Middle and upper income parents desire more parent involvement than lower socio-economic parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The school should confer with parents on the choice of classroom settings and/or teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Parents should participate in staff hiring decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Principals should encourage teachers to meet parents outside school hours if necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Parent participation in school budget planning is desirable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Parents do not have the necessary skills to evaluate teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. It is easier to involve middle and upper income parents in school than to involve lower socio-economic parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Parents should participate in the evaluation of school staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Parent input is useful in decisions regarding the hiring of school principals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Parents should act as advocates by initiating school policy changes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Parents should assist in the establishment of the educational goals for the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ________________________________
Part II. DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

Instructions: The following items are to gather information on your background characteristics and those of your school. Please read each item and respond appropriately.

Please write your answers in the spaces provided.

1. Your age: ______

2. Number of years as an elementary principal: ______

3. Last year as a classroom teacher: 19____

4. Number of years as an elementary teacher: ______

5. Undergraduate major: ______

6. Number of students in your school: ______

7. Percentage of children on free or reduced lunch: ______

8. Is your school designated a Chapter I school? ______

9. Is your school considered rural ______ or urban ______?

Please check the appropriate response for each item.

10. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

11. Highest education level attained:

    _____ Masters _____ Masters +30 _____ Certificate of Advanced Studies

    _____ Doctorate

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY!
November 1, 1993

Dear Principal,

You are invited to take part in a statewide survey on parent involvement. As a practicing principal, you are in a unique position. Today's society presents new challenges to administrators and this study promises to provide valuable information on the collaborative efforts between home and school. Your participation will enable us to objectively consider numerous facets related to parent involvement in school.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire. Do not write your name on the survey instrument, as your responses are confidential. Upon completion, simply tri-fold and staple the blue questionnaire for return mailing.

Thank you for your participation and willingness to promote quality education. Your response insures a successful project.

Linda Vaughn Brittle
Linda Vaughan Brittle
Linda Vaughan Brittle
APPENDIX G

FOLLOW-UP COVER LETTER
December 1, 1993

Dear Principal,

Last month you received a Parent Involvement Inventory and were invited to take part in a statewide survey on parent involvement. As a practicing principal, you are in a unique position. Today's society presents new challenges to administrators and this study promises to provide valuable information on the collaborative efforts between home and school. Your participation will enable us to objectively consider numerous facets related to parent involvement in school.

If you have not already done so, please complete the enclosed questionnaire. Do not write your name on the survey instrument, as your responses are confidential. Upon completion, simply tri-fold and staple the blue questionnaire for return mailing.

Thank you for your participation and willingness to promote quality education. Your response insures a successful project.

Sincerely,

Linda Vaughan Brittle
Doctoral Candidate and Chair,
Bristol Youth Services Advisory Board
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