THE SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF PARENTS AS AN ASPECT OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of Graduate Studies

University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Education

by

Iain T. Riffel

November, 2001

THE SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF PARENTS AS AN ASPECT OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

BY

IAIN T. RIFFEL

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the degree of social integration experienced by parents in their children's school. An analysis of the literature on school effectiveness and social integration determined that parents' perceptions of their social integration into their children's school may properly be considered an estimation by the parents of that school's effectiveness. Consequently, a research model was generated that identified the social integration experienced by parents within their children's schools as the main variable to be investigated. This variable comprised five dimensions of social integration: powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness, inclusion and satisfaction.

In 1997, a questionnaire incorporating measures of Lezotte's (1988, 1991) school effectiveness model was developed and distributed to all parents across ten schools in the same school division. Four of these schools (identified by pseudonyms) were selected as the sample for this study: Parkland, Westview, Hillcrest, and Lakeside. The study relied on existing data from these schools but original survey items were reorganized conceptually in light of the research model developed; then, a selection of the reorganized items was justified on the basis of a correlation analysis of items.

Powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness, inclusion, and satisfaction, as dimensions of social integration, were divided into nine variables, so that, for some dimensions, the two contexts of the classroom and the school could be examined separately. Descriptive statistics were produced for each of the variables, for each of the schools for each of the variables, and for each of the items within each variable for each of the schools.

It was found that some schools showed a greater degree of social integration by parents when compared to other schools. It was also found that parents experienced varying degrees of social integration on each of the five dimensions from school to school. Third, it was found that parents, in general, were more likely to experience some dimensions of social integration over others. Finally, it was found that all parents experienced higher degrees of social integration in the context of the school than they did in the context of the classroom.

It is clear that the research model presented in this study is supported, that is, the model offers an empirically legitimate way of obtaining important data on an aspect of school effectiveness. By examining the social integration of parents into their children's schools, school division leaders, school administrators and teachers can obtain a more precise indication of how they might better promote their own institutional effectiveness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This study is precipitated by the implementation of New

Directions (Manitoba Education and Training, 1994), a Progressive

Conservative government educational policy that was meant to change

public education in Manitoba. In the 1996-1997 school year, a

directive called School-Based Planning: A Continuous Process for

Effective Education and Resource for Developing and Implementing Annual

School Plans (Manitoba Education and Training, 1996) requested that all

schools submit a detailed plan for improvement by May, 1998. Specific

areas that required attention in the plan were goals, planned actions

to achieve the goals, and indicators of success. It was also expected

that the plan would be developed using a theoretical framework, such as

school effectiveness, and that data would be collected and analyzed

within such a framework. Furthermore, it was expected that educators

and parents would be involved in generating the instrument to collect

data, in analyzing the data, and, in general, having their involvement

reflected in the plan.

This study focuses upon the strategy of one Winnipeg school

division to respond to this policy directive and these expectations.

This school division struck school-planning teams to review Lezotte's

(1988, 1991) model for effective schools. The school-planning teams

included educators and parents from ten of sixteen schools in the

division. All educators, parents and Middle Years students were then

surveyed by questionnaire, using an inquiry adapted from Lezotte's

(1988, 1991) framework. The data and analysis provided by Proactive

Information Services Inc. (1997), a local Winnipeg research company,

informed the school-planning teams about the priorities of educators,

parents, and students across each of a number of areas, and identified the areas each group thought the school was doing well in and the areas each group thought required more attention.

This study is of theoretical interest because it offers an alternative to Lezotte's (1988, 1991) goal-oriented model for examining school effectiveness. Instead, a social-systems model, as suggested by Hoy and Ferguson (1989), is developed and the data are analyzed in a novel way. The framework used to develop this model is derived from the sociological literature on alienation. Dimensions of alienation, as proposed by Seeman (1959, 1972, 1983), are re-conceptualized into dimensions of social integration. These dimensions are then used to interpret the experiences of parents in their children's classrooms and schools.

This study is of practical interest because it shows that there are similarities and differences between schools in the social integration of parents. The study assumes that schools can make a difference, that is, schools can have positive effects on student achievement, staff productivity, and parental engagement, when schools improve in certain aspects of their operation (Henderson, 1987; Tangri & Moles, 1987; Haynes, Corner, & Hamilton-Lee, 1989; Epstein, 1995; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Reynolds & Teddlie, 2000). This study focuses on parents' sense of engagement and efficacy in their children's school, in light of their own experience, given the ways that they are or are not involved, and, of course, their perceptions of their children's experience in classrooms and schools. According to Epstein (1995):

> If educators view children simply as students, they are likely to
> see the family as separate from the school. If educators view
> students as children, they are likely to see both the family and

the community as partners with the school in children's education

and development. (p. 701)

Thus, this study is relevant to practitioners because it helps to

suggest ways that educators can promote the social integration of

parents more effectively in their children's schools.

Purpose of the Study

This study is an empirical investigation of the degree to which

parents perceive they are socially integrated in the schools their

children attend. The problems this study attempts to address are both

theoretical and practical. From a theoretical perspective, the

research literature on school effectiveness and school improvement

provides a framework for examining the functioning of schools and

identifying areas for improvement. There is general agreement among

theorists and researchers (Weber, 1971; Klitgaard & Hall, 1974;

Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer, & Wisenbaker, 1979; Edmonds, 1983;

Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rutter, 1983; Lezotte, 1988, 1991) that schools

having higher student achievement and staff productivity share many

traits. However, there is little direct evidence that indicates which

specific improvements will yield increases in student performance, that

is, causal relationships are very difficult to establish. According to

Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1989), "the yield of school effects

correlated with school outcomes from the traditional school

effectiveness studies has been modest" (p. 164). Such assertions are

often contested because they are either inferred or appear marginally

evidentiary. According to Hoy and Ferguson (1989), "the work of

Coleman, Brookover, Rutter, and Edmonds is typical of educational

studies on effective schools. Much of the research has been criticized

on measurement, statistical, methodological and theoretical grounds"

(p. 259). Over time, these criticisms have undermined the theory and

research on school effectiveness because there are few, if any, studies

that rely on either comparative or longitudinal data that could

establish, sufficiently, cause-effect relationships.

Also from a theoretical perspective, Seeman (1983) acknowledges

the disenchantment on the part of theorists and researchers with

alienation and its negative portrayal of current social conditions; a

negativity that has probably contributed to decreasing interest in this

line of social inquiry. He offers social integration as an alternative

because

> the negative word alienation, when seen in its positive side and
>
> in a broad sense, signifies membership - meaning the variety of
>
> fundamental ways in which the individual is grounded in society:
>
> by way of the sense of efficacy, inclusion, meaningfulness,
>
> engagement, trust and value commitment. (Seeman, 1983, p. 182)

In practical terms, this study attempts to address, in part, the

inability of school-planning teams to identify achievable goals and to

recommend plans for improving those things that will most likely make a

difference in schools. The criticisms of the research on effectiveness

and school improvement are echoed in the difficulties the local school-

planning teams experienced in analyzing the original school

effectiveness data provided by Proactive Information Services Inc.

(1997).

First, what constituted a "high" or "low" score for a given area

or for a given item in the original questionnaire was left to local

interpretation. Also, missing data was not considered an important

concern in the original study. Furthermore, the original report did

not provide each school with any comparative data from all schools in

the division. Overall areas of strength from school to school were not presented, nor were data on areas that required attention. The absence of comparative data undermined the potential for school administrators to learn from each other in meaningful ways.

Second, school-planning teams were left to facilitate the interpretation of the data with their local staff and parent groups, this from their limited knowledge of the research on effective schools and school improvement. A limited knowledge of this research literature and research methods undermined their ability to affirm or contest findings in legitimate ways.

Third, because school-planning teams were not able to examine the original data, the discovery and interpretation of other patterns that emerged in the data could not be attempted. The desirability of regrouping items or categorizing questions under different frameworks was considered by some school-planning teams but was not seen as being feasible.

This study attempts to remedy some of the limitations in the original survey conducted by Proactive Information Services Inc. (1997). Specifically, the original data are re-examined and given an explicit theoretical interpretation. In turn, the empirical investigation, cast in this theoretical framework, compares four similar schools from which specific findings are obtained, discussed, and recommendations are proposed.

Significance of the Study

As previously stated, this study is an empirical investigation of the degree to which parents perceive they are socially integrated into their children's schools. Thus, the problems addressed in this study

are of both theoretical and practical significance. From a theoretical

point of view, this study is significant to the theory and research on

school effectiveness and school improvement, because it develops a

social-systems model, rather than a goal-oriented model, for examining

schools. As Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1989) state:

> Time after time observers report that the organizational climate
>
> in successful school is obvious but hard to specify. Successful
>
> schools work for all people in the building. They are not
>
> schools for students; nor are they schools for teachers and
>
> administrators. They work for adults and children and
>
> adolescents. ... Good schools are good places to live and work,
>
> for everybody. (p. 183)

According to Owens (2001), some of the characteristics that have been

associated with effective schools are less crucial than "the sense of

community, in which alienation is reduced and a sense of mutual sharing

is strengthened" (p.126). Thus, the discussion on alienation is

renewed and social integration is developed as a line of inquiry for

examining the effectiveness of schools.

The social-systems model, as an alternative to the goal-oriented

model for examining effectiveness in schools, is significant because

the effective organization is equally concerned about incapacitating

people and placing undue strain upon its members as it is with student

achievement and staff performance. "Why effective schools exist, are

sustained, fail to emerge, or fail over time is unclear. ... The key,

however, lies in the people who populate particular schools at

particular times and their interaction within these organizations"

(Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1989, p. 168). Hoy and Ferguson (1989)

compare the goal-oriented and social-systems models, and offer the

latter as the preferred means to analyze effectiveness in schools.

Both of the models seem to share a common assumption, namely, that it is possible, and desirable, to arrive at the single set of evaluative criteria, and thus a single statement about organizational effectiveness. The goal model stresses the successful attainment of specific objectives, while the systems model is more concerned with internal consistency, the ability to adapt and the optimization of resources. ... It is assumed that all formal organizations, such as schools, attempt to achieve certain objectives and to develop group products through the manipulation of material and human resources; hence the study of effectiveness is concerned with both organizational means and ends. ... Consequently, organizational effectiveness is defined as the extent to which any organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members. (pp. 262-263)

When considering organizations, like schools, that depend on the manipulation of human resources (means), which are seeking to achieve increased student achievement and staff performance (ends), attention to the alienation of individuals is especially relevant. Seeman (1972) observes that changes are underway in the sphere of work where the trend is toward engagement and professionalization. This un-alientated state is seemingly related to notions of social integration that are explored in this study. For Seeman (1972), social integration has

a striking parallel to the varieties of alienation: competence is the obverse of powerlessness; understanding vs. meaninglessness; trust and social regulation vs. normlessness; cultural commitment vs. value isolation; intrinsic work orientation vs. self-

estrangement; and colleagueship vs. social isolation. (pp. 520-

521)

However, Seeman (1972) acknowledges the question of socialization also

remains one of the most neglected areas of work, much like alienation,

by virtue of the decreasing interest observed in the literature. In

the sphere of work, Seeman (1972) recommends that future research place

greater emphasis on the solution theme, where engagement, not

alienation, is the focus.

In practical terms, this study is significant because data about

parents' perceptions of their experience in their children's school is

compared in novel but legitimate ways. This secondary examination of

existing data provides the basis for discussing the ways and means by

which system administrators, school principals and teachers might more

effectively promote the social integration of parents. This study

offers a means for them to inform the development of policy and devise

recommendations for school improvement because it also offers a

framework that attempts to relate the social integration of parents to

matters of institutional effectiveness.

Overview of the Report

This thesis is organized into five chapters. This chapter

presents the background and basic rationale for the study and states

the purpose that guides it. The chapter also indicates the theoretical

and practical significance of the study, and concludes with an overview

of the chapters that characterize the final report of the research.

Chapter 2 develops the theoretical framework for the study. By

reviewing the literature on school effectiveness and alienation, an

attempt is made to justify the selection of the particular variables

that are used to measure the perceptions of parents about being socially integrated into their children's schools.

Chapter 3 presents a summary of the original study, a description of the sample, specifying how parent groups were selected from the original study, and the salient characteristics of their children's schools. Then, the conceptual regrouping of items in the original questionnaire into the proposed dimensions of social integration is theoretically justified and the operationalization of the variables used in this study is explained. The responses to each set of items designed to measure a particular variable were correlated to help select items that would be empirically consistent with the theoretical formulation. Following a brief report of this analysis, descriptive statistics for each of the variables are presented.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study. Descriptive statistics are presented for each of the schools and for each of the variables. Scores for each of the items, within each of the variables, are compared across schools. In detail, this chapter shows that parents experience social integration differently in different schools.

Finally, chapter 5 presents a summary of the study and a discussion of the findings. Also, the implications of the study for theory, practice, and future research are presented.

Chapter 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter reviews the theory and research related to the problem presented in chapter 1. It begins with a review of school effectiveness, identifying Lezotte's (1988, 1991) model, used in the original survey, as an example of this research literature. Following this, the concept of alienation is examined in order to identify the variables that are used to measure its obverse, social integration. This study is concerned with the social integration of parents into their children's schools, and, in part, because it relies on data that was collected from parents using an instrument designed from Lezotte's (1988, 1991) model, treating the social integration of parents as an aspect of school effectiveness is justified but requires explanation. In addition to this explanation, this chapter also provides a rationale for the selection of the particular variables used in this study to measure the social integration of parents into their children's schools.

School Effectiveness

The school effectiveness movement began in the late 1960's following a study by Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, Mc Partland, Mood, Weinfeld, and York, who wrote the so-called "Coleman Report" (1966). These authors reported that:

Schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context. ... This very lack of an independent effect means that the inequality imposed on children by their home, neighborhood and

peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities

with which they confront adult life at the end of school. For

equality of educational opportunity must imply a strong effect of

schools that is independent of the child's immediate social

environment, and that strong independence is not present in

American schools. (Coleman, et al., 1966, p. 325)

Unfortunately, in the late 1960's and early 1970's, it became widely

believed that schools do not make much of a difference in the

educational lives of students. However, this conclusion gave way to a

number of studies (Weber, 1971; Klitgaard & Hall, 1974; Brookover et

al., 1979; Edmonds, 1983; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Rutter, 1983) that

challenged this generalization.

Weber (1971) was one of the first researchers to respond to the

conclusion presented by Coleman and his colleagues (1966) by searching

for characteristics of effective schools. In a series of studies, he

repeatedly found eight characteristics of effective schools when using

an independently developed assessment tool to evaluate reading

achievement. His study showed that the schools in which the students

perform best have strong leadership, high expectations for students and

a positive culture (beliefs, values, norms, behavior patterns).

Furthermore, these schools individualize their programs and carefully

evaluate their pupils' progress. Like Weber (1971), Klitgaard and Hall

(1974) measured school effectiveness through student performance on

standardized tests. They examined student performance in reading and

in mathematics and showed that schools in which students perform best

also share certain characteristics, similar to those found by Weber

(1971). Specifically, they showed that some schools were more

effective than predicted since such schools performed well on the

standardized tests, compared to others, despite the low socio-economic status of many of their students.

Like Weber (1971) and Klitgaard and Hall (1974), Brookover and his colleagues (1979) examined school inputs (social composition of the student body, social structure, and climate) and student outputs (achievement, self-concept, self-reliance). However, this study also considered the relationship of these to certain so-called "processes" in the school. This study showed that these school inputs do not predict student outputs independent of school processes as defined, in part, by parental involvement and the openness of classroom organization. The norms, expectations, and views about the social system defined climate, as the educators, parents, and students perceive it. Although the specific school processes that were present in more and less effective schools were not contrasted, this study showed that schools with comparable resources had very different climate.

Like Brookover and his colleagues (1979), Rutter (1983) suggested that school processes have important effects on student outcomes. This led Good and Brophy (1986) to conclude that "the association between the combined measure of overall school process and each of the outcome measures was much stronger than was the relationship between any individual process variable and outcome measure" (p. 580).

Purkey and Smith (1983) showed that, commonly, effective schools have better control of students, more discipline, and high staff expectations for student achievement. Like Weber (1971) and Klitgaard and Hall (1974), their study identified strong leadership by the principal, high expectations for students, clear goals, an academic emphasis for the school, school-wide staff training program, and a system for monitoring student progress as indicative of effective

schools. Purkey and Smith (1983) also expanded the work of Brookover and his colleagues (1979) and Rutter (1978) by proposing a portrait of an effective school using so-called "process" variables. In their study, an effective school was portrayed as one having high parental involvement and support, school-wide recognition for academic success, instructional leadership, strong curriculum articulation and organization, school-wide staff development, collaborative planning, collegial relationships, and a sense of community on the part of all school members.

Edmonds (1983) is credited with having stimulated many improvement plans in schools. In fact, Good and Brophy (1986) hold "Edmonds, more than anyone, ... responsible for the communication of the belief that schools can and do make a difference" (p. 582). Edmonds (1983) contended that effectiveness in schools is a function of the leadership of the principal characterized by substantial attention to the quality of instruction, a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus, promotion of an orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning, teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are able to obtain at least minimum mastery, and the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation.

As previously stated, Lezotte's (1988, 1991) model of school effectiveness provided the template for collecting data for the original survey. His model largely reflects the line of inquiry on school effectiveness previously discussed, and to a large extent operationalizes Edmonds' (1983) model for effective schools. Lezotte (1988) acknowledges that there appears to be some confusion regarding three terms that are often used interchangeably in the literature on

effective schools, namely, school effects, school effectiveness, and effective schools. He states:

> School effects research tends to be the broader category and implies research questions that generally ask which aspects of the school tend to be related to behaviors or attitudes of the individuals who have a vested interest in the school. School effectiveness research should be used to describe those studies that examine the relationship between aspects of the school and the intended learning outcomes of the school. Effective schools is a more narrow concept in that it is intended to describe not only the relationship between aspects of the school and intended learning outcomes, but explicitly focuses on the equitable distribution of outcomes. (Lezotte, 1988, p. 8)

Thus, according to Lezotte (1991), "an effective school can be defined as one that can, in outcome terms, be reflective of its own teaching for learning mission, demonstrate the joint presence of quality (acceptably high levels of achievement) and equity (no differences in the distribution of that achievement among the major subsets of the student population)" (p. 3).

Lezotte (1988, 1991) also suggests that the attendance, attitude, achievement and behavior of students can be indicative of school effectiveness and certain features of schools, namely, a safe and orderly environment, a clear and focused mission, a climate of high expectations for success, shared instructional leadership, opportunities to learn, the monitoring of student progress and home-school partnerships are positively related to these indicators. In other words, for Lezotte (1988, 1991), improving in one or more of these areas will also improve students' attendance, attitude, achievement, and behavior, and, in any attempt at school improvement,

he places greater emphasis on the presence of certain desirable

behaviors and adjusting those undesirable behaviors to desirable ones.

> Moving beyond simply the elimination of undesirable behavior will
>
> represent a significant challenge for many schools. ... Since
>
> schools as workplaces are characterized by their isolation,
>
> creating more collaborative/cooperative environments for both the
>
> adults and students [requires] substantial commitment and change.
>
> ... Teachers must learn about teamwork and the school must create
>
> "opportunity structures" for collaboration so that adults can
>
> model collaborative working relationships for students. (Lezotte,
>
> 1991, p. 2)

Inasmuch as the school's mission considers the experience of all

members and articulates their common purpose and goals, desired

behaviors for all school participants should be articulated as plans

are developed and acted upon, Lezotte (1991) contends. In a similar

way, when many perspectives are considered and many groups are involved

in planning and decision-making, so are schools most likely to serve

their members. Therefore, he emphasizes a broadened form of school

leadership.

> Instructional leadership will remain important; however the
>
> concept will be broadened and leadership will be viewed as a
>
> dispersed concept that includes all adults, especially the
>
> teachers. ... This is in keeping with the teacher empowerment
>
> concept; it recognizes that a principal cannot be the only leader
>
> in a complex organization like a school. With the
>
> democratization of organizations, especially schools, the
>
> leadership function becomes one of creating a community of shared
>
> values. The mission will remain critical because it will serve

to give the community of shared values, an identification of what the school community cares most about. (Lezotte, 1991, pp. 3-4)

In the effort to build a community of shared values, Lezotte (1991) claims that effective home-school partnerships ensure that parents understand and support the basic mission of the school their children attend and are given the opportunity to play an important role in helping the school achieve this mission and goals. For Lezotte (1991), parental involvement is indicative of an authentic partnership between home and school. This implies that teachers and parents must each recognize that they have complementary expertise in working with children, that is, the vested interest in each child's success is shared. The fact that teachers and parents share similar intentions, goals, and value each other, must be realized. Regular, free, two-way communication between teachers and parents must be established. Simply put, the goal is "to build trust and enough communication to realize that both teachers and parents have the same goal--an effective school and home for all children" (Lezotte, 1991, p. 7).

It is apparent that throughout the literature on school effectiveness, and across each of Lezotte's (1988, 1991) areas for school improvement, a strong theme emerges. Parents' estimation of their children's school's effectiveness is related to the degree to which parents think they influence the school's direction, influence decisions about their children, share values and goals with others, agree with others in matters of behavior, participate in their children's education, and value the school experience of their children. Just as in the original survey, parents' impressions about their schools were gathered to identify needs and suggest improvements using Lezotte's (1988, 1991) school effectiveness framework, this study examines those same parents' impressions in a different theoretical

framework. This study and the original survey are united in their recognition that parents develop impressions about schools either from direct observation and their own experience, or by reflecting upon the experience of their children. However, in contrast, the framework of this study explores the degree to which parents report their sense of social integration beyond the single category of "home-school partnerships". That is, the social integration of parents is examined across all areas of school effectiveness originally identified. Because these perceptions relate to several aspects of a school's operation--mission and goals, climate, ethos, values, and relationships--the perceived social integration of parents can rightly be considered a broadly based measure of a school's effectiveness.

Alienation and Social Integration in Schools

In the social sciences, the examination of alienation as a social phenomenon gained prominence with the work of Seeman (1959, 1972, 1983) who conceptually identified six dimensions of alienation: powerlessness, value isolation, normlessness, meaninglessness, self-estrangement, and social isolation.

> It becomes quite clear that forms of alienation are the obverse
> of values central to American society: the sense of powerlessness
> goes counter to the values of mastery and autonomy; value
> isolation undercuts the goal of consensus; normlessness threatens
> the stable development of order and trust; meaninglessness and
> self-estrangement are the alienative counterparts of
> understanding and engagement; social isolation ... implicates the
> values of egalitarianism and individual worth. These are the

positive values that are at stake when the evidence concerning

alienation is assessed. (Seeman, 1972, p. 474)

Seeman's (1959, 1972, 1983) six dimensions of alienation are defined

either in terms of people's expectancies or values. Accordingly, to be

alienated means to be characterized by a sense of one or several of the

following: powerlessness, value isolation, normlessness,

meaninglessness, self-estrangement, and social isolation. Seeman

(1959, 1972, 1983) derived these dimensions of alienation from

traditional sociological theory and worked to provide operational

definitions of each. In fact, he defines each of the dimensions from a

distinctly social-psychological point of view.

Webb and Sherman (1989) apply Seeman's (1959, 1972, 1983)

conception to schools. They argue that bureaucracy is evident in

schools, in policies that direct educators, in directions that

administrators set for teachers, and in the routines teachers implement

for students. Increasingly, in the broader political context of

education, there is little decision-making left to parents and teachers

in schools. Thus, Webb and Sherman (1989) claim that it is important

to examine how bureaucracies, like schools, affect the alienation of

children, staff, and parents. Webb and Sherman (1989) identify most of

the same forms of alienation as Seeman (1959, 1972, 1983) does;

however, their definitions for each of the dimensions of alienation are

more applicable to educational settings. According to Webb and Sherman

(1989), "alienation as powerlessness comes about when individuals sense

their inability to participate in decisions that directly affect their

lives" (p. 13). Meaninglessness, they say, is related to the

difficulty in feeling "a deep connection or unity with the goals of the

institution" (p. 15). Normlessness is defined by an individual's

inability to achieve goals in a socially acceptable manner. Instead,

individuals seek other means to achieve goals that are contrary to the established norms. Norms are defined as "prescribed goals and socially accepted means for achieving the goals" (p.15). Isolation is defined as that situation where individuals reject "the desirability of any active inclusion in society" (p.16), and self-estrangement is that situation in which "individuals find little or no intrinsic satisfaction in the roles they play or the work they do. Activity has no intrinsic purpose but is carried out to achieve external rewards, such as pleasing others or making money" (p. 17).

In light of these dimensions of alienation, a theoretical model for social integration is constructed for this study. Simply stated, the contention is that parents' estimation of their children's school's effectiveness is affected by the degree to which parents think that they influence the school's direction, influence decisions about their children, share values and goals with others, agree with others in matters of behavior, participate in their children's education, and value the school experience of their children. Therefore, in this study, dimensions of powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness, inclusion, and satisfaction serve to describe the degree to which parents think they are socially integrated into their children's schools and classrooms. First, powerfulness is defined by the parents' view of their ability to influence the decisions and direction of the school in ways that affect their children's lives. The second dimension, meaningfulness, is defined by the parents' sense of connection to the values and goals of the school. Third, normfulness is defined by the parents' view of the acceptability of the behaviors of teachers and students in achieving their goals. Fourth, inclusion is defined by the parents' involvement in their children's education. Finally, satisfaction, as the fifth dimension of social integration, is

defined by the parents' perception of the happiness and success experienced by their children at school.

Powerlessness and Powerfulness

According to Seeman (1959), powerlessness "can be conceived as the expectancy or probability held by the individual that [his/her] own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, [s/he] seeks" (p. 784). This notion of alienation was conceived in the Marxian view of the worker's condition in capitalist society. In short, the worker is alienated to the extent that the prerogative and means of decision are expropriated by ruling entrepreneurs. "Max Weber extended this notion beyond the industrial sphere to others, like the modern soldier who is equally separated from the means of violence, the scientist from the means of inquiry, and the civil servant from the means of administration" (Gerth & Mills, 1946, p. 50). Seeman (1959) acknowledges that:

> The individual's expectancy for control of events is clearly
> distinguished from (a) the objective situation of powerlessness
> as some observers see it, (b) the observer's judgment of that
> situation against some ethical standard, and (c) the individual's
> sense of a discrepancy between [his/her] expectations for control
> and his desire for control. (p. 784)

In short, this dimension refers to the individual's sense of personal control over reinforcing situations, as contrasted with his/her view that the occurrence of reinforcements is dependent on external conditions, like chance or the manipulation of others.

In this study, the definition of powerlessness is operationalized particularly as it applies to the perceived influence of parents in schools. Hence, Seeman's (1972) notion of powerfulness as "a [high]

expectancy that one's own behavior can control the occurrence of personal and social rewards; for the [socially integrated person], control is not seemingly vested in external forces, powerful others, luck, or fate" (p. 472) is, from the perspective of parents in their children's school, their perceptions of their experience in influencing the decisions and direction of the school. Thus, powerfulness is a function of parental involvement in developing the mission, goals, plans for improving the school, and in making decisions about their children. Consequently, this dimension is a function of how and on what matters parents expect to be involved in their children's schools.

Meaninglessness and Meaningfulness

> According to Seeman (1959), meaninglessness
>
> refers to the individual's sense of understanding the events in
>
> which [s/he] is engaged. We may speak of high alienation, in the
>
> meaninglessness usage, when the individual is unclear as to what
>
> [s/he] ought to believe - when the individual's minimal standards
>
> for clarity in decision-making are not met. (p. 786)

Seeman (1959) credits Adorno's (1944) treatment of prejudice and search for meaning, Hoffer's (1951) portrait of a true believer, and Mannheim's (1940) description of the increase of functional rationality and concomitant decline of substantial rationality as the clearest contemporary examples of meaninglessness as a dimension of alienation. Mannheim (1940) contends that

> as society increasingly organizes its members with reference to
>
> the most efficient realization of ends (that is, functional
>
> rationality increases), there is a parallel decline in the
>
> capacity to act intelligently in a given situation on the basis
>
> of one's own insight into the interrelations of events" (p. 59).

In this study, meaningfulness is defined by "a sense of [comprehensibility] of social affairs, of events whose dynamics one [does] understand and whose future course one [can] predict. More formally, [it is] a [high] expectancy that satisfactory predictions about future outcomes can be made" (Seeman, 1972, p. 472). From the perspective of parents in their children's schools, their perceptions of meaningfulness relate to their connection to the values and goals of the school. Thus, meaningfulness is a function of the positive experience and understanding with other parents and educators. Consequently, this dimension is a function of the degree to which parents believe that classroom and school activities are important and have purpose.

Normlessness and Normfulness

Seeman derives the third dimension of alienation, the condition of normlessness, from Durkheim's (1893) description of anomie. According to Seeman (1959), "anomie denotes a situation in which the social norms regulating individual conduct have broken down or are no longer effective as rules for behavior" (p. 787). Merton (1949) further describes adaptations (kinds of conformity and deviance) that may occur when the disciplining effect of collective standards has been weakened. Merton (1949) argues that "anomie or normlessness will develop to the extent that the technically most effective procedure, whether culturally legitimate or not, becomes typically preferred to institutionally prescribed conduct" (p. 128).

In this study, normfulness is defined by "a high expectancy that socially [approved] means are necessary to achieve given goals; the view that one [is] bound by conventional standards in the pursuit of what may be, after all, quite conventional goals (e.g. position,

wealth)" (Seeman, 1972, p. 472). From the perspective of parents in their children's school, normfulness relates both to their experience and their observations of others that the purposes of the school are fulfilled in a socially acceptable manner. Within the classroom, normfulness is, in large part, a function of the parents' view that teachers display appropriate attitudes, work habits, and keep their students interested and progressing. Within the school, in general, normfulness is a function of the parents' view that expectations for achievement and personal behavior are clearly set and that expectations for relationships between participants in the school are defined and respected.

Isolation and Inclusion

According to Seeman (1959), "the alienated in the isolation sense are those who, ... assign low reward value to the goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society" (pp. 788-789). In this study, inclusion is defined by "the individual's [high] expectancy for involvement and social acceptance" (Seeman, 1972, p. 473). From the perspective of parents in their children's school, their perceptions of inclusion relate to their experience and their observations of others that participate in the educational lives of their children. This also relates to their perceptions about the degree to which they think they, and others, are invited to participate. Within the classroom, inclusion is, in large part, a function of the parents' view that teachers communicate with them regularly to help them understand the curriculum and inform them about their children's progress. In this context, feelings of trust and the realization that parents and teachers share similar goals influences their perceptions of inclusion. Within the school, inclusion is a

function of the parents' view that they are actively involved with
teachers and are working together. The belief that parents are welcome
in classrooms and schools influences their perceptions of inclusion.

Self-estrangement and Satisfaction

According to Seeman (1959):

What has been called self-estrangement refers essentially to the
inability of the individual to find self-rewarding activities
that engage him. ... To be self-alienated, in the final analysis,
means to be something less than one might ideally be if the
circumstances in society were otherwise - to be insecure, given
to appearances, conformist. (p. 790)

Further, Seeman (1972) argues that this definition

clearly represents a departure from two prevalent alternatives:
(1) that self-estrangement consists of the nonfulfillment of
certain innate human needs; and (2) that self-estrangement
involves some degree of rejection of one's self--some sense of
discrepancy between what one is and what one would like to be.
(p. 495)

In this study, "to be [satisfied] is to be engaged in activities
that [are] rewarding in themselves" (Seeman, 1972, p. 473). From the
perspective of parents, their perceptions of satisfaction are mostly a
function of their observations of their children's experiences. Within
the classroom, satisfaction is, in large part, a function of the
parents' view that teachers celebrate their children's accomplishments
and highlight their progress. Within the school, in general,
satisfaction is a function of the parents' view that their children are
happy to go to school. This indicates to parents that their children
are safe, connected to others, interested, and successful.

Summary

The main purpose of this chapter was to present the theoretical rationale for the problem and the variables that are used to analyze the problem. A review of the theory and research on school effectiveness and school improvement reveals a strong theme which is critical to the focus of the study, namely that, parents' estimation of their children's school's effectiveness is related to their sense of membership, engagement and efficacy in the functioning of classrooms and schools their children attend. Drawing upon data of parents' perceptions gathered in a survey designed to identify areas for school improvement, this study re-examines the perceptions in a novel theoretical framework that identifies several dimensions of social integration. Insofar as those perceptions reveal the degree of parental engagement in the classrooms and schools their children attend, the framework of this study is designed to address both the theory and practice of school effectiveness and improvement.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes how the theoretical model, developed in chapter 2, is operationalized. In order to empirically investigate the degree to which parents think they are socially integrated into their children's schools, it is necessary to define the sample from which data were collected as well as to identify the empirical measures that are used. The first section of the chapter discusses the original survey instrument and the sample of parents that are included in this study. In the second section, the measurement of the variables, within the theoretical framework of social integration, is described.

Original Survey and Sample

As outlined in chapter 1, in the 1996-1997 school year, a Winnipeg school division gathered school-planning teams, including educators and parents, for two inservice days to consider Lezotte's (1988, 1991) conceptual model and research on effective schools. Hulley (1996), from the North Star Centre for Personal and Organizational Effectiveness Inc., facilitated the workshop for school teams.

Following the inservice, school-planning teams consulted with educators, parents and students at the schools in the division in order to identify questionnaire items that could be used to determine the effectiveness of the schools in the division. After this preliminary information was gathered from the schools, questionnaires were developed to survey staff, parents, and students (Appendix A). The instruments were developed by senior administrators in the division in

consultation with Proactive Information Services Inc., a local Winnipeg research company, who consolidated the information from the school-planning teams. Subsequently, all educators and parents, and students in grades five through eight, in six schools were surveyed in the spring of 1997. In the fall of 1997, educators, parents and students in four other schools were surveyed. The same set of three questionnaires was used in all ten schools. The data and analysis, provided by Proactive Information Services Inc. (1997), informed school-planning teams about the priorities identified by each group in each school, the areas each group thought the school was doing well in, and the areas each group thought the school should improve upon.

Although staff and parents associated with the ten schools in the division were surveyed using the same instruments within the same year, this study focuses on only the perceptions of parents in only four schools. In large part, this is because there was a large volume of missing data for parents at some of the schools and because, unfortunately, much of the original data from staff was either lost or corrupted (only the staff data from four of the ten schools was available). This precluded the possibility of comparing staff and parent perceptions about the degree to which they experience social integration in the schools. While the parent data remained intact for all ten schools, in some schools a large percentage of parents did not return their questionnaires. This, coupled with the wide range in school size, required narrowing the sample to four schools in order to ensure that descriptive statistics for each school represented a reasonably large group of parents. Because this study is a secondary analysis of existing data, its feasibility was determined by whether or not a valid sample of parents in similar schools could be obtained.

To verify that a valid sample of parents in similar schools could be selected from the ten schools, similarities between the schools were examined, specifically size and survey response rates. Schools were also classified on their grade configuration and program. Of the ten schools, two were excluded because they were relatively smaller in size. Two others schools were excluded because substantially fewer parents responded to the questionnaire. Of the six remaining schools, two more were excluded from this study because of their organizational dissimilarity from the other schools.

Ultimately, four schools were selected for this study and were assigned pseudonyms to keep their identities reasonably confidential. At the time of the original survey, 165 families were surveyed at Parkland, 178 at Westview, 253 at Hillcrest, and 339 families at Lakeside. Population projections published monthly by the school division helped determine the total number of parents in each school. Only one survey was sent home for parents in each family to complete. The response rates for the original survey were 51% at Parkland, 75% Hillcrest, 80% at Lakeside, and 82% at Westview. All four schools selected are Early-Middle Years schools; Westview and Hillcrest are similar because they are both dual-track schools, where English instruction and French immersion programs are delivered; Parkland and Lakeside are both English instruction schools.

Measurement of the Variables

As presented in chapter 2, there are five variables that measure the degree to which parents think they are socially integrated into schools: powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness, inclusion, and satisfaction. However, other than for the powerfulness variable, each

of the other variables were examined in two ways. That is, there are two meaningfulness variables, one related to school values and the other related to school goals. For the remaining dimensions, normfulness, inclusion, and satisfaction variables, each are considered in two contexts - the classroom and the school. In fact then, nine variables are operationalized and measured in the study.

For all the items that were used from the original survey, parents could respond "always", "often", "sometimes", "rarely/never", or "don't know". In the original data, "always" received a score of 5.0; "often" received a 4.0; "sometimes", a score of 3.0; "rarely/never", a score of 2.0; and "don't know", a score of 1.0. In this study, however, a recoding of the original scale is used. That is, a response of "always" and "often" receives a score of 3.0; "sometimes", a score of 2.0; and "rarely/never" and "don't know" receive a score of 1.0.

The data were recoded because the scores for "always" and "often" had already been recoded on the disk for some schools, but not for others. Likewise, responses of "rarely/never" and "don't know" were combined, suggesting similar degrees of low social integration. "Don't know" was considered as being either the infrequency of the item's occurrence or the respondent's low integration into the school. While it is readily acknowledged that grouping responses affect the intercorrelations between items and the descriptive statistics for the variables, to group responses in this way is not unusual, as can be observed in other studies (e.g., Rothman & Black, 2001). Thus, the three-point scale that was developed for this study is different from the scales used by Proactive Information Services Inc. (1997) in the original survey.

Powerfulness

To determine the perception of parents about their ability to influence the decisions and the direction of the school, the following items are used:

1. I have had the opportunity to participate in setting the direction of the school.

2. Students have had had the opportunity to participate in setting the direction of the school.

3. Decisions concerning my child are consistent with the school's mission.

4. I am involved in making decisions about my child.

5. Consequences are applied consistently.

From these five items, items 1 and 4 are most conceptually tied to notions of powerfulness, as directly experienced by parents, because they address the level of influence parents perceive that they have in their children's school. Items 3 and 5 address powerfulness as a matter of expectancy on the part of parents. While item 2 does not directly address powerfulness as experienced by parents, it is nonetheless conceptually tied to powerfulness because it measures how parents indirectly perceive powerfulness, that is, in light of their estimate of their children's experience.

Table 1 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation range is from 0.193 to 0.435, indicating that items measure related aspects of powerfulness. These items were aggregated to create a measure of powerfulness.

Table 1

Intercorrelations of the Five Items for Powerfulness

Items	1	2	3	4	5
1	1.000	0.435	0.383	0.301	0.193
2		1.000	0.416	0.296	0.330
3			1.000	0.322	0.310
4				1.000	0.265
5					1.000

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for powerfulness. This variable has a range of scores from 5.0 to 15.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable and for those in subsequent sections, the valid percent of respondents and missing data represented in this table reflects the cumulative effect of missing data across all the items in the scale. That is, where parents did not respond to one or more of the items, their response to other items is recorded as missing. Thus, 42.5% of the data is missing for this variable. From the four schools selected, 28.0% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 30.9% did not answer item 2; 17.9% did not answer item 3; 25.6% did not answer item 4; and 24.6% did not answer item 5.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Powerfulness

Mean	11.33		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Median	12.00			
Mode	13.00	Valid	538	57.5%
Range	10.00	Missing	397	42.5%
Standard Deviation	2.59	Total	935	100.0%

Meaningfulness of School Values

To determine the perception of parents about their connection to the values of the school, the following three items are used:

1.   Academic excellence is valued by staff.

2.   Academic excellence is valued by my child.

3.   I value academic excellence.

From these three items, item 3 is most conceptually tied to notions of meaningfulness, because it relates to the values of the school, as directly experienced by parents. This identifies learning and excellence as central values in parents' perceptions of schooling. While items 1 and 2 do not speak directly to meaningfulness, as experienced by parents, they are nonetheless conceptually tied to it. By having parents indicate how they perceive staff and students value academic excellence, they consider their own responses in relation to their perceptions about the same values held by staff and students. Furthermore, by comparing responses item by item, this shows the degree to which groups in the school share the same values, at least from the parents' point of view.

Table 3 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation range is from 0.207 to 0.380, indicating that items measure related aspects of meaningfulness of school values. These items were aggregated to create the first measure of meaningfulness.

Table 3

Intercorrelations of the Three Items for

Meaningfulness of School Values

Items	1	2	3
1	1.000	0.380	0.207
2		1.000	0.330
3			1.000

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics for meaningfulness of school values. This variable has a range of scores from 3.0 to 9.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable, 39.3% of the data is missing. From the four schools selected, 29.6% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 26.9% did not answer item 2; and 31.4% did not answer item 3.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Meaningfulness of School Values

			Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Mean	8.20			
Median	9.00			
Mode	9.00	Valid	568	60.7%
Range	6.00	Missing	367	39.3%
Standard Deviation	1.15	Total	935	100.0%

Meaningfulness of School Goals

To determine the perception of parents about their connection to the goals of the school, the following two items are used:

1. Decisions and actions taken at this school reflect the school's written statement of purpose and beliefs (mission).

2. School activities (classroom, special events, extra-curricular) reflect the school's mission.

Both items are conceptually tied to notions of meaningfulness, as this relates to the goals of the school, as directly experienced by parents. They address how actions and activities at the school reflect its mission. Parents draw meaning from and connect school activities either to the mission that they also share or the mission as they think it should be.

Table 5 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation is 0.686, indicating that items measure related aspects of

meaningfulness of school goals. These items were aggregated to create a second measure of meaningfulness.

Table 5

Intercorrelations of the Two Items for Meaningfulness of School Goals

Items	1	2
1	1.000	0.686
2		1.000

Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for meaningfulness of school goals. This variable has a range of scores from 2.0 to 6.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable, 19.8% of the data is missing. From the four schools selected, 13.2% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; and 14.8% did not answer item 2.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Meaningfulness of School Goals

			Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Mean	5.21			
Median	6.00			
Mode	6.00	Valid	750	80.2%
Range	4.00	Missing	185	19.8%
Standard Deviation	1.30	Total	935	100.0%

Normfulness in the Classroom

To determine the perception of parents about the behavior they expect from their children's teacher, the following seven items are used:

1. My child's progress in monitored on an ongoing basis.

2. Teachers use multiple methods to assess my child's learning (e.g. tests, portfolios, projects, and conferencing).

3.   My child receives information on the purposes, techniques and
      criteria used in assessment.

4.   My child is involved in goal setting and self-assessment to help
      him/her become an independent learner.

5.   My child is involved in a variety of class activities that help
      him/her learn (e.g. projects, group work, hands-on activities).

6.   My child is challenged at an appropriate level.

7.   My child has opportunities that exist beyond the classroom that
      contribute to his/her learning.

All items are conceptually tied to notions of normfulness, as
indirectly experienced by parents, by virtue of their children's
perceptions and experience. All items address the behaviors parents
expect from their children's teacher, where the teacher is expected to
fulfill his/her purpose in a socially acceptable manner.

Table 7 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The
correlation range is from 0.196 to 0.564, indicating that items measure
related aspects of normfulness in the classroom. These items were
aggregated to create the first measure of normfulness.

Table 7

Intercorrelations of the Seven Items for Normfulness in the Classroom

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1.000	0.454	0.365	0.336	0.311	0.365	0.310
2		1.000	0.388	0.359	0.338	0.326	0.296
3			1.000	0.564	0.196	0.212	0.277
4				1.000	0.238	0.267	0.263
5					1.000	0.371	0.362
6						1.000	0.378
7							1.000

Table 8 presents the descriptive statistics for normfulness in the classroom. This variable has a range of scores from 7.0 to 21.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable, 39.7% of the data is missing. From the four schools selected, 14.4% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 12.6% did not answer item 2; 31.5% did not answer for item 3; 14.6% did not answer item 4; 16.0% did not answer item 5; 16.8% did not answer item 6; and 28.6% did not answer item 7.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Normfulness in the Classroom

Mean	18.03		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Median	19.00			
Mode	21.00	Valid	564	60.3%
Range	14.00	Missing	371	39.7%
Standard Deviation	2.91	Total	935	100.0%

Normfulness in the School

To determine the perception of parents about the behaviors they expect of all school members, the following seven items are used:

1. Rules and expectations for student behavior are clear.

2. Staff behavior contributes to a safe and orderly environment.

3. Staff treat my child with respect.

4. Students treat staff with respect.

5. Staff in this school have high expectations for my child.

6. Staff is committed to helping all students master important learning objectives.

7. Achievement expectations are shared with students.

All items are conceptually tied to notions of normfulness, as directly experienced by parents. These items are not specific to the behavior of their children's teacher, as were the items that

operationalized the first normfulness variable. Instead, they address the way members of the school behave and relate to the students and to each other.

Table 9 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation range is from 0.230 to 0.460, indicating that items measure related aspects of normfulness in the school. These items were aggregated to create a second measure of normfulness.

Table 9

Intercorrelations of the Seven Items for Normfulness in the School

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1.000	0.411	0.371	0.241	0.306	0.316	0.351
2		1.000	0.435	0.367	0.285	0.345	0.319
3			1.000	0.378	0.299	0.399	0.328
4				1.000	0.359	0.230	0.313
5					1.000	0.460	0.413
6						1.000	0.425
7							1.000

Table 10 presents the descriptive statistics for normfulness in the school. This variable has a range of scores from 7.0 to 21.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable, 41.5% of the data is missing. From the four schools selected, 9.7% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 25.1% did not answer item 2; 19.8% did not answer item 3; 24.4% did not answer item 4; 24.6% did not answer item 5; 13.4% did not answer item 6; and 25.9% did not answer item 7.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Normfulness in the School

Mean	18.67		Frequency	Percent
Median	20.00		(n)	(%)
Mode	21.00	Valid	547	58.5%
Range	14.00	Missing	388	41.5%
Standard Deviation	2.88	Total	935	100.0%

Inclusion in the Classroom

To determine the perception of parents about their connection to their children's classroom, the following three items are used:

1.   There is frequent communication with parents/guardians.

2.   I receive regular feedback on my child's progress.

3.   Teachers help parents/guardians understand school programs/curriculum.

All items are conceptually tied to notions of inclusion, as directly experienced by parents. Like the items that operationalized the first variable for normfulness, they address the behaviors parents expect from their children's teacher, that is, behaviors that encourage them, as parents, to be informed about and involved in their children's education.

Table 11 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation range is from 0.534 to 0.739, indicating that items measure related aspects of inclusion in the classroom. These items were aggregated to create the first measure of inclusion.

Table 11

Intercorrelations of the Three Items for Inclusion in the Classroom

Items	1	2	3
1	1.000	0.739	0.534
2		1.000	0.543
3			1.000

Table 12 presents the descriptive statistics for inclusion in the classroom. This variable has a range of scores from 3.0 to 9.0, and is scale is skewed to the right. For this variable, 35.7% of the data is missing. From the four schools that were selected, 16.8% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 14.8% did not answer item 2; and 27.3% did not answer item 3.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for Inclusion in the Classroom

			Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Mean	7.50			
Median	8.00			
Mode	9.00	Valid	601	64.3%
Range	6.00	Missing	334	35.7%
Standard Deviation	1.67	Total	935	100.0%

Inclusion in the School

To determine the perceptions of parents about their involvement in the school, the following three items are used:

1. Parents/Guardians play an active role in the school.

2. Staff and parents/guardians work together to promote student success.

3. Parent/Guardian involvement is valued by staff.

All items are conceptually tied to notions of inclusion, as directly experienced by parents. They address the degree to which

parents perceive staff welcome their involvement and value them. These items also show how parents perceive the level of volunteerism and encouragement of such in the school.

Table 13 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation range is from 0.535 to 0.619, indicating that items measure related aspects of inclusion in the school. These items were aggregated to create a second measure of inclusion.

Table 13

Intercorrelations of the Three Items for

Inclusion in the School

Items	1	2	3
1	1.000	0.581	0.535
2		1.000	0.619
3			1.000

Table 14 presents the descriptive statistics for inclusion in the school. This variable has a range of scores from 3.0 to 9.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable, 37.3% of the data is missing. From the four schools selected, 29.4% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 15.6% did not answer item 2; and 27.7% did not answer item 3.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for Inclusion in the School

			Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Mean	7.7184			
Median	8.0000			
Mode	9.0000	Valid	586	62.7%
Range	6.0000	Missing	349	37.3%
Standard Deviation	1.6520	Total	935	100.0%

Satisfaction in the Classroom

To determine the perception of parents about the value they place upon their children's experience in the classroom, the following three items are used:

1.   My child receives recognition for his/her accomplishments.

2.   Staff emphasizes my child's strengths rather than shortcomings.

3.   My child receives constructive feedback about his/her progress and achievement.

All items are tied to notions of satisfaction, as indirectly experienced by parents, by virtue of their children's perceptions and experiences in classrooms. Like the items that operationalized the first normfulness and inclusion variables, these items address the behaviors parents expect of their children's teacher, that is, those behaviors that the teacher shows to keep their children motivated and engaged.

Table 15 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation range is from 0.467 to 0.543, indicating that items measure related aspects to satisfaction in the classroom. These items were aggregated to create the first measure of satisfaction.

Table 15

Intercorrelations of the Three Items for Satisfaction in the Classroom

Items	1	2	3
1	1.000	0.543	0.467
2		1.000	0.494
3			1.000

Table 16 presents the descriptive statistics for satisfaction in the classroom. This variable has a range of scores from 3.0 to 9.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable, 32.6% of the data is

missing. From the four schools selected, 21.9% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 23.4% did not answer item 2; and 8.9% did not answer item 3.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction in the Classroom

Mean	7.77		Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Median	9.00			
Mode	9.00	Valid	630	67.4%
Range	6.00	Missing	305	32.6%
Standard Deviation	1.16	Total	935	100.0%

Satisfaction in the School

To determine the perception of parents about the value they place upon their children's experience in the school, the following three items are used:

1. My child feels safe at this school (in classrooms, on school grounds).

2. My child is happy to go to school.

3. My child feels successful at school.

All items are conceptually tied to notions of satisfaction, as indirectly experienced by parents, by virtue of their children's perceptions and experiences. These items reflect the sense of belonging parents expect their children to experience in the school.

Table 17 presents the correlation matrix for the items. The correlation range is from 0.252 to 0.427, indicating that items measure related aspects of satisfaction in the school. These items were aggregated to create a second measure of satisfaction.

Table 17

Intercorrelations of the Three Items for Satisfaction in the School

Items	1	2	3
1	1.000	0.277	0.252
2		1.000	0.427
3			1.000

Table 18 presents the descriptive statistics for satisfaction in the school. This variable has a range of scores from 3.0 to 9.0, and is skewed to the right. For this variable, 30.6% of the data is missing. From the four schools selected, 13.6% of parent respondents did not answer item 1; 14.0% did not answer item 2; and 20.4% did not answer item 3.

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction in the School

			Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Mean	8.46			
Median	9.00			
Mode	9.00	Valid	649	69.4%
Range	6.00	Missing	286	30.6%
Standard Deviation	0.96	Total	935	100.0%

Summary

In order to operationalize the theoretical model outlined in chapter 2, the main purpose of this chapter was to discuss the original study conducted by Proactive Information Services Inc. (1997) that led to the development of the original survey instrument, present basic information on the sample, and to describe the measurement of the variables. From the school effectiveness survey conducted by Proactive Information Services Inc. (1997) in ten schools in one Winnipeg school

division, four schools were selected for this study. The schools are similar in size and show similar parent response rates to the questionnaire. They are also similar in grade configuration (Early and Middle Years) and program (English instruction and French immersion dual-track).

The purpose of this study is to examine an aspect of school effectiveness from a social-systems point of view, using data collected under Lezotte's (1988, 1991) goal-oriented framework. Relying primarily upon the work of Seeman (1959, 1972, 1983), five dimensions of social integration were derived theoretically and operationalized into five variables: powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness, inclusion, and satisfaction. Other than the powerfulness variable, each of the other variables are examined in two ways. Therefore, there are two meaningfulness variables, one related to school values and the other related to school goals. Normfulness, inclusion, and satisfaction are each examined in two contexts, one focusing on the classroom and the other focusing on the school. Therefore, in fact, nine variables are used in the study.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings on the research question: what is the degree to which parents perceive they experience social integration in schools? The research model presented in chapter 2 includes five dimensions of social integration: powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness, inclusion and satisfaction. Each of the latter has two ways in which social integration is measured. Consequently, nine variables are examined in the first section of this chapter. To determine the degree of parental social integration in the four schools, descriptive statistics are presented for each of the schools for each of the variables and, following this, for each item within each variable. In the second section, the nine variables are compared in greater detail so as to determine whether parents experience social integration differently in different schools.

Comparison of Schools

Data about the variables and the items that operationalize each of the variables are presented in two ways. The first table in each part of this section reports the descriptive statistics for each of the schools on each of the variables examined. This includes the means, the percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all items within the variable, the percentage of parents who answered "rarely/never" and "don't know" to all items within the variable, and the percentage of missing data. Only differences between schools that are greater than 5.0% are discussed. Differences of less than 5.0% are considered as indicating no real differences between schools.

The second table in each part presents the valid percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" on each item that was used to create the variable. This table elaborates on differences between schools that were observed in the first table. In this table, only differences between schools that are greater than 10.0% are discussed. Differences of less than 10.0% are considered as indicating no real differences between schools. In the tables, "PL" represents Parkland School, "WV" represents Westview School, "HC" represents Hillcrest School, and "LS" represents Lakeside School.

Powerfulness

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience powerfulness, as a dimension of social integration, five items are used. Table 19 presents the descriptive statistics for powerfulness in each of the four schools. This table presents the mean, the percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all items within the variable, the percentage of parents who answered "rarely/never" and "don't know" to all items within the variable, and the percentage of missing data. For this variable, Parkland has the highest mean (11.82 out of 15.00), the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (17.2%) and the lowest percentage of missing data (40.0%). Lakeside has the lowest mean (10.86). Westview has the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (10.6%), and the highest percentage of missing data (47.2%). Furthermore, it is noted that Parkland and Hillcrest show similar percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often", which are higher than the same percentages shown for Westview and Lakeside.

Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for Powerfulness in Each School

School	Mean (5.0-15.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	11.82	17.2	3.0	40.0
WV	11.38	10.6	0.0	47.2
HC	11.61	15.2	0.0	42.7
LS	10.86	12.5	3.5	41.0

Table 20 presents the percentage of parents in each school who answered "always" and "often" to each of five items indicative of powerfulness. This table shows that 60.1% of parents at Westview and 55.6% at Parkland say that "they are "always" and "often" provided with opportunities to participate in setting the direction of their schools" (item 1), whereas 42.0% of parents at Hillcrest and 37.0% at Lakeside report the same. Second, 79.7% of parents at Parkland say that "decisions concerning their children are "always" and "often" consistent with their schools' mission" (item 3), whereas 65.1% of parents at Westview and 65.9% at Lakeside report the same. Third, 60.5% of parents at Hillcrest say that "they are "always" and "often" involved in making decisions about their children" (item 4), whereas 49.2% of parents at Lakeside and 48.8% at Parkland report the same. Fourth, 65.8% of parents at Hillcrest and 60.3% at Parkland say that "consequences are "always" and "often" applied consistently at their schools" (item 5), whereas 50.4% of parents at Westview and 49.5% at Lakeside report the same. Furthermore, the highest percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "decisions concerning their children are "always" and "often" consistent with the school's mission" (item 3). However, the lowest percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "their school "always" and "often" provides

students with opportunities to participate in setting the direction of the school" (item 2).

Table 20

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Powerfulness

School	Items				
	1	2	3	4	5
PL	55.6	29.8	79.7	48.8	60.3
WV	60.1	24.8	65.1	51.9	50.4
HC	42.0	30.2	72.4	60.5	65.8
LS	37.0	30.0	65.9	49.2	49.5

Meaningfulness of School Values

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience meaningfulness of school values, as a dimension of social integration, three items are used. Table 21 presents the descriptive statistics for the meaningfulness of school values in each of the four schools. For this variable, Parkland has the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (63.8%). Lakeside has the lowest percentage of missing data (38.3%). This table also shows that Lakeside has the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (51.2%). Westview has the highest percentage of missing data (43.3%). Furthermore, it is noted that Parkland, Westview, and Hillcrest show similar percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often" (63.8%, 59.4%, and 56.2%, respectively), which are all higher than the percentage shown for Lakeside (51.2%).

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics for

Meaningfulness of School Values in Each School

School	Mean (3.0-9.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	8.41	63.8	3.0	40.0
WV	8.28	59.4	1.0	43.3
HC	8.20	56.2	0.0	39.5
LS	8.05	51.2	1.9	38.3

Table 22 presents the percentage of parents in each school who answered "always" and "often" to each of three items indicative of meaningfulness of school values. This table shows that 79.2% of parents at Parkland say that "staff at the school "always" and "often" values academic excellence" (item 1), whereas 66.8% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Furthermore, the highest percentage of parents in all four schools is attributed to "the value they themselves place upon academic excellence" (item 3) when compared to their estimation of the value placed upon academic excellence by "staff at their school" (item 1) and "their children" (item 2).

Table 22

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Meaningfulness of School Values

School	Items		
	1	2	3
PL	79.2	74.4	98.3
WV	72.5	73.6	95.6
HC	72.8	68.3	92.9
LS	66.8	68.1	92.1

Meaningfulness of School Goals

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience meaningfulness of school goals, as a dimension of social integration, two items are used. Table 23 presents the descriptive statistics for the meaningfulness of school goals in each of the four schools. For this variable, Parkland has the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (76.2%). Lakeside has the lowest percentage of missing data (15.6%). This table also shows that Lakeside has the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (61.5%). Westview has the highest percentage of missing data (28.7%). Furthermore, it is noted that Westview, Hillcrest and Lakeside show similar percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often", which are lower than the same percentage shown for Parkland.

Table 23

Descriptive Statistics for

Meaningfulness of School Goals in Each School

School	Mean (3.0-6.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	5.39	76.2	9.2	21.2
WV	5.17	63.0	9.4	28.7
HC	5.26	68.6	9.2	18.2
LS	5.11	61.5	10.1	15.6

Table 24 presents the percentage of parents in each school who answered "always" and "often" to each of two items indicative of meaningfulness of school goals. This table shows that 78.7% of parents at Parkland say that "their school's activities "always" and "often" reflect its mission" (item 2), whereas 66.2% of parents at Westview and 67.3% at Lakeside report the same.

Table 24

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Meaningfulness of School Goals

School	Items	
	1	2
PL	82.0	78.7
WV	78.4	66.2
HC	74.3	75.2
LS	72.6	67.3

Normfulness in the Classroom

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience normfulness in the classroom, as a dimension of social integration, seven items are used. Table 25 presents the descriptive statistics for normfulness in the classroom in each of the four schools. For this variable, Parkland and Hillcrest have the highest mean (18.68 and 18.56 out of 21.00, respectively) and the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (31.3% and 35.9%, respectively). Westview has the lowest percentage of missing data (28.7%). This table also shows that Westview and Lakeside have the lower means (17.80 and 17.45, respectively) and the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (24.5% and 21.5%, respectively). Furthermore, it is noted that Parkland and Hillcrest show similar percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often", which are substantially higher than the percentages shown for Westview and Lakeside.

Table 25

Descriptive Statistics for Normfulness in the Classroom in Each School

School	Mean (7.0-21.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	18.68	31.3	0.0	40.0
WV	17.80	24.5	0.0	28.7
HC	18.56	35.9	0.0	39.5
LS	17.45	21.5	1.0	38.3

Table 26 presents the percentage of parents in each school who answered "always" and "often" to each of seven items indicative of normfulness in the classroom. This table shows that 86.6% of parents at Hillcrest say that "their children's progress is "always" and "often" monitored on an ongoing basis" (item 1), whereas 71.2% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Second, 56.4% of parents at Hillcrest and 50.4% of parents at Parkland say that "their children "always" and "often" receive information on the purposes, techniques and criteria used in assessment" (item 3), whereas 44.7% of parents at Lakeside and 39.6% of parents at Westview report the same. Third, 65.3% of parents at Parkland, 56.6% of parents at Westview, and 56.3% of parents at Hillcrest say that "their children are "always" and "often" involved in goal setting and self-assessment" (item 4), whereas 46.2% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Fourth, 80.8% of parents at Parkland say that "their children are "always" and "often" challenged at an appropriate level" (item 6), whereas 68.5% of parents at Lakeside and 65.8% of parents at Westview report the same. Fifth, 71.5% of parents at Hillcrest and 70.5% of parents at Parkland say that "opportunities "always" and "often" exist beyond the classroom that contribute to their children's learning" (item 7), whereas 57.9% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Furthermore, with the single

exception of parents at Hillcrest school on item 1, the highest

percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "multiple

methods are "always" and "often" used by teachers to assess the

students learning" (item 2), and that "students are "always" and

"often" involved in a variety of class activities to help them learn"

(item 5). However, the lowest percentage of parents in all four

schools perceive that "their children "always" and "often" receive

information on the purposes, techniques and criteria used in

assessment" (item 3) and that "their children are involved in goal-

setting and self-assessment" (item 4).

Table 26

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Normfulness in the Classroom

School	Items						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
PL	81.1	82.8	50.4	65.3	89.9	80.8	70.5
WV	76.8	82.2	39.6	56.6	85.2	65.8	62.6
HC	86.6	86.1	56.4	56.3	89.7	73.2	71.5
LS	71.2	82.2	44.7	46.2	80.8	68.5	57.9

Normfulness in the School

In order to determine the degree to which parents

experience normfulness in the school, as a dimension of social

integration, seven items are used. Table 27 presents the descriptive

statistics for normfulness in the school in each of the four schools.

For this variable, Parkland and Hillcrest have the highest mean (19.21

and 19.14 out of 21.00, respectively) and percentage of parents who

answered "always" and "often" (48.5% and 46.3%, respectively).

Parkland also has the lowest percentage of missing data (37.6%). This

table also shows that Lakeside has the lowest mean (18.01). Lakeside

and Westview have the lowest percentage of parents who answered
"always" and "often" (32.5% and 29.6%, respectively). Westview also
has the highest percentage of missing data (44.9%). Furthermore, it is
noted that Parkland and Hillcrest show similar percentages of parents
who answered "always" and "often", which are substantially higher than
the same percentages shown for Westview and Lakeside.

Table 27

Descriptive Statistics for Normfulness in the School in Each School

School	Mean (7.0-21.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing %
PL	19.21	48.5	0.0	37.6
WV	18.73	29.6	0.0	44.9
HC	19.14	46.3	0.0	41.1
LS	18.01	32.5	2.0	41.9

Table 28 presents the percentage of parents in each school who
answered "always" and "often" to each of seven items indicative of
normfulness in the school. This table shows that 90.0% of parents at
Parkland say that "rules and expectations for students behavior are
"always" and "often" clear" (item 1), whereas 83.8% of parents at
Lakeside report the same. Second, 87.8% of parents at Parkland and
86.3% of parents at Hillcrest say that "their staff's behavior "always"
and "often" contributes to a safe and orderly environment" (item 2),
whereas 76.1% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Third, 76.2% of
parents at Hillcrest and 73.3% of parents at Parkland say that
"students "always" and "often" treat staff with respect" (item 4),
whereas 60.1% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Fourth, 73.3% of
parents at Parkland, 71.9% of parents at Hillcrest, and 68.4% of
parents at Westview say that "their staff "always" and "often" have

high expectations for their children" (item 5), whereas 58.2% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Fifth, 83.7% of parents at Parkland, 81.6% of parents at Westview, and 79.7% of parents at Hillcrest say that "their staff are "always" and "often" committed to helping all students master important learning objectives" (item 6), whereas 69.1% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Sixth, 75.0% of parents at Parkland say that "achievement expectations are "always" and "often" shared with students" (item 7), whereas 61.4% of parents at Lakeside and 61.0% of parents at Westview report the same. Furthermore, the highest percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "rules and expectations for student behavior are "always" and "often" clear" (item 1), and that "staff "always" and "often" treat children with respect" (item 3). However, the lowest percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "students "always" and "often" treat their staff with respect" (item 4), that "their staff "always" and "often" have high expectations for children" (item 5), and that "achievement expectations are "always" and "often" shared with students" (item 7).

Table 28

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Normfulness in the School

School	Items						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
PL	90.0	87.8	89.7	73.3	73.3	83.7	75.0
WV	86.2	82.4	88.1	64.8	68.4	81.6	61.0
HC	86.3	86.3	89.9	76.2	71.9	79.7	70.6
LS	83.8	76.1	84.9	60.1	58.2	69.1	61.4

Inclusion in the Classroom

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience inclusion in the classroom, as a dimension of social integration, three items are used. Table 29 presents the descriptive statistics for inclusion in the classroom in each of the four schools. For this variable, Parkland and Hillcrest have the highest means (7.89 and 7.87 out of 9.00, respectively) and the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (51.9% and 50.0%, respectively). This table also shows that Westview and Lakeside have the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (41.3% and 29.8%, respectively). Lakeside also has the lowest mean (7.03). Furthermore, it is noted that Parkland and Hillcrest show similar percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often", which are both higher than the percentage shown for Westview, and these three are substantially higher than the percentage shown for Lakeside.

Table 29

Descriptive Statistics for Inclusion in the Classroom in Each School

School	Mean (3.0-9.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	7.89	51.9	1.9	34.5
WV	7.50	41.3	3.7	38.8
HC	7.87	50.0	1.8	34.4
LS	7.03	29.8	3.2	35.7

Table 30 presents the percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to each of three items indicative of inclusion in the classroom. This table shows that 73.3% of parents at Hillcrest, 71.6% of parents at Parkland, and 70.2% of parents at Westview say that "there is "always" and "often" frequent communication with parents"

(item 1), whereas 56.4% of parents at Lakeside report the same.

Second, 69.2% of parents at Parkland and 67.0% of parents at Hillcrest

say that "they "always" and "often" receive regular feedback about

their children's progress" (item 2), whereas 59.7% of parents at

Westview and 48.1% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Third,

63.7% of parents at Parkland and 62.8% of parents at Hillcrest say that

"teachers "always" and "often" help them understand school programs and

curriculum" (item 3), whereas 54.5% of parents at Westview and 44.6% of

parents at Lakeside report the same. Furthermore, the highest

percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "there is

"always" and "often" frequent communication with them" (item 1).

However, the lowest percentage of parents in all four schools perceive

that "teachers "always" and "often" help parents understand school

programs and curriculum" (item 3).

Table 30

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Inclusion in the Classroom

School	Items		
	1	2	3
PL	71.6	69.2	63.7
WV	70.2	59.7	54.5
HC	73.3	67.0	62.8
LS	56.4	48.1	44.6

Inclusion in the School

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience

inclusion in the school, as a dimension of social integration, three

items are used. Table 31 presents the descriptive statistics for

inclusion in the school in each of the four schools. For this

variable, Parkland and Hillcrest have the highest mean (8.00 and 8.03

out of 9.00, respectively) and the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (59.3% and 56.5%, respectively). Westview also has the lowest percentage of parents who answered "rarely/never" and "don't know" (0.0%). This table also shows that Westview and Lakeside have the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (44.1% and 40.0%, respectively). Lakeside also has the lowest mean (7.35) and the highest percentage of parents who answered "rarely/never" and "don't know" (5.2%). Furthermore, it is noted that Parkland and Hillcrest show similar percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often", and these are substantially higher than the percentages shown for Westview and Lakeside.

Table 31

Descriptive Statistics for Inclusion in the School in Each School

School	Mean (3.0-9.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	8.00	59.3	2.8	34.5
WV	7.72	44.1	0.0	37.6
HC	8.03	56.5	1.9	39.1
LS	7.35	40.4	5.2	37.2

Table 32 presents the percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to each of three items indicative of inclusion in the school. This table shows that 69.3% of parents at Parkland and 68.8%% of parents at Hillcrest say that "they "always" and "often" play an active role in their schools" (item 1), whereas 54.7% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Second, 74.3% of parents at Hillcrest and 73.2% of parents at Parkland say that "they and staff "always" and "often" work together to promote student success" (item 2), whereas

60.5% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Third, 77.8% of parents at Parkland and 73.9% of parents at Hillcrest say that "their involvement is "always" and "often" valued by staff" (item 3), whereas 62.6% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Furthermore, the lowest percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "parents "always" and "often" play an active role in the school" (item 1).

Table 32

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Inclusion in the School

School	Items		
	1	2	3
PL	69.3	73.2	77.8
WV	62.1	68.4	71.1
HC	68.8	74.3	73.9
LS	54.7	60.5	62.6

Satisfaction in the Classroom

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience satisfaction in the classroom, as a dimension of social integration, three items are used. Table 33 presents the descriptive statistics for satisfaction in the classroom in each of the four schools. For this variable, Parkland, Westview, and Hillcrest have the highest means (8.01, 8.01, and 7.96 out of 9.00, respectively) and the highest percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often" (58.0%, 58.2%, and 56.9%, respectively). This table also shows that Lakeside has the lowest mean (7.38) and the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (37.1%).

Table 33

Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction in the Classroom in Each School

School	Mean (3.0-9.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	8.01	58.0	4.5	32.1
WV	8.01	58.2	3.3	31.5
HC	7.96	56.9	3.0	34.0
LS	7.38	37.1	3.5	32.4

Table 34 presents the percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to each of three items indicative of satisfaction in the classroom. This table shows that 72.5% of parents at Hillcrest, 71.6% of parents at Parkland, and 68.8% of parents at Westview say that "their children "always" and "often" receive recognition for their accomplishments" (item 1), whereas 56.7% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Second, 79.4% of parents at Parkland say that "staff "always" and "often" emphasize their children's strengths rather than shortcomings" (item 2), whereas 67.9% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Third, 72.9% of parents at Hillcrest, 72.3% of parents at Parkland, and 71.6% of parents at Westview say that "their children "always" and "often" receive constructive feedback about their progress and achievement" (item 3), whereas 57.6% of parents at Lakeside report the same.

Table 34

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Satisfaction in the Classroom

School	Items		
	1	2	3
PL	71.6	79.4	72.3
WV	68.8	77.8	71.6
HC	72.5	75.1	72.9
LS	56.7	67.9	57.6

Satisfaction in the School

In order to determine the degree to which parents experience satisfaction in the school, as a dimension of social integration, three items are used. Table 35 presents the descriptive statistics for satisfaction in the school in each of the four schools. For this variable, Parkland has the highest mean (8.68 out of 9.00) and the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (75.6%). Hillcrest and Westview also have higher percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often" (74.6% and 68.9%, respectively). This table also shows that Lakeside has the lowest mean (8.23) and the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" (57.6%). Furthermore, it is noted that Parkland and Hillcrest show similar percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often", which are higher than the same percentage shown for Westview, and these three are all substantially higher than the same percentage shown for Lakeside.

Table 35

Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction in the School in Each School

School	Mean (/9.0)	Always and Often (Valid %)	Rarely/Never and Don't Know (Valid %)	Missing (%)
PL	8.68	75.6	0.0	25.5
WV	8.50	68.9	0.0	33.1
HC	8.59	74.6	0.0	33.2
LS	8.23	57.6	0.8	29.8

Table 36 presents the percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to each of three items indicative of satisfaction in the school. This table shows that 95.7% of parents at Parkland say that "their children "always" and "often" feel safe at their school" (item

1), whereas 84.7% of parents at Lakeside report the same. Second,

95.4% of parents at Parkland say "their children are "always" and

"often" happy to go to their school" (item 2), whereas 81.2% of parents

at Lakeside report the same. Third, 79.7% of parents at Parkland and

79.0% of parents at Hillcrest say that "their children "always" and

"often" feel successful at their schools" (item 3), whereas 67.8% of

parents at Lakeside report the same. Furthermore, the highest

percentage of parents in all four schools perceive that "their children

"always" and "often" feel safe at their schools" (item 1), and that

"their children are "always" and "often" happy to go to school" (item

2). However, the lowest percentage of parents in all four schools

perceive that "their children "always" and "often" feel successful at

their schools" (item 3).

Table 36

Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to Items Indicative of

Satisfaction in the School Items

School	Items		
	1	2	3
PL	95.7	95.4	79.7
WV	88.6	88.3	77.3
HC	91.9	90.6	79.0
LS	84.7	81.2	67.8

Comparison of Variables

In order to examine whether parents experience social integration

differently in different schools, the data were examined in four ways.

First, the mean score for each variable in each school is presented as

a percentage (Table 37). In turn, the percentage of parents who

responded "always" and "often" and the percentage of parents who

responded "rarely/never" and "don't know" to all of the items in each of the variables are presented in Table 38 and Table 39, respectively. Finally, the percentage of missing data for each of the variables is presented in Table 40.

In each of the following tables, "P" represents the powerfulness variable, "Mv" represents meaningfulness of school values, "Mg" represents meaningfulness of school goals, "Nc" represents normfulness in the classroom, "Ns" represents normfulness in the school, "Ic" represents inclusion in the classroom, "Is" represents inclusion in the school, "Sc" represents satisfaction in the classroom, and "Ss" represents satisfaction in the school. As previously stated, "PL" represents Parkland, "WV" represents Westview, "HC" represents Hillcrest, and "LS" represents Lakeside.

Table 37 presents the mean, as a percentage, for each variable for each school. This table shows that two schools, Parkland and Hillcrest, have the highest mean scores across all the variables. The two schools that show the lowest mean scores across the variables are Westview and Lakeside. The table also shows that there are few differences between the schools that are 5% or more. It is also noted that the two variables that show the highest mean scores across the schools are satisfaction in the school (Ss) and meaningfulness of school values (Mv). The variable that shows the lowest mean score across the schools is powerfulness (P). Moreover, the dimensions of social integration experienced by parents in the context of the school (Ns, Is and Ss) show higher mean scores than the same dimensions experienced by parents in the context of the classroom (Nc, Ic, and Sc).

Table 37

Mean Percentages for Each Variable in Each School

School	Variables								
	P	Mv	Mg	Nc	Ns	Ic	Is	Sc	Ss
PL	78.8	93.4	89.9	88.9	91.5	87.7	88.9	89.0	96.5
WV	75.9	92.0	86.2	84.7	89.2	83.3	85.8	89.0	94.5
HC	77.4	91.1	87.6	88.4	91.1	87.5	89.2	88.4	95.5
LS	72.4	89.5	85.2	83.1	85.8	78.1	81.7	82.0	91.4

Table 38 presents the percentage of parents who responded "always" and "often" to all of the items for each of the variables in each school. Again, this table shows that two schools, Parkland and Hillcrest, have the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all items within each of the variables. The two schools where the least percentage of parents consistently answered the same are again, Westview and Lakeside. Notably, the two variables that show the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all of the items within each of the variables are satisfaction in the school (Ss) and meaningfulness of school goals (Mg). The variables that show the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all of the items within each of the variables are normfulness in the classroom (Nc) and, powerfulness (P). Again, the dimensions of social integration experienced by parents in the context of the school (Ns, Is and Ss) show higher mean scores than the same dimensions experienced by parents in the context of the classroom (Nc, Ic, and Sc).

Table 38

Percentage of Parents Who Answered "Always" and "Often" to

All Items for Each Variable in Each School

| School | Variables | | | | | | | | |
	P	Mv	Mg	Nc	Ns	Ic	Is	Sc	Ss
PL	17.2	63.8	76.2	31.3	48.5	51.9	59.3	58.0	75.6
WV	10.6	59.4	63.0	24.5	29.6	41.3	44.1	58.2	68.9
HC	15.2	56.2	68.6	35.9	46.3	50.0	56.5	56.9	74.6
LS	12.5	51.2	61.5	21.5	32.5	29.8	40.4	37.1	57.6

Table 39 presents the percentage of parents who responded "rarely/never" and "don't know" to all of the items for each of the variables. Little variability exists from one school to another. Notably, the highest percentage of parents who consistently answered "rarely/never" and "don't know" to each of the items is observed for meaningfulness of school goals (Mg).

Table 39

Percentage of Parents Who Answered "Rarely/Never" and "Don't Know" to

All Items for Each Variable in Each School

| School | Variables | | | | | | | | |
	P	Mv	Mg	Nc	Ns	Ic	Is	Sc	Ss
PL	3.0	3.0	9.2	0.0	0.0	1.9	2.8	4.5	0.0
WV	0.0	1.0	9.4	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.3	0.0
HC	0.0	0.0	9.2	0.0	0.0	1.8	1.9	3.0	0.0
LS	3.5	1.9	10.1	1.0	2.0	3.2	5.2	3.5	0.8

Table 40 presents the percentage of missing data for each variable at each of the four schools. As explained in chapter 3, where a parent respondent did not answer one item, all responses to other items in the same variable were excluded. This table shows little variability in the percentage of missing data across the schools. The variables that consistently show the lowest percentage of missing data

in each school are meaningfulness of school goals (Mg), satisfaction in

the school (Ss), and satisfaction in the classroom (Sc). The variables

that show the highest percentage of missing data are powerfulness (P),

normfulness in the classroom (Nc), and meaningfulness of school values

(Mg).

Table 40

Percentage of Missing Data for Each Variable in Each School

School	Variables								
	P	Mv	Mg	Nc	Ns	Ic	Is	Sc	Ss
PL	40.0	40.0	21.2	40.0	37.6	34.5	34.5	32.1	25.5
WV	47.2	43.3	28.7	28.7	44.9	38.8	37.6	31.5	33.1
HC	42.7	39.5	18.2	39.5	41.1	34.4	39.1	34.0	33.2
LS	41.0	38.3	15.6	38.3	41.9	35.7	37.2	32.4	29.8

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings regarding

the degree to which parents perceive they are socially integrated into

their children's schools. The comparison of schools shows that parents

at some schools consistently experience higher social integration than

parents do at other schools. Parkland has the highest mean in most

variables (P, Nc, Ns, Ic, Sc and Ss), the second highest mean in the Is

variable, the highest percentage of parents who answered "always" and

"often" to all of the items in most variables (P, Mv, Mg, Ns, Ic, Is,

and Ss), and the second highest percentage in the Sc variable. Also,

Parkland has the lowest percentage of missing data for the P and Ns

variables. Hillcrest has the highest mean in the Is variable, the

second highest mean in three variables (Nc, Ns, and Ic), the highest

percentage of parents who answered always" and "often" to all of the

items in the Nc variable, and the second highest percentage in four

variables (Ns, Ic, Is, and Ss). Conversely, Lakeside has the lowest

mean in most variables (P, Nc, Ns, Ic, Is, Sc and Ss) and the lowest

percentages of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all the

items in most variables (Mv, Mg, Nc, Ns, Ic, Is, Sc and Ss). Lakeside

also has the highest percentage of parents who answered "rarely/never"

and "don't know" to all the items in the Is variable. Westview has the

second lowest mean in the Nc variable and the second lowest percentage

of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all of the items in

four variables (Nc, Ns, Ic and Is). Westview also has the highest

percentage of missing data in four variables (P, Mv, Mg, and Ns).

However, Westview also has the second highest mean and the highest

percentage of parents who answered "always" and "often" to all the

items in the Sc variable and a higher percentage of parents who

answered "always" and "often" to all the items in the Ss variable. The

item-by-item analysis shows, in general, that the mean percentage of

parents who answered "always" and "often" to items that are associated

with their children's experience are generally lower than items related

to the direct experience of the parents.

The comparison of variables suggests that parents in the four

schools consistently experience some dimensions of social integration

over others. Satisfaction in the school (Ss), for all four schools,

has the highest mean, the highest percentage of parents who answered

"always" and "often" to all of the items, a low percentage of parents

who answered "rarely/never" and "don't know", and a lower percentage of

missing data. Conversely, powerfulness (P), in the four schools, has

the lowest mean, the lowest percentage of parents who answered "always"

and "often", and the highest percentage of missing data. Furthermore,

the means and the percentage of parents who answered "always" and

"often" to all of the items are substantially higher for variables

examined in the context of the school (Ns, Is, and Ss) than the same variables examined in the context of the classroom (Nc, Ic, and Sc).

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes the study, discusses the findings, and identifies some important implications for theory and practice. How schools may effectively promote the social integration of parents, in the interests of improving the schools, is the most important implication explored. The study concludes by suggesting ways the theoretical model could be improved and used to inform future research on parental social integration and effective schools.

Summary

This study was an examination of the degree to which parents think they are socially integrated into their children's schools. Because school effectiveness models are, for the most part, goal-oriented and are criticized on theoretical and methodological grounds, it was of theoretical interest to develop a model that examines schools and their effectiveness from a social-systems point of view, where an aspect of school culture is specified and compared between schools in an empirically legitimate way. The development of a conceptual framework for parental social integration was an attempt to specify such an aspect of culture. Parental involvement in schools is widely considered a feature of effective schools and is seen as having a positive impact on student achievement (Henderson, 1987; Tangri & Moles, 1987; Haynes, Corner, & Hamilton-Lee, 1989; Epstein, 1995; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Reynolds & Teddlie, 2000). Therefore, it was also of practical interest to examine what parents think about their connection with and involvement in their children's school, as an aspect of that

school's effectiveness. By examining the nature and degree of social integration of parents, it was thought that senior administrators, principals and teachers could obtain a more precise indication of how they might better approach the question of the institutional effectiveness of their own schools.

The original survey that this study relied upon for its data was inspired by the work of Lezotte (1988, 1991), who identifies several areas that promote school effectiveness. These areas include a safe and orderly environment, a clear and focused mission, a climate of high expectations, opportunities to learn, monitoring of student progress, and home-school partnerships. Using data originally gathered in these categories, and within a theoretical framework of social integration, developed specifically for this study, a novel approach was taken to notion of school effectiveness. In this study, therefore, the degree to which parents think they influence school direction and influence decisions about their children (powerfulness), share values and goals with others and the institution (meaningfulness), agree with others and the institution in matters of behavior (normfulness), participate in their children's and others education (inclusion), and value the experience of their child (satisfaction) were considered to reflect the parents' estimation of the effectiveness of their children's school.

Powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness, inclusion, and satisfaction, as dimensions of social integration, were divided into nine variables, so that for some dimensions, the two contexts of the classroom and the school could be examined separately. Four schools from the same Winnipeg school division, comparable in program, size, and survey response rate, were selected for the study. The schools, identified by pseudonyms, were Parkland, Westview, Hillcrest, and Lakeside. Because this study relied upon existing parent data from

these schools (Proactive Information Services Inc., 1997), original survey items were first regrouped conceptually, then, justified empirically. Descriptive statistics were produced for each variable and scores were skewed to the right. Descriptive statistics were also produced for each of the items within each variable for each of the schools so that any patterns or trends observed in the perceptions of parents could be highlighted.

Broadly, the findings suggest that some schools are, in fact, better at promoting the social integration of parents than others. Second, the findings also suggest that parents experience varying degrees of social integration on each of the five dimensions from school to school. Third, the findings suggest that parents are more likely to experience some dimensions of social integration over others. Finally, the findings suggest that parents in all four schools consistently experience higher degrees of social integration in the context of the school than they do in the context of the classroom.

Discussion

It is clear that the research model presented in this study is supported, that is, the model offers an empirically legitimate way of obtaining important data on an aspect of school effectiveness. However, because the theoretical framework used in this study was novel, it is difficult to discuss the findings in light of previous theory and research on school effectiveness, especially from a social-systems point of view. Although this line of inquiry is suggested for future research, it has remained largely unexplored. For similar reasons, it is difficult to consider the findings specifically in light of social integration.

The conceptual framework for this study was derived, in part, from Lezotte's (1988, 1991) model for school effectiveness and Seeman's (1959; 1972; 1983) dimensions of alienation. The argument was made that social integration is manifested throughout all areas of effectiveness specified by Lezotte (1988, 1991). Therefore, it is fruitful to examine parents' perceptions of their sense of belonging and association with their children's school, as an aspect of that school's effectiveness.

As previously stated, the findings showed that some schools are, in fact, better at promoting the social integration of parents than others. For example, parents at Parkland experienced the highest degree of social integration, on all dimensions. Conversely, parents at Lakeside experienced the least degree of social integration in all dimensions, regardless of whether the context was the classroom or school.

The findings also showed that parents experience varying degrees of social integration on each of the five dimensions from school to school. For example, parents at Hillcrest experienced higher degrees of social integration than did parents at Westview or Lakeside. A high percentage of parents perceived high agreement about expectations and behavior in the classroom and school (normfulness), a high degree of connectedness in the classroom and school (inclusion), and a high degree of satisfaction in the school. Conversely, parents at Westview experienced lower degrees of social integration than parents at Parkland or Hillcrest. A low percentage of parents perceived a high degree of influence (powerfulness), a high degree of shared values and goals (meaningfulness), high agreement about expectations and behavior in the classroom and in the school (normfulness), and a high degree of connectedness in the classroom and in the school (inclusion). However,

a high percentage of parents at Westview still perceived a high degree of satisfaction in the classroom and in the school.

These findings are consistent with the theoretical framework of this study: parents' perceptions of their social integration into their children's school may properly be considered an estimation by the parents of that school's effectiveness. Because the dimensions of social integration were observed in many of Lezotte's (1989, 1991) categories, planning for improvements in one dimension would likely affect other areas of school effectiveness areas positively. For example, where educators work to increase a sense of powerfulness, the parents' estimation of the school's environment as "safe and orderly", its mission as "clear and focused" and its home-school relations as a "partnership" will likely be more positive. A safe and orderly environment focuses, in part, on parents' perceptions related to their expectation that undesirable behaviors are generally absent from the school. A clear and focused mission relates, in part, to parents' perceptions about their understanding of the school's mission or goals representing all students and parents. Finally, home-school partnerships direct attention to parents' perceptions of their involvement in helping the school achieve its mission. In a similar way then, where principals and teachers work to increase a sense of meaningfulness of school values, the parents' belief that the climate supports "high expectations" will also be strengthened. Where educators work to increase a sense of meaningfulness of school goals, the parents' estimation of the mission as "clear and focused" will also likely increase. Where educators work to increase a sense of normfulness in the classroom, the parents' estimation of the classroom as providing "opportunities to learn" and giving attention to the "monitoring of student progress" will likely be more positive. Where

educators work to increase a sense of normfulness in the school, the parents' regard for the "safe and orderly environment", the "climate of high expectations" and the "monitoring of student progress" will also likely increase. Where educators work to increase a sense of inclusion in the classroom and in the school, the parents' estimation of the commitment to "home-school partnerships" will also likely increase. Where educators work to increase a sense of satisfaction in the classroom, the parents' perceptions of the classroom's climate, as one which favors "high expectations" and the "monitoring of student progress", will likely be more positive. Finally, where educators work to increase a sense of satisfaction in the school, the parents' regard for the "safe and orderly environment" and the view of the school providing "opportunities to learn" will also likely increase.

These findings are also relevant to the study of school effectiveness on methodological grounds. Without the comparison of similar schools, it would have been difficult to determine what constituted a "high" or "low" score for each dimension, given that all scales were generally skewed to the right. By means of these comparisons, showing differences for each of the school on each of the variables, strengths and areas for improvement for each school were identified with more precision.

Generally the literature on school effectiveness has shown that effective schools show similar traits: high attendance, positive student attitudes, high achievement scores, good behavior, and increased staff productivity. However, it has been argued that there is little evidence to suggest that by improving one area of school effectiveness, other areas will be positively affected (Clark, et al., 1989). On the other hand, there is increasing evidence to suggest that

where schools focus on organizational culture, such indicators of
effectiveness improve.

A substantial and growing body of empirical evidence, derived

from vigorous research in schools and other educative

organizations, indicates that the effectiveness of these

organizations, in terms of student learning and development, is

significantly influenced by the quality and characteristics of

the organizational culture. Not suprisingly, the research

clearly suggests that schools that emphasize supportiveness, open

communication, collaboration, intellectuality, and that reward

achievement and success outperform (in terms of achievement,

attendance, dropout rate, frustration, and alienation) those that

emphasize competition, constraint and restrictiveness, rules and

standard operating procedures, and that reward conformity.

(Owens, 2001, p. 175)

These observations are relevant to school improvement initiatives as
they relate to matters of organizational effectiveness, probably
because they reduce the alienation of those involved in schools,
including parents.

As previously stated, the findings suggest that parents, in
general, are more likely to experience some dimensions of social
integration over others. For example, parents in all four schools
experienced satisfaction in the school to the greatest extent, compared
to other dimensions. Conversely, parents experienced powerfulness, the
ability to influence the direction and decisions of the school, least
when compared to other dimensions. These findings are consistent with
the literature on alienation: alienation is a multi-faceted phenomenon;
however, it has relatively distinct dimensions, as can be noted in
Seeman's (1959) model and the findings of this study. Thus, measures

of powerfulness, meaningfulness, normfulness did not serve as indicators of inclusion and satisfaction.

The findings also suggest that parents, in all four schools, experienced higher degrees of social integration in the context of the school rather than in the classroom. This finding is surprising because one might predict that parents would experience greater social integration in the classroom, where their children work and play, and where parents are most inclined and likely to speak and work with school staff. However, this finding may result from the fact that this school division has provided significant professional development for school administrators which has focused on fostering greater participation from community members, particularly parents. School administrators have focused on doing this, and this may well be recognized by parents. Teachers, on the other hand, may have not have been socialized to the same extent as administrators. Perhaps parents do not view teachers as community builders to the same extent. Or perhaps, as Epstein's (1995) observes:

> Once people hear about such concepts as family-like schools, they
> remember positive examples of schools, teachers, and places in
> the community that were 'like a family' to them. They may
> remember how a teacher paid individual attention to them,
> recognized their uniqueness, or praised them for real progress,
> just as a parent might. Or they might recall things at home that
> were 'just like school' and supported their work as a student, or
> they might remember community activities that made them feel
> smart or good about themselves and their families. They will
> recall that parents, siblings, and other family members engaged
> in and enjoyed educational activities and took pride in the good

schoolwork or homework that they did, just as the teacher might.
(p.703)

Implications

There are several implications of this study for school effectiveness theory and research, and for the study and practice of social integration. These implications deserve the attention of school principals, their staffs, and system administrators. The implications of this study for school effectiveness theory and research are related to the nature of this study and the way it was conducted.

First, the social-systems model for considering school effectiveness, suggested by Hoy and Ferguson (1989) had only been suggested, not explored. Like other goal-oriented theories, this model confirms that similarities and differences exist between schools, and that some schools are, in fact, better than others at promoting the social integration of parents, that is, these schools are more effective. However, the similarities and differences between schools are more apparent using the model presented in this study than in other studies. This study was developed, in part, to address some of the methodological criticisms about school effectiveness research. In doing so, how the schools ranked in relation to each other was more relevant than what constituted a "high" or "low" score. Future school effectiveness research should be conducted so as to show similarities and differences between schools, across a range of very similar aspects, or should be conducted to show trends and changes on such variables in one or more schools over time, that is, longitudinal research. Both types of studies should be conducted in different school systems, including public and private, if only to provide some

data which should be increasingly relevant to policy makers in an environment of school choice.

Although the literature on alienation has been reviewed in this study, the implications of this study are more related to theory development in regard to social integration. This study develops and operationalizes a conceptual model for considering social integration in institutions like schools, which, again, had only been suggested in the research, not pursued. Furthermore, the model that is used in this study has attempted to identify and operationalize some important aspects of organizational culture, an increasingly important orientation in the literature on organizations.

There are also some important implications of this study, which are of practical interest to system administrators, the principals and the teachers of the schools that were studied. It is reasonable to suggest that Parkland has little to improve in socially integrating its parents whereas Lakeside could improve the social integration of its parents by developing strategies that focus on all dimensions in both the classroom and the school. Hillcrest, on the other hand, could develop strategies that would improve the social integration of its parents by increasing their sense of powerfulness, their view of the meaningfulness of the school's values and goals, and their satisfaction with the experience their children receive in classrooms. In doing so, the parents' estimation of their school's effectiveness would very probably increase in Lezotte's (1988, 1991) areas of safe and orderly environment, clear and focused mission, climate for high expectations and success, and home-school partnerships. Westview could develop strategies that would increase the social integration of its parents by increasing their sense of powerfulness, their view of the meaningfulness of the school's values and goals, their view of

normfulness and inclusion in both the context of the classroom and the school.

However, despite the findings of this study that parents experience different dimensions of social integration in different schools, it is clear that all schools could improve their perceived effectiveness by focusing more attention on parents' experience of powerfulness. Seeman (1972) asserts four propositions about powerlessness that are relevant to fostering parents' perceptions of powerfulness in schools. The first proposition emphasizes the importance of mediating between the needs of the parents and the requirements imposed by the government, Manitoba Education and Training, and the school division. The implication of practical import is that all educators, not solely administrators, become more skilled at mediating competing needs in their immediate community. Seeman (1972) states:

> [First], membership and participation in control-relevant organizations is associated with low alienation (powerlessness). A good deal has been said in the mass-society literature concerning the need for organizations that can mediate between the individual and the state or corporation. The implication is that such organizations provide the individual with an instrument for control over [his/her] affairs, hence the prediction that participation will be associated with low alienation: i.e. with a relatively high sense of mastery. (p. 476)

Seeman's (1972) second and third propositions emphasize the importance of organized parental involvement in schools. In light of these propositions, Parent Advisory Councils and the inclusion of parents on various school committees are very likely good ways of increasing their sense of powerfulness. Their suggestions must,

however, be taken seriously. At the time the original study was conducted, parent advisory councils and the expectation that parents would be involved in developing annual school plans had only been recently legislated by the Manitoba government. In an effort to mediate between the needs of parents and the needs of the school, system administrators, principals and teachers must continue to explore ways to help organize parents in meaningful and helpful ways. Again, Seeman (1972) may be helpful here:

> [Second], the alienated (powerless) person is not likely to engage in planned, instrumentally oriented action. (p. 478)
> [Third], the powerless are characterized by their readiness to participate in relatively unplanned and/or short-term protest activities. (p. 482)

Seeman's (1972) fourth proposition gives emphasis to a surprising finding of the study. That is, in all four schools, the data suggest that the students' views and perspective could be more carefully considered. Says Seeman (1972):

> [Fourth], those who feel powerless tend to learn less of the control-relevant information available in the environment. In a series of studies in varied contexts, it has been demonstrated that poor learning and high powerlessness are associated. The poor learning is not simply a function of such variables as intelligence, test-taking skills, or status background, for the learning in question is differential: it does not occur with any and all information, but occurs especially when the information involved is potentially useful in the planning, management, and control of life outcomes. (p. 486)

In some respects, this is supported by recent studies that have attempted to show that students

who are at risk are much more likely affected by the quality of

instruction than are those who are not at risk. At-risk students

- those who feel depressed outside of school, invest almost no

time in doing homework, and hang out for many hours with friends

- are the most likely to be alienated from instruction when it is

boring and non-relevant. However, when instruction is

challenging, academically demanding, and relevant, these students

are almost as attentive in class as those who are not at risk.

Under such conditions, students who are at risk may even be more

engaged than their less troubled peers. Students who are at risk

tend to reap greater benefits from every improvement in the

quality of instruction. (Yair, 2000, p. 261)

In some respects the conceptual framework and empirical results

of this study warrant further exploration. Future studies could

complement this inquiry by first, confirming the identification and

operational definitions for each of dimensions of social integration in

a more rigorous way. Some of the dimensions identified in this study

and their operational definitions were more closely tied to the

original survey items than were they the clear obverse of Seeman's

dimensions of alienation.

Second, future studies could expand upon this line of inquiry by

creating an original survey instrument, where items are specifically

devised to collect data about social integration. Because the original

survey was intended to collect data about Lezotte's (1989, 1991)

perspective on school effectiveness, it is reasonable to anticipate

that different findings may result from different empirical items,

depending on their validity as measures of social integration.

Third, future studies could expand upon the results of this

inquiry by correlating perceptions of parental social integration with

students' attitudes, attendance, behavior, and achievement. Because many practitioners and especially the public view school effectiveness as a matter of heightened student achievement, examining social integration more broadly could provide an indication to system administrators, school principals and teachers alike, which areas require more attention in their schools to heighten concern for student achievement.

Finally, it follows that future studies might also expand this line of inquiry by examining and comparing the social integration of all school members, which, of course, would include educators, clerical/custodial staff, and students themselves. Other inquiries that work more obviously to show the connection between what Owens (2001) has called "the quality and characteristics of the organizational culture" and the effectiveness of schools may provide a fuller understanding of the dimensions of parental social integration in schools.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. (1944). <u>The dialect of enlightenment</u>. New York: Continuum

    (1993). Originally published as "Dialectic der Aufklarung"

Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker,

    J. (1979). <u>School social systems and student achievement:</u>

    <u>Schools can make a difference.</u> New York: Praeger.

Clark, D., Lotto, L., & Astuto, T. (1989). Effective schools and

    school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of

    inquiry. In J. Burdwin (Ed.), <u>School Leadership</u> (pp. 159-186).

    Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A.,

    Weinfield, F., & York, R. (1966). <u>Equality of educational</u>

    <u>opportunity.</u> Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Deal, T. & Peterson, D. (1999). <u>Shaping school culture: The heart of</u>

    <u>leadership.</u> San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Durkheim, E. (1893). The division of labor in society. In R. Joines,

    <u>Emile Durkheim: An introduction to four major works.</u> (1986, pp.

    24-59). Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Edmonds, R. (1983). <u>Search for effective schools: The identification</u>

    <u>and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective</u>

    <u>for poor children.</u> East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State

    University.

Epstein, J. (1995, May). School/family/community partnerships. <u>Phi</u>

    <u>Delta Kappan,</u> 701-712.

Gerth, H. & Mills, C. W. (1946). <u>From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.</u>

    New York: Oxford.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (1986). School effects. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching, 3rd ed., (pp. 570-602). New York: McMillan.

Haynes, N. M., Corner, J. P. & Hamilton-Lee, M. (1989). School climate enhancement through parental involvement. The Journal of School Psychology, 27, 87-90.

Henderson A. (1987). The evidence continues to grow: Parental involvement improves student achievement. Columbia, Maryland: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Hoffer, Eric (1951). The true believer. New York: Harper and Row.

Hoy, W. & Ferguson, J. (1989). A theoretical framework and exploration of organizational effectiveness in schools. In J. Burdwin (Ed.), School leadership (pp. 259-274). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Hulley, W. (1996, October). Planning for more successful schools: The importance of the correlates of effective schools and data in school based planning. Paper presented at the meeting of the school-planning teams on school effectiveness, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Klitgaard, R. & Hall, G. (1974). Are there unusually effective schools? Journal of Human Resources, 74, 90-106.

Proactive Information Services Inc. (1997). Helping clients make a difference: A divisional report on schools' effectiveness. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Lezotte, L. (1988). School improvement based on effective schools research. In D. Lipsky & A. Gartner (Eds.) Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. Columbia, Maryland: Brookes Publishing.

Lezotte, L. (1991). Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation. Okemos, Michigan: Effective Schools Products Ltd.

Mannheim, K. (1940). Man and society in an age of reconstruction. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Manitoba Education and Training (1994). New directions. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Manitoba Education and Training (1996). School-Based planning: A continuous process for effective education and resource for developing and implementing annual school plans. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Merton, R. (1949). Social theory and social structure. Chicago, Illinois: Free Press.

Owens, R. (2001). Organizational behavior in education (7th edition). Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Purkey, S. & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 427-452.

Reynolds, D. & Teddlie, C. (2000). The processes of school effectiveness. In D. Reynolds & C. Teddlie (Eds.) The international handbook of school effectiveness research. London: Falmer Press

Rothman, S. & Black, A. (2001). Media and business elites: Still in conflict? The Public Interest, 143, 72-87.

Rutter, M. (1983). School effects on pupil progress: Research findings and policy implications. In L.S. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.) Handbook of Teaching and Policy. New York: Longman.

Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 24, 783-791.

Seeman, M. (1972). Alienation and engagement. In A. Campbell and P.E. Converse (Eds.) <u>The human meaning of social change</u> (pp. 467-527). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Seeman, M. (1983). Alienation motifs in contemporary theorizing: The hidden continuity of classic themes. <u>Social Psychology Quarterly,</u> <u>46,</u> 171-183.

Tangri, S. & Moles, O. (1987). Parents and community. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.) <u>Educators' handbook: A research</u> <u>perspective.</u> New York: Longman.

Webb, R. & Sherman, R. (1989). <u>Schooling and society</u>. New York: Macmillan.

Weber, G. (1971). Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. <u>Occasional Papers, 18</u>. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.

Yair, G. (2000). Educational battlefields in America: The tug-of-war over students' engagement with instruction. <u>Sociology of</u> <u>Education, 73,</u> 247-269.

APPENDIX A

X SCHOOL
- STUDENT SURVEY -

> We want to know what students think about this school.
> Student opinions are important, so please be honest when you answer the questions.
> Your answers will be grouped with other students' answers.
> No one needs to know exactly what _you_ said, so do NOT put your name on this paper.
>
> **Thank you for your help!**

First, tell us about you...

1. You are a: ☐ girl ☐ boy

2. You are in:

☐1 grade 5 ☐2 grade 6 ☐3 grade 7 ☐4 grade 8 ☐5 senior 1

3. How well do you do at school? ☐1 very well ☐2 okay ☐3 not very well

4. In the last two years, have you done any of these things at school?

Have you...	Yes	No
been in a school play or school production?	☐	☐
joined a school club?	☐	☐
participated in school sports?	☐	☐
been part of a special event (for example, school assemblies, spirit week, activity days, preparing Christmas hampers)?	☐	☐
been on a committee with other students (for example, class committees, student council)?	☐	☐
been on a committee with a teacher (for example, to plan a special event)?	☐	☐

5. In an average month, how many days of school do you usually miss?

☐1 none ☐2 1 or 2 days ☐3 3 or 4 days ☐4 5 days or more

Now, tell us what you think about school . . .

6. How often do you think these things are true at your school?

	All/Most of the Time	Sometimes	Never
I feel safe at this school (in classrooms, on school grounds).	☐	☐	☐
Teachers treat students with respect.	☐	☐	☐
Students treat teachers with respect.	☐	☐	☐
I know the rules at this school.	☐	☐	☐
My teachers treat me the same as they treat other students.	☐	☐	☐
At this school students have a say about things that affect them.	☐	☐	☐
Teachers expect good work from me.	☐	☐	☐
My teachers help me learn.	☐	☐	☐
I am happy at school.	☐	☐	☐
We do a lot of different things in class (for example, projects, group work, puzzles, games).	☐	☐	☐
I am interested in what I am learning at school.	☐	☐	☐
Doing well at school is important to me.	☐	☐	☐
Teachers give me work to do that is too easy.	☐	☐	☐
Teachers focus on my strengths, not my weaknesses.	☐	☐	☐
Teachers give me work to do that is too hard.	☐	☐	☐
I have the opportunity to evaluate my own work.	☐	☐	☐
My parents know how well I am doing at school.	☐	☐	☐
I am encouraged to set goals for myself.	☐	☐	☐
I talk to my parents about my school work.	☐	☐	☐
This school has a lot of school spirit.	☐	☐	☐
Students treat each other with respect.	☐	☐	☐
I feel successful at school.	☐	☐	☐

7. **Which two or three things do you think need to be <u>improved</u> at this school? (✓ TWO or THREE things only.)**

☐01 Make sure students are safe at school.
☐02 Make sure students are treated fairly.
☐03 Teach things in different ways (more activities, hands-on).
☐04 Make subjects more interesting.
☐05 Let students have more say in things that affect them.
☐06 Have higher academic standards.
☐07 Have more extra-curricular activities (for example, clubs).
☐08 Have students more involved in setting their own goals.
☐09 Something else? Please explain. _____
OR
☐10 This school doesn't need to improve anything.

8. **How would you rate your school?**

☐1 Great!   ☐2 Good   ☐3 Okay   ☐4 Not very good   ☐5 Terrible!

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!
Proactive Information Services Inc.

"X" School
- STAFF SURVEY -

Staff opinions and observations are important to the school planning process.
Please answer the following questions based on your own opinions and experiences.
Your individual responses will be kept strictly confidential and you will remain anonymous.

Thank you for your cooperation.

1. At which levels do you currently teach/work with students?

   ☐1 early years　　　☐2 middle years　　☐3 both levels

2. In total, how many years have you taught/worked in schools?

   ☐1 10 years or fewer　　☐2 11 to 20 years　　☐3 more than 20 years

3. Including this school year, how many years have you been in your current school?

   _____ years

4. Are you a:　☐1 teacher (e.g. principal, classroom teacher)
   　　　　　　☐2 other staff (e.g. secretary, paraprofessional)

5. Please ✓ how often each of the following is EVIDENT at your school.

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely/ Never
SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT				
Rules and expectations for student behaviour are clear.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Consequences are applied consistently.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff behaviour contributes to a safe and orderly environment.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff treat students with respect.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students treat staff with respect.	☐	☐	☐	☐
The school building is well maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students feel safe at this school (in classrooms, on school grounds).	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff feel safe at this school (in classrooms, on school grounds).	☐	☐	☐	☐
CLEAR AND FOCUSED MISSION				
The school mission is valued by staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐
The school mission is the driving force behind important decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐
As staff, we have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Parents/guardians have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.	☐	☐	☐	☐
School activities (classroom, special events, extra-curricular) reflect the school's mission.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff support a vision of the school as a learning community.	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely/ Never
SHARED LEADERSHIP				
Leadership is shared among staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Improvement of instructional practice is promoted in this school (e.g. securing resources, supporting p.d.).	☐	☐	☐	☐
Concerns of staff are addressed.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff collaborate to resolve concerns.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff work collaboratively to improve teaching and learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff members share ideas and work together to implement curriculum.	☐	☐	☐	☐
The primary focus of staff professional development is improving student learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐
CLIMATE OF HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR SUCCESS				
Staff in this school have high expectations for students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff is committed to helping all students master important learning objectives.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Achievement expectations are shared with students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Academic excellence is valued by staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Academic excellence is valued by students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Academic excellence is valued by parents/guardians.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students have opportunities to receive recognition for their accomplishments.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff emphasize students' strengths rather than shortcomings.	☐	☐	☐	☐
OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND BE SUCCESSFUL				
Teachers keep current on instructional strategies and programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Learning is facilitated through differentiated instruction.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Key skills and concepts are taught across subject areas.	☐	☐	☐	☐
In our school, opportunities exist beyond the classroom that contribute to student learning.	☐	☐	☐	☐
This school has strategies for supporting at-risk students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff extend learning opportunities for challenge students.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Equipment/materials/resources are available to support student learning (e.g. technology, library resources).	☐	☐	☐	☐
Classroom interruptions are managed to respect time on task.	☐	☐	☐	☐
MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS				
Student progress is monitored on an ongoing basis.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students receive constructive feedback about their progress and achievement.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teachers use multiple methods to assess student learning (e.g. tests, portfolios, projects, conferencing).	☐	☐	☐	☐
Assessment results are used to set instructional and programming priorities.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students receive information on the purposes, techniques and criteria used in assessment.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Students are involved in goal setting and self-assessment to help them become independent learners.	☐	☐	☐	☐

HOME-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely/ Never
There is frequent communication with parents/guardians.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Parents/guardians receive regular feedback on their child's progress.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Parents/guardians are involved in making decisions about their child.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teachers help parents/guardians understand school programs/ curriculum.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Parents/guardians play an active role in the school.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff and parents/guardians work together to promote student success.	☐	☐	☐	☐
Parent/guardian involvement is valued by staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Under each heading, please ✓ the THREE you think are the MOST important as we set priorities for the coming school year.

3 MOST IMPORTANT ↓

SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT
_____ 1 Rules and expectations for student behaviour are clear.
_____ 2 Consequences are applied consistently.
_____ 3 Staff behaviour contributes to a safe and orderly environment.
_____ 4 Staff treat students with respect.
_____ 5 Students treat staff with respect.
_____ 6 The school building is well maintained.
_____ 7 Students feel safe at this school (in classrooms, on school grounds).
_____ 8 Staff feel safe at this school (in classrooms, on school grounds).

3 MOST IMPORTANT ↓

CLEAR AND FOCUSED MISSION
_____ 1 The school mission is valued by staff.
_____ 2 The school mission is the driving force behind important decisions.
_____ 3 As staff, we have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.
_____ 4 Parents/guardians have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.
_____ 5 Students have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.
_____ 6 School activities (classroom, special events, extra-curricular) reflect the school's mission.
_____ 7 Staff support a vision of the school as a learning community.

3 MOST IMPORTANT ↓

SHARED LEADERSHIP
_____ 1 Leadership is shared among staff.
_____ 2 Improvement of instructional practice is promoted in this school (e.g. securing resources, supporting p.d.).
_____ 3 Concerns of staff are addressed.
_____ 4 Staff collaborate to resolve concerns.
_____ 5 Staff work collaboratively to improve teaching and learning.
_____ 6 Staff members share ideas and work together to implement curriculum.
_____ 7 The primary focus of staff professional development is improving student learning.

3 MOST IMPORTANT

↓ **CLIMATE OF HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR SUCCESS**

_____ 1 Staff in this school have high expectations for students.
_____ 2 Staff is committed to helping all students master important learning objectives.
_____ 3 Achievement expectations are shared with students.
_____ 4 Academic excellence is valued by staff.
_____ 5 Academic excellence is valued by students.
_____ 6 Academic excellence is valued by parents/guardians.
_____ 7 Students have opportunities to receive recognition for their accomplishments.
_____ 8 Staff emphasize students' strengths rather than shortcomings.

3 MOST IMPORTANT

↓ **OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND BE SUCCESSFUL**

_____ 1 Teachers keep current on instructional strategies and programs.
_____ 2 Learning is facilitated through differentiated instruction.
_____ 3 Key skills and concepts are taught across subject areas.
_____ 4 In our school, opportunities exist beyond the classroom that contribute to student learning.
_____ 5 This school has strategies for supporting at-risk students.
_____ 6 Staff extend learning opportunities for challenge students.
_____ 7 Equipment/materials/resources are available to support student learning (e.g. technology, library resources).
_____ 8 Classroom interruptions are managed to respect time on task.

3 MOST IMPORTANT

↓ **MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS**

_____ 1 Student progress is monitored on an ongoing basis.
_____ 2 Students receive constructive feedback about their progress and achievement.
_____ 3 Teachers use multiple methods to assess student learning (e.g. tests, portfolios, projects, conferencing).
_____ 4 Assessment results are used to set instructional and programming priorities.
_____ 5 Students receive information on the purposes, techniques and criteria used in assessment.
_____ 6 Students are involved in goal setting and self-assessment to help them become independent learners.

3 MOST IMPORTANT

↓ **HOME-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP**

_____ 1 There is frequent communication with parents/guardians.
_____ 2 Parents/guardians receive regular feedback on their child's progress.
_____ 3 Parents/guardians are involved in making decisions about their child.
_____ 4 Teachers help parents/guardians understand school programs/curriculum.
_____ 5 Parents/guardians play an active role in the school.
_____ 6 Staff and parents/guardians work together to promote student success.
_____ 7 Parent/guardian involvement is valued by staff.

7. Please use the following space for any other comments or suggestions.

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!
Proactive Information Services Inc.

"X" School
- PARENT SURVEY -

WE WANT YOUR OPINIONS!

As part of Assiniboine South's planning process, we want to know how parents/guardians view their child's school. Please help us by completing the questionnaire and returning it to the school by _____.

Thank you for your help.

1. **How many children do you currently have attending this school?**

   # of children = _____

2. **Please ✓ whether your <u>oldest</u> child attending this school is:**

   ☐ female ☐ male

3. **What is the grade level of your <u>oldest</u> child attending this school?**

   ☐01 Kindergarten ☐03 Grade 2 ☐05 Grade 4 ☐07 Grade 6 ☐09 Grade 8

   ☐02 Grade 1 ☐04 Grade 3 ☐06 Grade 5 ☐08 Grade 7 ☐10 Senior 1 (Grade 9)

4. **Please ✓ <u>ALL</u> the ways you are regularly involved in your child's education?**

   ☐01 Working with my child at home

   ☐02 As a volunteer at the school

   ☐03 Working at the school

   ☐04 On parent council

   ☐05 On another school committee

   ☐06 Attended parent-teacher conferences

   ☐07 Another way: _____

   ☐08 Providing opportunities outside school to enrich my child's learning (e.g. library use, music/art lessons, organized sports, youth organizations)

   ☐09 Attended a school performance (e.g. drama production, concert)

   ☐10 Attended a school special event (e.g. Science Fair, parent education night, activity day)

   ☐11 I am <u>not</u> regularly involved.

5. **How do you get information about how your <u>oldest</u> child is doing in school?**

   ☐1 School newsletter

   ☐2 What my neighbours tell me

   ☐3 Parent-teacher conferences

   ☐4 Personal contact with school staff

   ☐5 Special events

   ☐6 Take home notices

   ☐7 What my child tells me

   ☐8 Another way: _____

> ## When answering questions 6 and 7 please think about your oldest child attending this school.

6. On the left hand side please ✓ the THREE items in each category you think are MOST IMPORTANT.

On the right hand side please ✓ how often each of the following is EVIDENT at your child's school.

3 MOST IMPORTANT	Always	✗ Often	Sometimes	Rarely/ Never	Don't Know
SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT					
___1 Rules and expectations for student behaviour are clear.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___2 Consequences are applied consistently.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___3 Staff behaviour contributes to a safe and orderly environment.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___4 Staff treat my child with respect.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___5 Students treat staff with respect.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___6 The school building is well maintained.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___7 My child feels safe at this school (in classrooms, on school grounds).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3 MOST IMPORTANT					
CLEAR AND FOCUSED MISSION					
___1 Decisions and actions taken at this school reflect the school's written statement of purpose and beliefs (mission).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___2 I have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___3 Students have the opportunity to participate in setting direction for the school.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___4 School activities (classroom, special events, extra-curricular) reflect the school's mission.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___5 Decisions made concerning my child are consistent with the school's mission.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3 MOST IMPORTANT					
CLIMATE OF HIGH EXPECTATIONS FOR SUCCESS					
___1 Staff in this school have high expectations for my child.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___2 Staff is committed to helping all students master important learning objectives.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___3 Achievement expectations are shared with students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___4 Academic excellence is valued by staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___5 My child values academic excellence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___6 I value academic excellence.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___7 My child has opportunities to receive recognition for what he/she has accomplished.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
___8 Staff emphasize my child's strengths rather than shortcomings.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

				Rarely/	Don't
3 MOST IMPORTANT ↓ OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND BE SUCCESSFUL	Always	Often	Sometimes	Never	Know

3 MOST
IMPORTANT
↓ **OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND BE SUCCESSFUL**

___1 My child is happy to go to school. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___2 My child is involved in a variety of class activities to help him/her learn (e.g. projects, group work, hands-on activities). ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___3 My child is challenged at an appropriate level. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___4 My child has opportunities beyond the classroom that contribute to his/her student learning. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___5 Equipment/materials/resources are available to support student learning (e.g. technology, library resources). ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___6 My child feels successful at school. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

3 MOST
IMPORTANT
↓ **MONITORING OF STUDENT PROGRESS**

___1 My child's progress is monitored on an ongoing basis. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___2 My child receives constructive feedback about his/her progress and achievement. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___3 Teachers use multiple methods to assess my child's learning (e.g. tests, portfolios, projects, conferencing). ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___4 My child receives information on the purposes, techniques and criteria used in assessment. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___5 My child is involved in goal setting and self-assessment to help him/her become an independent learner. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

3 MOST
IMPORTANT
↓ **HOME-SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP**

___1 There is frequent communication with parents/guardians. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___2 I receive regular feedback on my child's progress. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___3 I am involved in making decisions about my child. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___4 Teachers help parents/guardians understand school programs/curriculum. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___5 Parents/guardians play an active role in the school. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___6 Staff and parents/guardians work together to promote student success. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

___7 Parent/guardian involvement is valued by staff. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

7. **Overall, how satisfied are you with the education that your child is receiving at this school?**

☐1 Very satisfied   ☐2 Satisfied   ☐3 Dissatisfied   ☐4 Very Dissatisfied

8. **Please use this space for any other comments or suggestions you have about the school.**

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!
Proactive Information Services Inc.