March 6, 1975

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Karlheinz Helmut Paul entitled "The Impact of Parents and Teachers on the Organizational Structure of Elementary Schools." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Sociology.

Michael Betz

Michael Betz, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Dean Champion

J. Michael Brostrom

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

THE IMPACT OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Karlheinz Helmut Paul

March 1975

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A great deal of appreciation is expressed to Dr. D. Michael Betz, who supplied both the data and major guidance, and without whose considerable prodding this study may not have been completed at this time.

The beneficial comments and recommendations of Professors Dean J. Champion and J. Michael Brooks are to be especially acknowledged.

Unfortunately, any theoretical and methodological mistakes are the sole responsibility of the author.

1197682

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to add some theoretical and empirical knowledge to the "open system" perspective in the study of formal organizations with data from 36 elementary schools. It deals with the impact of two collectivities, parents and teachers, on the organization of the school. The major variables were social class of the school neighborhood, parental participation, educational attainment of teachers, the centralization of decision making in schools, the formalization of rules and procedures in schools, and educational goals.

The following general hypotheses were generated: (1) SES is positively associated to rates of parental participation in PTA and with teachers; (2) parental participation is positively associated with the centralization of decision making and the formalization of rules and procedures in schools; (3) the educational attainment of teachers is directly associated with the decentralization of decision making in schools; and (4) SES is directly associated with the type of educational goals stressed by schools. All but one of the hypotheses were supported by the data. The remaining hypothesis was supported but in the opposite direction as was predicted; a decrease in formalization existed where parental participation was high.

Gamma coefficients were computed on data collected from the 36 elementary schools in the school district serving Knoxville, Tennessee. These cases represented 227 teachers and 31 PTA presidents. The major implication of this study was that it showed the necessity for further

research concerned with a clarification and delineation of such entities as: (1) the "professionalism" of teachers, and (2) structural variables in organizations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	2
The Organization	2
The Collectivities	2
The Impact of Parents	4
School Reaction	6
The Impact of Teachers and School Reaction	9
The Net Effect of Impact Upon the School	10
II. METHODOLOGY	13
The Data	13
The Variables and Measures	14
Statistical Analysis	23
III. FINDINGS	25
IV. SUMMARY	47
REFERENCES	52
APPENDIX	56
VITA	69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Matrix of Kendall's Tau for Index of Formalization	21
II.	Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and Parental Attendance at PTA	26
III.	Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and Active Parental PTA Participation	26
IV.	Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and the Percentage of Parental Contact with Teachers	28
V.	Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and Weekly Parent Contact with Teachers	28
VI.	Relationship Between the Percentage of Parental Contact with Teachers and the Centralization of Decision Making in Schools	30
VII.	Relationship Between Weekly Parental Contact with Teachers and the Centralization of Decision Making in Schools . .	31
VIII.	Relationship Between the Percentage of Parental Contact with Teachers and the Formalization of Rules and Procedures in Schools	32
IX.	Relationship Between Weekly Contact of Parents with Teachers and the Formalization of Rules and Procedures in Schools	33
X.	Relationship Between the Educational Attainment of Teachers and the Decentralization of Decision Making in Schools	34

TABLE PAGE

XI. Relationship Between the Educational Attainment of Teachers and the Decentralization of Decision Making in Schools Controlling for the Percentage of Parental Contact with Teachers 35

XII. Relationship Between the Educational Attainment of Teachers and the Formalization of Rules and Procedures in Schools Controlling for the Percentage of Parental Contact with Teachers 38

XIII. Relationship Between the Formalization of Rules and Procedures and the Centralization of Decision Making in Schools 38

XIV. Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and the Years of Experience of Schools' Teaching Staffs 40

XV. Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and the Educational Attainment of Schools' Teaching Staffs 40

XVI. Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and the Educational Goal of Critical Thinking . . . 42

XVII. Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and the Educational Goal of College Preparation . . 43

XVIII. Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and the Educational Goal of Vocational Training . . 43

XIX. Relationship Between Social Class of School Neighborhood and the Educational Goal of Character Training . . 45

TABLE PAGE

XX. Relationship Between Social Class of the School Neighborhood and the Educational Goal of Citizenship 45

XXI. Number of Teachers Sampled Within Each School by Social Class Ranking of Schools 57

XXII. School Values and Standard Deviations of the Educational Attainment of Teachers by Social Class Ranking of Schools 58

XXIII. School Values for the Percentage of PTA Participation and the Percentage of Active PTA Participation by Social Class Ranking of Schools 59

XXIV. School Values and Standard Deviations of the Percentage of Parental Contact with Teachers and the Weekly Parental Contact with Teachers by Social Class Ranking of Schools 60

XXV. School Values and Standard Deviations of the Levels and Index of the Centralization of Decision Making in Schools by Social Class Ranking of Schools 61

XXVI. School Values and Standard Deviations of the Qualities and Index of the Formalization of Rules and Procedures in Schools by Social Class Ranking of Schools 64

XXVII. School Values and Standard Deviations of Educational Goals by Social Class Ranking of Schools 67

INTRODUCTION

Historically much attention has been paid to the internal relations within organizations, but little attention has been paid to that of the organization in relation to its environment. An organization's relationship with its environment may be basically trichotomized into: (1) organization to organization, (2) organization to the political sphere, and (3) organization to collectivities (Hollister, 1966: 1). This paper is concerned with the refinement of some previously conducted research in examining organizations-collectivities relationships in the educational system. Specifically, this paper shall test hypotheses dealing with the impact of two collectivities--parents and teachers--on the organization of the school.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Organization

The focal point of this research is the organization, which shall henceforth be referred to as "the school." The school may be defined as ". . . an agency seeking out the 'captive student' to indoctrinate him (her) with newly formulated knowledge and values" (Corwin, 1965: 156), or it may be viewed as a "people changing" organization (Hollister, 1966: 3). From a more general definition, the school is a "service institution" (Becker, 1953: 128). The school exists and operates (functions) within a particular environment and it must select both personnel (such as teachers, principals, and secretaries) and other resources (such as taxes) from its environment. The school is affected by at least two collectivities: parents (tax source) and teachers (personnel).

The Collectivities

One of the collectivities affecting the school is the clientele. The client is defined here as the parent(s) of a given child, and the child is considered as an extension of the parent. The child serves as a "vehicle of information" to the parent (Hollister, 1966: 7). This distinction is made for analytical clarity because it is the parent who pays for and evaluates the service which is rendered by the school. In

characterizing the relationship of the parent to the organization in the educational system, the central issue, in this paper, is the degree of parental power and its consequences on the school's operation. Clients legitimize their power because they are the taxpayers who support the school, and it is their children who are being educated (Hollister, 1966: 9).

The parents, as examined above, represent a collectivity which operates largely outside the organization as they influence the school. The teachers, however, are the collectivity which most directly influence the school from within and who perform the work and represent the school to the parents. Teachers are in somewhat of a tenuous position. They would like to view themselves as professionals with control over their work domain, but both school administrators and parents are unwilling, in most cases, to grant them this control.[1] Wilensky (1964) views public school teaching as a profession in process or a marginal profession (Pavalko, 1971: 29). Nevertheless, whether teachers are professionals or "marginal" professionals, they desire autonomy to carry out duties in serving the children (Hollister, 1966: 22).

---

[1]Ronald Pavalko has constructed a useful scheme for an analysis of occupations-professions. Pavalko contends that a profession(al) has: (1) theory (a mastery over a particular body of knowledge), (2) relevance to social values (medicine-health, law-justice), (3) a training period (length of time, difficulty, specialization), (4) motivation (the service of clients is the primary goal), (5) autonomy (control comes from within the profession), (6) sense of commitment (a profession is a "calling"; work is an end in itself), (7) sense of community (identity of its own; few leave the profession; professionals share common values; professionals select the members of the future), (8) code of ethics.

The Impact of Parents

Foskett (1955), Axlerod (1956), Bell and Force (1956), Lenski (1956), and others have been concerned with how people (clients) exert pressure on organizations, that is, people's (clients') participation in organizations. Consistently throughout their research these people have found that participation in organizations is positively related to the education and income of the client. Gordon and Babchuck (1959) have noted two different types of voluntary organizations which helps refine an understanding of whom is likely to participate in the Parent-Teacher Association and other educational concerns. In their scheme, Instrumental organizations have goals which are ". . . to maintain or change the status quo outside the organization not to bring about immediate personal gratification," and Expressive organizations ". . . provide the setting for immediate and continuing gratification for the individual" (Gordon and Babchuck, 1959: 22-29). Higher SES people tend to join Instrumental organizations, and lower SES people tend to join Expressive organizations. The Parent-Teacher Association and Citizens for Better Schools are examples of Instrumental organizations.[2]

Although these studies are useful in describing the relationship between SES and participation in organizations, most of the studies merely describe relationships, and do not delve deeper into the "whys." Foskett (1955) and Anderson (1971) add further analytical clarity.

---

[2]Bowling clubs and bridge clubs are examples of Expressive organizations.

Foskett asserts that participation in organizational activities is, simply, social interaction. His logic follows that social interaction requires certain social skills (Foskett, 1955: 436). In relation to participation in Instrumental organizations, these social skills would entail the ability to articulate one's thoughts, knowledge of rules of order, and the like. The previous considerations are at the root of the issue. The general tendency is that the higher the client's SES, the more will be the mastery over the social skills necessary for participation in an Instrumental organization (PTA). Anderson attacks the problem from a different viewpoint. He feels that SES defines the problem of participation in organizations with variables that are not easily changed; that is, it is very difficult to change parents' education and income levels. Anderson asserts that it might be more fruitful to analyze variables that are more amenable to change, such as alienation. Alienation, as a quality of a clientele, is directly related to a feeling of control by the organization of that clientele. The organization is more autonomous if their clientele are alienated (Anderson, 1971: 12-24). Hollister (1966) supports this contention by showing one possibility of why many parents do not participate in school activities. "They're scared"; that is, many parents feel they have no power (Hollister, 1966:15). Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis I: Social class of the school neighborhood is directly associated with the amount of participation in parent-teacher associations by the parents.

Hypothesis I provides one type of setting in which the school experiences the impact of parents, that is, from an organization of parents. In gaining a broader view, it is noted that parents may interact with the school outside the boundaries of the PTA on their own with teachers and administrators. For the purposes of this research, parental contact with teachers will suffice as a complementary viewpoint to Hypothesis I. The same logic which led to the first hypothesis is implemented for the second which states that:

Hypothesis II: Social class of the school neighborhood is directly associated with contacts between teachers and parents.

School Reaction

In characterizing the role of the school in the organization-collectivities relationship in the educational system, Simpson and Gulley (1962) have devised a scheme for an analysis of organizations in terms of the goal(s) of the organization, and whom the organization must satisfy. An organization can be focused or diffuse depending on the number of goals the organization wishes to attain, and an organization can be internally or externally oriented in terms of its relationship to its environment. Simpson and Gulley assert that a focused-internal organization is expected to be highly centralized because it is designed to accomplish specific goals with little concern for an external environment (highly bureaucratic). A diffuse-external organization is expected to be highly decentralized because of varied goals and a sensitivity to the external environment with both conditions discouraging a

rationalized central structure (Simpson and Gulley, 1962: 344-351). Following this scheme, the school would seem to be diffuse because the definitions of the goals of education are as many as there are people defining them. The school would seem to be externally oriented because it must respond to public definitions, and to a tradition of "grass roots" participation. The school is also legally responsible for the safety of students (Hollister, 1966: 20).

Problematic in the nature of the school is the fact that, along with responding to public definitions of educational goals, the school is constrained by lack of citizen confidence and support by way of money. The central issue seems to be one of power (autonomy); that is, the school needs to have some control to operate efficiently (within given boundaries). Thompson and McEwen (1958) have cited five strategies which organizations can use to maintain autonomy: passive adaptation, coalition, co-optation, bargaining, and competition. Which organizational strategy will alleviate the situation for the school? By process of elimination, it can be seen that all of the aforementioned strategies, except passive adaptation, would not achieve the desired goal of school autonomy. Coalition and co-optation would bring the parents closer to the operations of the school. The parents would be given equal status in the former case, and would be subsumed within school operations in the latter case. Bargaining and competition would place the school in a very tenuous position since the school receives its resources from the parents. In the former case, the school has virtually nothing to bargain with and in the latter case, the parents could view the situation as overt resistance to their wishes, thus creating more

problems for the maintenance of autonomy. Of concern in this paper is the organizational strategy of passive adaptation and the two types of organizational responses which seemingly fall under this heading: centralization of decision making and formalization of rules and procedures. Passive adaptation is a method, used by schools, of imposing upon themselves restraints of activity or direction of activity which may occur in the form of the centralization of decision making or the formalization of rules and procedures (Corwin, 1965: 391). Centralization of decision making is the placing of decision making control into higher offices, and the formalization of rules and procedures is a more strict adherence to the "letter of the law" rather than a freer interpretation of regulations (Hollister, 1972: 2). The school, being an open system, is vulnerable to outside pressure or participation. Further "a client orientation" undermines colleague control and professional norms (Wilensky, 1964: 137).

Organizational responses, such as centralization of decision making and the formalization of rules and procedures, may aid the school, as structural deterrents, in maintaining a degree of autonomy against outside interference. Adaptation, in this manner, alleviates pressure placed on any particular school, thus requiring a more concerted effort on the part of the parents to disturb or affect the operation of the school. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis III: Client participation is directly associated with the degree of the centralization of decision making in schools.

Hypothesis IV: Client participation is directly associated with the degree of the formalization of rules and procedures in schools.

The Impact of Teachers and School Reaction

In the relationship between the school and teachers, a problem is in evidence. The structure of educational systems is bureaucratic; and as such they operate through a hierarchical distribution of power (authority) with teachers subordinate to administrators. Administrators of the educational system are likely to be more concerned with the coordination and administration of education rather than education itself (Firestone, 1972: 17). Teachers, as professionals, are more concerned with education, and it is expected that they would want regulation and control to come from within their profession (Lortie, 1969: 28). What confounds the problem is that the teacher must function within the school unlike, for example, medical doctors in private practice or corporate research scientists working away from the corporation. In dealing with this conflict of interests, Becker (1953) shows that, if teachers are willing, they can wield power by banding together and requesting transfers in mass, and also, the "ultimate sanction" is the cooperation of the teachers with the parents against certain authority figures (Becker, 1953: 138). Adams (1971) feels, however, that control over teachers is not that stringent because teachers do their real work alone, isolated from administrators. Whatever the situation is in reality, it is assumed that the school administration would not like the problem to reach the point

where the "ultimate sanction" is used.

The most important variable in this discussion seems to be the professionalism of the teachers. The more professional teachers are, the more autonomy they would demand in doing their work. A major means of attaining this professional attitude is through the education achieved by teachers. Teachers, as staff members, are an integral part of any school, and being such, the school should be aware of their wishes. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis V: Educational attainment of teachers in a school is directly associated with decentralized decision making in the school.

The Net Effect of Impact Upon the School

The physical make-up of the educational system facilitates the intervention of parents. In the United States, schools are community (locally) based organizations (Hollister, 1966: 5). Being such, schools are open systems, and within organizational boundaries, smaller organizations such as the Parent-Teacher Association are in operation, furthering the ease of intervention (Hollister, 1972: 6). The manner in which pressure is exerted may differ by kind and degree because different parents adhere to different value systems and attitudes.

Kohn (1959) has constructed a useful scheme for classifying clients in terms of their class and associated values and attitudes. At one extreme of the continuum are Lower or Working Class attitudes and values, while at the other extreme are Middle-Class attitudes and values. The "Upper-Class" is purposely eliminated in Kohn's scheme, as

in this paper, because his concern is with the public educational system. In his view, it is the general tendency of the Upper-Class not to make use of public education. Kohn's scheme is accepted here and will be followed in this paper. It is important to note that the extremes of Kohn's scheme are "ideal types" and may not exist in reality. The only implication is that the more Middle or Lower-Class a particular client is, the more the particular values and attitudes are exhibited by the client.

Kohn contends that Lower-Class parents stress that: (1) children should become respectable citizens, (2) children should not violate the proscriptions of the law, (3) physical punishment, (4) punishment only for the "doing" of some act, (5) obedience, (6) trustworthiness; whereas Middle-Class parents stress: (1) internalized standards of conduct for their children, (2) action according to one's own principles, (3) in lieu of physical punishment, the threat of loss of love and reason are used, (4) punishment for the "omission" of some act (the stress is placed more on the intent rather than the act itself), (5) consideration and self-control, (6) truthfulness (Kohn, 1959: 352-366 and Kohn, 1959: 337-351). Kohn states that there are certain "universal" acts that do receive physical punishment in either extreme, such as the destruction of property (Kohn, 1959: 362). In relation to school activities, Sieber and Wilder (1967) add to Kohn's scheme by showing that Lower-Class parents stress the content of subject matter, while Middle-Class parents stress the qualities of discovery and creativity.

Considering this scheme and the nature of the school as a "client-oriented" organization, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis VI: Social class of the school neighborhood is positively associated with schools stressing Middle-Class goals and negatively associated with those stressing Lower-Class goals.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Data

The data used in this study were gathered in the winter of 1971 from 36 elementary schools.[1] These schools are all of the elementary schools with 1-6 grades in the school district of Knoxville, Tennessee (population: 175,000, 1970). Elementary schools were used because they function in neighborhoods with relatively homogeneous socioeconomic characteristics (Sexton, 1967: 117). Although each school serves a particular neighborhood, with particular characteristics, the entire set of schools (36) serve the total range of characteristics within the school district of Knoxville. It is assumed that socioeconomic characteristics of neighborhoods in Knoxville are similar to those of any city of comparable size. The relative homogeneity of characteristics within any neighborhood facilitates the analysis of hypotheses in this study. Data were obtained from teachers (N=227) and PTA presidents (N=31)[2] by the use of a self-administered questionnaire. Careful use of a stratified sample of teachers by school size and grade level were selected.

---

[1]The data were gathered by Michael Betz, Associate Professor of Sociology, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

[2]Five schools did not have PTA's: one in both the highest and middle SES neighborhoods and three schools in the lowest SES neighborhood.

The Variables and Measures

Independent Variables

Social class of the school neighborhood (SES). The social class of the elementary school neighborhood was determined by three knowledgeable judges who were asked to rank order the occupational prestige of the residents in the neighborhoods served by the 36 schools. The judges were chosen on the basis of their knowledge of the school system and the city (Knoxville) in which it is located.[3] The judges were asked to categorize, in their opinion, 12 schools belonging in the highest, 12 in the lowest, and 12 in the middle category by occupational prestige of the neighborhood. They were then asked to rank the schools from highest to lowest within each of the three categories. The Spearman rank ordering, internally, was .83 between judges 1 and 2, .82 between judges 2 and 3, and .80 between judges 1 and 3. These rankings had to be combined into one score. This was accomplished by looking for agreement between the judges. The agreement patterns that were accepted ranged from all three agreeing, to two judges being only one rank apart, to all three judges being only two ranks apart. The cases which fall into these predetermined categories covered all but 10 of the schools, as is shown below:

---

[3]One judge is an eminent sociologist and former chairperson of the Metropolitan Planning Commission of Knoxville, Tennessee. Another judge is a demographer and member of the same Metropolitan Planning Commission, and the other judge is a former superintendent of schools for Knoxville, Tennessee.

Agreement among three judges	1
Agreement between two judges	9
Two judges agree within one	13
Three judges agree within two	1
Two judges agree within two	3
Total	26

Where disagreement and ties existed, information received from principals and census data were used. The refinement of rankings correlated .93 with judge 1, .92 with judge 2, and .89 with judge 3. Surveys to obtain Federal funds were conducted by school district officials, and these surveys supported the ranking of school neighborhoods.

Client participation. In this study, client (parent) participation is used both as an independent and dependent variable. This variable is measured in a variety of ways. It is hoped that these several indices give a more accurate picture of parent participation.

The following four questions were asked of PTA presidents concerning their perceptions of:

1. What is the average number of parents who attend PTA meetings?
1a. This average number is what percent of all the parents in the boundary of this school?
2. Of those who come to PTA, how many are actively involved in PTA work?
2a. This number of actives is what percent of all the parents in the boundary of this school?

Questions 1a and 2a are of concern here since they are percentages of participation. This is an important consideration because school

neighborhoods vary in population and the use of percentages standardizes this situation across school neighborhoods.

The following two questions were asked of teachers concerning their perceptions of:

1. What percent of the parents of all students in your school have initiated contact with you this year?
2. In an average week how many parents initiate contact with you about some school related matter?

Question 1 follows the logic of the previous discussion concerning the use of percentages; however, question 2 violates this logic since the values are raw figures. This discrepancy will be dealt with in the following discussion of school characteristics. Nevertheless, the range of scores for these four indicators across the 36 schools are as follows:

PTA Q1a. 0 percent to 36.6 percent

Q2a. 0 percent to 21.1 percent

For the five schools having no PTA, their values are coded as 0 percent assuming a lack of interest on the part of parents.

Teachers Q1. 15.17 percent to 79.67 percent

Q2. 0.50 percent to 7.17 percent

In consideration of the remaining variables and the latter two indices of client participation above, this study maintains that the organization (school) can be a focal point for sociological inquiry. This is accomplished here with the exception of the variable of educational attainment, through the use of perceptual data acquired from teachers.[4] It is argued that if there is sufficient agreement in the

---

[4]It is recognized that these data, derived from teachers, may

perceptions of teachers within any given schools, this agreement of perception can be generalized as a school characteristic. As a general method, this conception was achieved by computing a mean for the values of each variable within each school. The mean thus becomes the school value for a particular variable. In order to determine the degree of agreement in perception of a "school value," the standard deviation for each variable within each school was computed (the listing of these standard deviations is provided in the Appendix). For the sake of relevancy, further discussions of this procedure are presented under the heading of each of the following variables.

Educational attainment. It is assumed that the higher the education, according to formal credentials, the more a teacher will be exposed to a concern for professional autonomy (Lortie, 1969: 24-25). Specifically, this autonomy concerns the work domain. This variable was measured by asking teachers:

Do you have a:
1. B.A. or B.S. degree
2. Beyond the Bachelor's degree but less than a Master's degree
3. M.A.
4. Beyond M.A.

The "school values" for this variable ranged from a low of 1.00 to a high of 2.13.[5]

---

preclude certain findings in that teachers represent one position within the structure of the school that represents a location from which biases may emanate.

[5]Upon inspection of the standard deviations for this variable (see the Appendix), it is found that the teaching staffs within the 36 schools are relatively homogeneous according to their educational attainment.

Dependent Variables

Centralization of decision making. Centralization and decentralization of decision making are assumed to be opposite ends of a continuum. Centralization means a delegation of authority to higher positions in the structure of the school; whereas, decentralization means a more democratic system of decision making relationships within the school. Centralization may also be conceived of ". . . as the degree of participation in decision making or the degree of reliance on the hierarchy of authority" (Hage and Aiken, 1967: 80). This concept is measured by the following question:

> What is the relative influence of the following groups in affecting operations in your school? (Number in order of influence, i.e., most influential is a 1, least influential is a 6.)
> *6 Parents
> 5 PTA
> 4 Teachers
> 3 Principal
> 2 Superintendent
> 1 School Board
>
> *The numerical values represent an "idealized" ranking.

An index for centralization was created by computing standard deviations (see the Appendix) for each level in the scale. For this "six-level" scale, a standard deviation of 1.50 or less was considered to be acceptable as indicating perceptual agreement for each school. Upon inspection, it was found that the School Board level was not acceptable because of the great disparity in perception of the relative influence of the School Board. The remaining five categories were weighted against an idealized model of centralized decision making

structure by multiplying each level's school value by its corresponding "idealized" value (Parent-value X 6, PTA-value X 5, etc.). Weighting the categories and adding them together within each school, gave us a numerical value for the concept of centralization. These values ranged from a low of 89.33 to a high of 64.50.[6]

Formalization of rules and procedures. Formalization refers to the manner in which school affairs are conducted; that is, the degree to which rules and procedures are adhered to. Specifically, the school may conduct its affairs on a continuum from very informal to very formal. The following question serves as an index of formalization for this study:

> In some buildings, relationships between teachers and principals tend to be very informal, whereas in others they tend to be mainly businesslike and formal. Of course, the particular individuals involved make a difference, but generally speaking, in your building when teachers and the principal are involved in handling each of the following things, do they tend to handle them more informally or more on a business-like and formal basis?

	How Things are Handled in Your Building			
	Very Informal	Informal	Business-like and Formal	Very Business-like and Formal
1. Selecting required textbooks	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Selecting supplementary reading matter	_____	_____	_____	_____

[6]A high numerical value represents less influence in decision making; whereas a low numerical value represents high influence in decision making.

3. Determining the required courses	____	____	____	____
4. Giving permission to outside groups to speak to students	____	____	____	____
5. Formulating instructional policy	____	____	____	____
6. Promoting a teacher to department head or other supervisory positions	____	____	____	____
7. Determining the percentage of students to be normally passed, failed, etc. (grading curve)	____	____	____	____

An index for formalization was created by attaining an average score of those teachers in each school for each decision. A standard deviation for each category in each school was computed (see the Appendix). On this four-point scale, a standard deviation of 1.00 or less was considered to be acceptable. The values for each quality were added to each other in each school. In order to legitimate this addition, it was necessary to correlate each category with every other category (Inter-Item correlation). The rationale for this method is that if the categories correlate highly with each other (also, a single category with the total of other categories), it is contended that the separate questions are additive and are measuring the same characteristic (Formalization). Table I displays a matrix of these values (the correlation coefficients are Kendall's Tau values; all are significant at the .001 level unless otherwise noted). The values for the index of formalization ranged from a low of 4.00 to a high of 23.50.

TABLE I

MATTRIX OF KENDALL'S TAU FOR INDEX OF FORMALIZATION

	Inter-item Correlations							Item-total Correlations
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1		.5542	.6656	.4427	.7216	.6096	.3313	0.6984
2			.6656	.3313[a]	.3857	.3857	.6656	0.6440
3				.3313[a]	.4977	.4977	.4427	0.6961
4					.3857	.4977	.4427	0.4953
5						.4375	.2737[b]	0.5869
6							.1617[c]	0.6611
7								0.5395

[a]Significant at the .002 level.

[b]Significant at the .009 level.

[c]Significant at the .083 level.

Goals. Goals justify the organization's existence and serve as a basis for gaining resources. Goals are "a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize" (Hall, 1972: 80). The following question was asked of teachers about what they thought were the goals stressed in their specific school:

> Please rank the following educational goals from 1 to 5 in the order that you think the emphasis is actually given to these goals in this school. (1 = highest emphasis, 5 = lowest emphasis).
>
> Critical thinking
> College preparation
> Vocational training
> Character training (moral and religious)
> Citizenship

It is assumed that the qualities of critical thinking and college preparation are manifested in higher socioeconomic school neighborhoods; whereas the quality of vocational training is assumed to be manifested in lower social class school neighborhoods. The qualities of character training and citizenship are also used for exploratory purposes.

In order to arrive at a "school value" for each goal, a mean was computed for each quality within each school. Along with each mean, a standard deviation was computed (see the Appendix). For the five-point scale above, a standard deviation of 1.25 or less was considered acceptable for a quality to be considered a "school value."[7] The following

---

[7]Upon inspection, it is evident that there is a disparity of perception within schools about goals stressed. Nevertheless, statistical analysis will be conducted and further discussion and clarification will be forthcoming in Chapter III.

is the range of scores for each goal.[8]

	Low	High
Critical thinking	5.00	1.50
College preparation	5.00	1.00
Vocational training	5.00	2.00
Character training	4.25	1.00
Citizenship	4.00	1.25

Statistical Analysis

The indices used to measure the variables in this study are assumed, generally, to be of the ordinal level; that is, an underlying continuum exists for all indices. In arriving at "school values" for each variable, interval level statistics were used (the mean and the standard deviation). This study contends that it is justified in using such statistics. In relation to the mean and the standard deviation, one of the major problems with ordinal level data is that extreme scores can inflate these statistics unrealistically. All of the variables used in this study, except weekly contact by parents, are bounded to alleviate this problem. Qualitatively, intervalness of the data is argued for insofar as the indices provide one conception of a measurement of reality just as years of education is one interval conception of educatedness. The primary objective of this study, however, is to measure the degree of

---

[8]A high numerical value represents low emphasis placed on a goal; whereas a low numerical value represents high emphasis placed on a goal.

association between the above stated variables. For this purpose, the ordinal level measure, Goodman's and Kruskal's Gamma, is used. Quantitatively, these data do not meet the rigid assumptions required of the most popular interval measure of association, Pearson's r, and hence, the use of Gamma.

For the tabular presentations which follow in the next chapter, there are certain theoretical, logical and statistical considerations necessary. The tables will be trichotomized along the independent variable, and dichotomized along the dependent variable. As an example of the three above-mentioned considerations, the variable Social Class will suffice. Theoretically, there is a massive amount of literature supporting the contention that, minimally, there are three basic strata in American society: the Upper, Middle, and Lower Classes. Most of the people in the society fall under the heading of Middle-Class. Any definition of the boundaries of these classes is a relatively arbitrary one. Logically this study has trichotomized the 36 school neighborhoods into three equal parts. This is the most conservative means of dissection, if, in fact, the middle stratum is the largest. Statistically, a table with six cells is the maximum size allowable due to the small N of 36 in this study. For purposes of critical analysis of this scheme, all "school values" are presented in the Appendix.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

This chapter will present the data and findings from the testing of the six hypotheses.

Hypothesis I contends that the social class of the school neighborhood is directly associated with the amount of participation in Parent-Teacher Associations by parents. The two measures for participation in the PTA are: (1) the percentage of parents in the boundary of the school attending PTA, and (2) the percentage of parents in the boundary of the school active in PTA concerns.

Table II shows that there is a strong positive association between social class and the percentage of parents attending PTA. Seventeen of the 24 schools in the upper two social class categories manifested relatively high degrees of participation by parents with a degree of association of better than .75. Eleven of the 12 schools in the lowest social class category manifested relatively low participation rates. Almost 76 percent of the variation in parental participation is explained by social class neighborhood residence, supporting the hypothesized relationship.

Table III shows that there is a moderately high positive relationship between social class and the percentage of parents active in PTA concerns. In contrast to Table II, parents in the middle social class category tend to actively participate slightly more than do parents in the Upper-Class category. Nevertheless, social class still explains a

TABLE II

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND PARENTAL ATTENDANCE AT PTA

	Social Class			Total
	High		Low	
Percentage of participation:				
High	(9) 75.0	(8) 66.7	(1) 8.3	18
Low	(3) 25.0	(4) 33.3	(11) 91.7	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.75591

PRE = 76 percent

TABLE III

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND ACTIVE PARENTAL PTA PARTICIPATION

	Social Class			Total
	High		Low	
Percentage of active participation:				
High	(7) 58.3	(10) 83.3	(1) 8.3	18
Low	(5) 41.7	(2) 16.7	(11) 91.7	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.55814

PRE = 56 percent

relatively high amount, almost 56 percent, of the variability in active parental participation in PTA.

There is an important substantive distinction to be made between Tables II and III. Attendance at PTA meetings does not necessarily imply that anything is being accomplished at these meetings. For this study, active participation is assumed to be more important in terms of its effect on school (organizational) structure. From these findings, Hypothesis I is supported very well by the data.

Hypothesis II contends that the social class of the school neighborhood is directly associated with contacts between teachers and parents. The two measures of parental contact are: (1) the percentage of parents of all students in a particular school initiating contact with teachers, and (2) the average weekly contact of parents with teachers.

Table IV shows that there is a moderately high positive relationship between social class and the percentage of parental contact with teachers. Fifteen of the 24 schools in the upper two social class categories manifested relatively high degrees of contact with teachers by parents with a degree of association greater than .61. Ten of the 12 schools in the lowest social class category had relatively low contact rates. Slightly over 61 percent of the variation in parent-initiated contact with teachers is explained by residence within a particular social class neighborhood category, supporting the hypothesized relationship.

Table V shows that there is a strong positive association between social class and weekly parental contact. There is a stronger

TABLE IV

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
Percentage of parental contact:				
High	(8) 66.7	(7) 58.3	(2) 16.7	17
Low	(4) 33.3	(5) 41.7	(10) 83.3	19
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.61017

PRE = 61 percent

TABLE V

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND WEEKLY PARENT CONTACT WITH TEACHERS

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
Weekly parental contact:				
High	(10) 83.3	(5) 41.7	(2) 16.7	17
Low	(2) 16.7	(7) 58.3	(10) 83.3	19
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.77419

PRE = 77 percent

association, .77, than that shown in Table IV, with greater than 77 percent of the variation in weekly parental contact being explained by social class of the school neighborhood. A note of caution, in viewing Table V, is in order. Simple raw figures, as those used in the variable of weekly parental contact, for dealing with this type of situation may be a little misleading because the class size may not always be the same across the 36 schools. Considering this fact, Table IV would be more credible; however, the findings shown in Table IV add credibility to those in Table V for this particular research. Hypothesis II is supported very well by the data. These data, along with those presented in Tables II and III, also add support to previously conducted "client-participation" research such as mentioned in Chapter I.

Hypothesis III contends that parental participation is directly associated with the degree of centralization of decision making in schools. Parental participation, in this case, as an independent variable, was measured in a similar fashion as in Hypothesis II where it was a dependent variable: (1) the percentage of parents in a particular school initiating contact with teachers, and (2) the average weekly contact of parents with teachers. An index for centralization of decision making, the dependent variable, was constructed using an influence ranking (see Chapter II).

Table VI shows that there is a moderately low positive relationship between the percentage of parental contact and the degree of centralization of decision making. In seven of the 12 schools with the greatest parental contact, centralization of decision making in the

TABLE VI

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING IN SCHOOLS

	Percent of Parental Contact			
	High		Low	Total
Centralization:				
High	(7) 58.3	(7) 58.3	(4) 33.3	18
Low	(5) 41.7	(5) 41.7	(8) 66.7	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.32432

PRE = 32 percent

school existed whereas only four of the 12 schools with the least parental contact had a centralized decision making arrangement. Thirty-two percent of the variation in the dependent variable was explained by the percentage of parental contact.

Table VII shows that there is virtually no association between weekly parental contact and the degree of centralization of decision making in the school. As can be seen from Table VII, there is no significant variation between variables. Considering the findings in Table V and the discussion of the variable, weekly parental contact, under Hypothesis II, the lack of variation found in Table VII may be attributable to the lack of stability of this variable, since it was computed from raw scores without concern for the size of the population

TABLE VII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WEEKLY PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING IN SCHOOLS

	Weekly Parental Contact			
	High		Low	Total
Centralization:				
High	(6) 50.0	(7) 58.3	(5) 41.7	18
Low	(6) 50.0	(5) 41.7	(7) 58.3	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.11009

PRE = 11 percent

base from which it came. With this in mind, Hypothesis III is considered to be moderately supported by the data.

Hypothesis IV contends that parental participation is directly associated with the degree of the formalization of rules and procedures in schools. The same two measures of parental participation used in Hypothesis III are used here. An index for the formalization of rules and procedures, the dependent variable, was constructed by combining different teacher-related school procedures (see Chapter II).

Table VIII shows that there is a moderately low negative relationship between the percentage of parental contact and the degree of formalization of rules and procedures in schools. In nine out of the 12 schools with the lowest percentage of parental contact, the rules and procedures

TABLE VIII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS AND THE FORMALIZATION OF RULES AND PROCEDURES IN SCHOOLS

	Percent of Parental Contact			
	High		Low	Total
Formalization:				
High	(5) 41.7	(4) 33.3	(9) 75.0	18
Low	(7) 58.3	(8) 66.7	(3) 25.0	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = -0.41739

PRE = 42 percent

in the school tended to be more formalized; whereas five of the 12 schools with the highest percentage of parental contact were formalized. Forty-two percent of the variation in the dependent variable was explained by the percentage of parental contact.

Table IX shows that there is a moderately low negative relationship between weekly parental contact and the degree of the formalization of rules and procedures in schools. In this case, all of the variation between variables occurs within the upper two categories of parental contact, but in the opposite direction expected by the hypothesis. In view of the findings in Hypotheses III and IV, the result is surprising. Hage and Aiken (1967) contend that as centralization increases so does

TABLE IX

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WEEKLY CONTACT OF PARENTS WITH TEACHERS AND THE FORMALIZATION OF RULES AND PROCEDURES IN SCHOOLS

	Weekly Parental Contact			
	High		Low	Total
Formalization:				
High	(2) 16.7	(10) 83.3	(6) 50.0	18
Low	(10) 83.3	(2) 16.7	(6) 50.0	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = -0.38710

PRE = 38 percent

formalization in organizations and vice-versa. This is obviously not the case here. Further discussion of this matter will be reserved for the next section when the remaining findings which might have relevance are reported. For now, Hypothesis IV is not supported by the data; a negative association is in evidence.

Hypothesis V contends that the educational attainment of teachers is directly associated with the degree of decentralized decision making in the school. Educational attainment was measured simply by asking teachers: Do you have a (1) B.A. or B.S. degree, (2) beyond the Bachelor's but less than a Master's degree, (3) M.A., or (4) beyond M.A.? To measure the dependent variable, the degree of decentralized decision making, an index was constructed using the influence that

different levels in the organization exercised (see Chapter II).

Table X shows that there is a moderately low positive relationship between the educational attainment of teachers and the degree of decentralization of decision making in the school.

TABLE X

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF TEACHERS AND THE DECENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING IN SCHOOLS

	Educational Attainment			
	High		Low	Total
Decentralization:				
High	(8) 66.7	(5) 41.7	(5) 41.7	18
Low	(4) 33.3	(7) 58.3	(7) 58.3	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.32432

PRE = 32 percent

In eight of the 12 schools with the highest level of teacher educational attainment, decision making in the school tended to be more decentralized. The degree of association was a positive .32. In seven of the 12 schools with the lowest level of teacher educational attainment, decision making was less decentralized. Thirty-two percent of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the educational

attainment of teachers. In view of these findings, Hypothesis V is moderately supported by the data.

In viewing Tables VI and X, it becomes apparent that two variables (percentage of parental contact and educational attainment of teachers) are affecting the same dependent variable, centralization (decentralization) of decision making. In order to see if either relationship is spurious, it is important to control for one of the independent variables while the other operates upon the dependent variable. Table XI shows that in schools with higher rates of parental contact, the educational attainment of teachers also affects the structure of decision making; that is, both variables operate in conjunction with one another. In schools with lower rates of parental contact, the data suggest that the educational attainment of teachers has little bearing on the structure of decision making.

TABLE XI

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF TEACHERS AND THE DECENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING IN SCHOOLS CONTROLLING FOR THE PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS

	Percent of Parental Control				
	High		Low		
Educational Attainment	High	Low	High	Low	Total
Decentralization:					
High	(4) 66.7	(4) 33.3	(6) 54.5	(4) 57.1	18
Low	(2) 33.3	(8) 66.7	(5) 45.5	(3) 42.9	18
Total-N	6	12	11	7	36

A major difficulty for this research was in creating a theoretical linkage between the two collectivities of parents and teachers. It was shown in the first chapter that parents by financial support and teachers by working with students are of vital importance to the operation of the school. Without either of these collectivities the school cannot operate. The data show, however, two findings are contrary to most of the literature reviewed concerning the impact of parents and teachers. The first problem is the apparent contradiction between the centralization of decision making and the formalization of rules and procedures. It was hypothesized that as the participation of parents increased so would both the degree of centralization and formalization; the latter two variables were viewed as organizational strategies used by the school administration to maintain a degree of autonomy from parental intervention. Hage and Aiken (1967) support this hypothesized relationship because, in their research of organizations, they found that with an increase in centralization, formalization also increases and vice-versa. Their research has shown an opposite relationship. As an explanation, schools may provide an unusual setting for organizational study: that is, the teachers, as professionals, must work within the school. Much research has shown the difficulty professionals experience in dealing with hierarchically structured organizations. It has also been shown that organizations often have their professional staffs working outside the regular hierarchical chain of the organization. This is, of course, an impossibility for schools, because of the nature of parent-teacher-school relations.

In dealing with the problem of parental intervention, the administrators must, at the same time, satisfy their teachers. In this light,

the findings relevant to centralization of decision making and the formalization of rules and procedures can be explained. Table XII shows that schools having higher degrees of parental contact more frequently have a low degree of formalization but mostly where teacher educational levels are low. Where parental contact rates are lower, the formalization of rules and procedures is more frequently higher but mostly where the educational level of teachers is higher. Table XIII further shows that with the exception of schools with highly centralized decision making structures, there is a moderately negative relationship between centralization and formalization. In placing the decision making within schools into higher offices, teachers' control over their work domain is limited to an extent, but by slackening the stress placed on adherence to rules and procedures, the administration may hope to appease its teachers.

The rationale presented above introduces a second problem for a theoretical linkage between the two collectivities of parents and teachers. Hypothesis V asserted that as the educational attainment of teachers increases in schools, the centralization of decision making decreases. This hypothesis was supported by the data and presents no grave problem for this study; however, upon further analysis, an important substantive issue arises. Becker (1953), Sexton (1967), and others have noted that "better" teachers tend to work in higher SES schools. If this is the case, it would make Hypothesis V contradictory to Hypothesis III which relates participation with centralization of decision making in this sense. If participation rates are higher in higher SES school neighborhoods and if "better" teachers are found in higher SES schools, a higher

TABLE XII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF TEACHERS AND THE FORMALIZATION OF RULES AND PROCEDURES IN SCHOOLS CONTROLLING FOR THE PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS

Educational Attainment	Percent of Parental Contact				Total
	High		Low		
	High	Low	High	Low	
Formalization:					
High	(3) 50.0	(2) 16.7	(9) 81.8	(4) 57.1	18
Low	(3) 50.0	(10) 83.3	(2) 18.2	(3) 42.9	18
Total-N	6	12	11	7	36

TABLE XIII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FORMALIZATION OF RULES AND PROCEDURES AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING IN SCHOOLS

	Centralization			Total
	High		Low	
Formalization:				
High	(4) 33.3	(5) 41.7	(3) 25.0	12
Middle	(4) 33.3	(4) 33.3	(4) 33.3	12
Low	(4) 33.3	(3) 25.0	(5) 41.7	12
Total-N	12	12	12	36

degree of centralization cannot exist in the former case, while a lower degree of centralization exists in the latter case. This contradiction lies in the ambiguity of the term "better teachers." Outside the realm of teaching techniques, the term "better teachers" can be operationalized as the years of experience of the teacher, and the educational attainment of the teacher. These are the two major means by which the term "better teachers" is operationalized in the literature. This study makes no claim as to what a "better" teacher is, it presents only a rationale for "professionalism" through the use of the variable, educational attainment of teachers.

Tables XIV and XV represent tests conducted upon the assertions made by the literature that "better" teachers tend to be in higher SES schools. Table XIV shows that there is virtually no association between social class standing of schools and the years of experience of their teaching staffs. If anything significant does exist, it can be seen that eight of the 12 schools in the highest social class level have teaching staffs whose experience is in the lower level.

Table XV shows that there is a moderately low negative relationship between social class standing of schools and the educational attainment of their teaching staffs. Only nine of the 24 schools in the highest two social class levels have teaching staffs with educational attainment in the higher level; whereas, eight of the 12 schools in the lowest social class level have teaching staffs in the higher level of educational attainment. Thirty-two percent of the variation in the dependent variable was explained by social class standing.

TABLE XIV

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF SCHOOLS' TEACHING STAFFS

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
Years of experience:				
High	(4) 33.3	(8) 66.7	(6) 50.0	18
Low	(8) 66.7	(4) 33.3	(6) 50.0	18
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = -0.21429

PRE = 21 percent

TABLE XV

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF SCHOOLS' TEACHING STAFFS

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
Educational attainment:				
High	(5) 41.7	(4) 33.3	(8) 66.7	17
Low	(7) 58.3	(8) 66.7	(4) 33.3	19
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = -0.32143

PRE = 32 percent

These findings, in conjunction with the discussion thus far, aid in an understanding of the relationship between the collectivities of parents and teachers. Becker (1953) has noted that teachers feel threatened by outside interference and this is manifested, in this study, by the "better" teaching staffs being in the lower social class schools where parental participation rates are lower. These findings also reflect a situation in which control of decision making is seemingly more important to more "professional teachers" than whether a school's operations are run along formal or informal lines.

Hypothesis VI contends that the social class of the school neighborhood is positively associated with schools stressing Middle-Class goals and negatively associated with those stressing Lower-Class goals. The qualities of critical thinking and college preparation were assumed to be stressed more by higher social class neighborhoods, while vocational training was assumed to be stressed more by lower social class neighborhoods. The qualities of character training and citizenship were also examined for exploratory purposes.

Table XVI shows that there is a moderately low positive relationship between social class of the school neighborhood and stress placed on critical thinking. Eight of the 12 schools in the highest social class category manifested a relatively high degree of stress placed on critical thinking. Eight of the 12 schools in the lowest social class category placed little emphasis on critical thinking. Over 42 percent of the variation in critical thinking is explained by social class of the school neighborhood. This moderately supports the predicted relationship.

TABLE XVI

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE EDUCATIONAL GOAL OF CRITICAL THINKING

	Social Class			Total
	High		Low	
Critical thinking:				
High	(8) 66.7	(4) 33.3	(4) 33.3	16
Low	(4) 33.3	(8) 66.7	(8) 66.7	20
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.42857

PRE = 42 percent

Table XVII shows that there is a moderately high positive relationship between social class and stress placed on college preparation. Similar findings are in evidence in Table XVII as were found in Table XVI. Slightly less than 52 percent of the variation in stress placed on college preparation is explained by social class of the school neighborhood. Thus far, the hypothesis relating social class to different goals is well supported.

Table XVIII shows that there is a strong negative association between social class of the school neighborhood and stress placed on vocational training. Eleven of the 12 schools in the lowest social class category placed a high degree of emphasis on vocational training. Ten of the 12 schools in the highest social class category placed a low

TABLE XVII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE EDUCATIONAL GOAL OF COLLEGE PREPARATION

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
College preparation:				
High	(9) 75.0	(4) 33.3	(4) 33.3	17
Low	(3) 25.0	(8) 66.7	(8) 66.7	19
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.51724

PRE = 52 percent

TABLE XVIII

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE EDUCATIONAL GOAL OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
Vocational training:				
High	(2) 16.7	(4) 33.3	(11) 91.7	17
Low	(10) 83.3	(8) 66.7	(1) 8.3	19
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = -0.83077

PRE = 83 percent

degree of emphasis on vocational training. Slightly over 83 percent of the variation of the dependent variable is explained by social class of the school neighborhood. This coincides very well with the predicted relationship.

These findings lend empirical support to Melvin Kohn's scheme presented in Chapter I as well as support for Hypothesis VI which was derived from the scheme. As is seen in Tables XVI and XVII, the stronger of the two relationships is that of social class with college preparation. This is quite plausible because of the findings in Table XVIII. There seems to be a clearer distinction between college preparation and vocational training than between critical thinking and vocational training. The choice is straightforward in the former case: a choice between college or vocational school; whereas in the latter case the choice becomes more vague. Critical thinking is predictable but as these data show, college preparation is more predictable by social class level.

Table XIX shows that there is virtually no association between social class of the school neighborhood and stress placed on character training. As can be seen in the tabular presentation, there is minimal variation between the variables.

Table XX shows that there is a moderately low positive relationship between social class and stress placed on citizenship. Seven of the 12 schools in the highest social class category placed a relatively high emphasis on citizenship. Eight of the 12 schools in the lowest social class category placed a relatively low degree of emphasis on citizenship. Slightly more than 32 percent of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by social class.

TABLE XIX

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE EDUCATIONAL GOAL OF CHARACTER TRAINING

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
Character training:				
High	(5) 41.7	(8) 66.7	(4) 33.3	17
Low	(7) 58.3	(4) 33.3	(8) 66.7	19
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.10714

PRE = 10 percent

TABLE XX

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL CLASS OF THE SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE EDUCATIONAL GOAL OF CITIZENSHIP

	Social Class			
	High		Low	Total
Citizenship:				
High	(7) 58.3	(6) 50.0	(4) 33.3	17
Low	(5) 41.7	(6) 50.0	(8) 66.7	19
Total-N	12	12	12	36

Gamma = 0.32727

PRE = 32 percent

Due to the relatively high degree of association among the variables in the hypothesized relationship, these latter two qualities of character training and citizenship are deemed to be of relative unimportance for the purposes of this study. The importance of these findings is reflected in the fact that parents have influence in determining the direction their children's education should take. This is not a very significant statement concerning higher social class schools where parental participation rates are high and parental concerns are in evidence. The above statement takes a much more significant stance when it is seen that lower class concerns are reflected in schools where parental intervention is minimal. This will be dealt with at greater length in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

This final section consists of a listing of the hypotheses tested; a summary statement of the findings; and a brief discussion of some alternative means of studying the impact of parents and teachers on the organizational structure of schools.

Hypothesis I: Social class of the school neighborhood is directly associated with the amount of participation in parent-teacher associations by parents.

Hypothesis II: Social class of the school neighborhood is directly associated with contacts between teachers and parents.

Hypothesis III: Client participation is directly associated with the degree of the centralization of decision making in schools.

Hypothesis IV: Client participation is directly associated with the degree of the formalization of rules and procedures in schools.

Hypothesis V: Educational attainment of teachers in a school is directly associated with decentralized decision making in the school.

Hypothesis VI: Social class of the school neighborhood is positively associated with schools stressing

Middle-Class goals and negatively associated with those stressing Lower-Class goals.

Both Hypotheses I and II were supported by the data giving credence to previously conducted research in the area and providing an understanding that differential pressure is placed upon schools by the social class standing of the neighborhood in which the school is located. Hypotheses III and IV are concerned with the effect of parental intervention on two structural variables of the school: (1) centralization of decision making, and (2) the formalization of rules and procedures. The third hypothesis was supported by the data showing that parental intervention tends to pressure decision making authority into higher offices within the school. The fourth hypothesis was not supported by the data; as a matter of fact, quite an opposite relationship occurred lending support to one interpretation that informality in school operations is an organizational strategy used to appease teachers when a degree of autonomy over decision making control is lost due to parental intervention.

In conjunction with parents placing pressure on the school, teachers also intervene in school operations, but for different reasons. Parents legitimate their intervention because they provide the financial resource for the school and it is their children who are served. Teachers intervene because they assume themselves to be skilled professionals and hence, require control over their work domain. Hypothesis V was supported by the data showing that the educational attainment of teachers (an indicator of exposure to professional ideals) places pressure on the school to decentralize its decision making.

Finally, Hypothesis VI was supported by the data showing that the educational goals stressed by schools are dependent upon the social class setting in which the school is located.

In retrospect, there is one major shortcoming in this research. This study provides no means to account for why schools in lower social class neighborhoods reflect Lower-Class educational goals. In higher social class schools, the degree of parental intervention serves as an explanation for why particular educational goals are manifested but this cannot help explain the situation in lower social class schools where parental intervention is relatively minimal. Further confounding the problem is the fact that teachers are the product of Middle-Class colleges and universities and would be expected to possess Middle-Class values, and given the relative amount of freedom from parental intervention in lower social class schools, it would be expected that teachers would profess higher social class educational goals in lower social class schools. On the other hand, teachers may have the best interests of both students and parents in mind. Teachers may feel that Lower-Class children have little chance of going to college primarily because of financial considerations, and they would do better by preparing children for vocational training.

This study has demonstrated that the environment can be viewed in interaction with the organization. Parents and teachers have been shown to be two collectivities which put pressure on administrators who are primarily concerned with an "efficiently" operating school. Both collectivities have legitimate claims for their viewpoints. This study may

serve all three groups by providing a view of the roles that each group plays in relation to the others. The parents are concerned with the education of their children; teachers provide this education; and school administrators coordinate the delivery of education. This relatively crude model is not unlike a patient-doctor-hospital administrator or parishioner-minister-church administrator model of service organizations. Each element in the relationship is a necessary part of the organization. The implication to be drawn from this is that boundaries of competence are an essential characteristic for an efficiently operating organization; that is, each component in the school has its own contribution to make. Parents should provide as much information as possible to teachers concerning their attitudes and values, analogous to the medical history of patients. It is then the responsibility of teachers, as skilled professionals, to deliver the service, being aware of the clients' wishes as doctors would be aware of patients' wishes. Finally, it is the function of school administrators to coordinate the delivery of the services providing the physical plants and appropriate environments, analogous to hospital administrators coordinating the delivery of medical services.

The model presented above is certainly an idealized conception, and if it did exist in reality, the necessity for this study would be questionable. It was the purpose of this research to explicate the dynamics of the organization-collectivities relationship in the educational system. Questions may arise as to the validity and reliability of the indicators of these dynamics. Future research in this area should be concerned with developing clearer measures of the variables

in this study relevant to the three major components of parents, teachers, and school administration. Parental participation has been equated, to an extent, with intervention by parents in school operations. A more concise picture of what parents do at PTA meetings and individually with teachers is necessary. In relation to teachers, further elaboration would be helpful; not just in terms of their formal credentials and years of experience, but also in terms of teaching techniques and their relationships with their clients. Finally, a more in-depth view into the workings of the decision making process would clarify the positions taken by school administrators. This study has merely scratched the surface in exposing the complexity involved in doing research in this area. It is hoped that the implication to be drawn from this is that parents, teachers, and administrators need studies to help provide a greater understanding of the dynamics of the educational system.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Adams, Raymond S., et al.
1970 "School Size, Organizational Structure, and Teaching Practices." Educational Administration Quarterly, 6 (Autumn): 15-31.

Anderson, Barry
1971 "Socio-Economic Status of Students and School Bureaucratization." Educational Administration Quarterly, 7 (Spring): 12-24.

Axlerod, Morris
1956 "Urban Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review, 21 (February): 13-19.

Becker, Howard S.
1953 "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School." Journal of Educational Sociology, 27 (November): 128-141.

Bell, Wendell and Marganne T. Force
1956 "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations." American Sociological Review, 21 (February): 25-34.

Corwin, Ronald G.
1965 A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Firestone, William
1972 "Community Organizations and School Reform: A Case Study." A paper presented to the convention of the Midwest Sociological Society.

Foskett, John M.
1955 "Social Structure and Social Participation." American Sociological Review, 20 (August): 431-438.

Gordon, C. Wayne and Nicholas Babchuck
1959 "A Typology of Voluntary Associations." American Sociological Review, 24 (February): 22-29.

Hage, Jerald and Michael Aiken
1967 "Relationship of Centralization to Structural Properties." Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (June: 72-92.

Hall, Richard H.
1972 Organizations: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hollister, Clifton David
1966 "Bureaucratic Structure and School-Parent Communication in Eighteen Detroit Elementary Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

1972 "School Bureaucracy as a Response to Parents' Demands." A paper presented to the sixty-seventh annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, Louisiana (August 28-31).

Kohn, Melvin L.
1959 "Social Class and Parental Values." American Journal of Sociology, 64 (January): 337-351.

1959 "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority." American Sociological Review, 24 (June): 352-366.

Lenski, Gerhard E.
1956 "Social Participation and Status Crystalization," American Sociological Review, 21 (August): 458-464.

Lortie, Dan C.
1969 "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." In Amitai Etzioni (ed.), The Semi Professions and Their Organization. New York: The Free Press. Pp. 1-53.

Pavalko, Ronald M.
1971 Sociology of Occupations and Professions. Stasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo
1967 The American School: A Sociological Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Sieber, Sam D. and David E. Wilder
1967 "Teaching Styles: Parental Preferences and Professional Role Definitions." Sociology of Education, 40 (Fall): 302-315.

Simpson, Richard L. and William H. Gulley
1962 "Goals, Environmental Pressures, and Organizational Characteristics." American Sociological Review, 27 (June): 344-351.

Thompson, James D. and William J. McEwen
1958 "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal-Setting an Interaction Process." American Sociological Review, 23 (February): 23-31.

Wilensky, Harold L.
1964 "The Professionalization of Everyone?" American Journal of Sociology, 70 (September): 137-158.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

TABLE XXI

NUMBER OF TEACHERS SAMPLED WITHIN EACH SCHOOL BY SOCIAL CLASS RANKING OF SCHOOLS

$\overline{X}$ H	M	L
6	2	9
10	6	6
10	2	9
7	5	4
10	5	8
8	6	13
10	4	7
4	4	8
5	4	5
6	5	3
6	5	4
9	6	6

TABLE XXII

SCHOOL VALUES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF TEACHERS BY SOCIAL CLASS RANKING OF SCHOOLS

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
1.83	1.00	1.89	1.17	0.00	0.60
1.30	2.00	1.33	0.48	1.73	0.52
1.89	1.50	1.56	0.78	0.00	1.01
1.86	1.40	1.75	1.21	0.89	0.96
1.40	1.80	2.13	0.52	0.84	0.64
1.29	1.17	1.77	0.49	0.41	0.93
1.78	1.25	2.00	0.83	0.50	0.58
1.25	1.75	1.63	0.50	1.50	0.74
1.40	1.67	2.00	1.14	0.58	0.71
1.17	1.80	2.00	0.41	0.84	0.00
2.00	1.60	2.00	0.63	0.89	1.41
1.11	1.80	1.83	0.33	1.30	1.17

TABLE XXIII

SCHOOL VALUES FOR THE PERCENTAGE OF PTA PARTICIPATION AND THE PERCENTAGE OF ACTIVE PTA PARTICIPATION BY SOCIAL CLASS RANKING OF SCHOOLS

Percentage of PTA Participation			Percentage of Active PTA Participation		
$\overline{X}$ H	M	L	$\overline{X}$ H	M	L
29.50	17.90	11.10	4.40	15.10	1.60
17.30	16.80	2.40	8.70	5.00	2.40
0.00	12.70	1.70	0.00	8.40	0.90
17.60	10.50	4.00	14.70	5.10	2.00
9.30	0.00	0.00	1.10	0.00	0.00
22.40	19.70	16.10	17.20	7.90	7.20
8.60	13.00	0.00	4.30	13.00	0.00
15.40	36.60	8.90	8.20	21.10	4.80
30.50	22.60	2.30	9.50	5.60	2.00
12.00	9.40	4.60	2.70	6.30	2.80
16.20	14.70	0.00	6.50	5.90	0.00
22.40	10.30	2.90	9.00	4.80	2.90

TABLE XXIV

SCHOOL VALUES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE PERCENTAGE OF PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS AND THE WEEKLY PARENTAL CONTACT WITH TEACHERS BY SOCIAL CLASS RANKING OF SCHOOLS

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
		Percentage of Parental Contact			
79.67	42.50	17.67	18.28	0.00	11,05
49.88	37.00	27.67	43.92	44.10	24.63
56.50	47.50	15.88	36.80	0.00	11.89
47.83	18.75	55.50	33.17	9.46	30.07
54.50	36.00	23.57	38.42	26.08	23.43
53.38	56.80	23.00	34.23	31.72	20.58
55.33	49.00	30.00	32.07	38.31	24.90
30.75	48.75	45.88	41.72	22.50	23.22
31.80	44.50	29.00	39.35	46.95	33.24
28.75	51.80	26.67	13.15	31.56	20.82
52.33	47.80	39.50	51.18	39.30	34.99
28.89	15.17	18.00	40.31	11.65	18.99
		Parental Weekly Contact			
5.83	1.00	1.38	2.48	0.00	1.19
2.67	0.75	0.83	2.40	0.96	0.75
2.43	0.50	1.71	1.27	0.00	2.81
2.17	1.60	1.33	1.47	0.55	0.58
1.90	1.40	0.86	1.37	1.34	0.69
2.13	3.33	0.83	1.36	3.44	1.40
1.78	0.50	0.86	1.64	0.58	0.90
1.7	1.50	3.57	2.22	1.00	3.46
3.60	1.67	1.20	3.71	1.53	0.84
1.00	6.20	1.33	0.71	10.55	1.53
7.17	1.20	1.50	12.38	0.84	1.00
1.33	2.00	1.00	1.12	0.89	0.89

TABLE XXV

SCHOOL VALUES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE LEVELS AND INDEX OF THE CENTRALIZATION OF DECISION MAKING IN SCHOOLS BY SOCIAL CLASS RANKING OF SCHOOLS

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
		Parents			
3.83	5.00	5.00	1.17	0.00	1.00
2.63	4.50	4.67	1.60	1.29	0.52
5.13	3.00	5.29	0.99	0.00	1.10
5.00	5.33	4.33	0.63	0.58	1.15
3.60	4.50	4.71	1.84	1.00	0.76
5.13	5.17	5.20	0.64	0.41	1.03
5.00	5.67	5.14	0.71	0.58	0.90
4.50	5.00	4.00	1.00	0.82	1.41
5.80	5.50	5.00	0.45	0.00	0.82
4.80	4.20	5.67	0.84	1.10	0.58
5.75	4.25	5.00	0.50	1.50	0.00
5.44	5.00	4.17	1.13	1.10	1.33
		PTA			
4.83	6.00	4.44	0.75	0.00	1.13
5.33	5.50	6.00	0.87	1.00	0.00
5.38	5.50	4.43	0.74	0.00	1.27
5.67	5.67	5.33	0.52	0.58	1.15
5.33	3.60	5.29	1.32	1.95	1.50
5.38	5.50	5.40	1.06	0.84	0.52
4.89	5.33	4.29	1.17	0.58	1.11
4.75	5.00	4.80	1.26	1.41	1.10
5.20	5.50	5.50	0.45	0.00	0.58
5.40	4.60	5.33	0.89	0.89	1.15
5.25	4.75	5.33	0.50	0.96	2.04
4.67	5.33	5.17	0.71	0.82	
		Teachers			
2.17	4.00	3.78	0.41	0.00	1.56
4.75	3.50	3.33	1.49	1.29	1.03
3.25	2.00	4.14	1.04	0.00	1.21
3.83	4.00	3.00	0.41	0.00	1.73
3.60	2.50	4.00	0.97	1.00	0.63
3.50	3.50	3.64	0.76	0.84	1.21
4.11	3.00	3.00	1.17	1.73	1.53

TABLE XXV (continued)

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
3.75	3.00	3.80	1.71	1.15	1.48
2.80	4.00	3.75	1.64	0.00	0.50
3.80	3.40	4.00	1.30	1.82	0.00
2.50	2.25	4.67	1.73	1.26	1.15
3.11	3.67	3.33	1.17	0.82	0.82
		Principal			
1.17	3.00	2.33	0.41	0.00	1.41
2.50	2.25	2.33	1.20	0.96	1.03
2.00	1.00	2.14	1.07	0.00	1.07
2.83	3.00	2.33	0.41	0.00	0.58
2.40	1.50	3.29	0.97	1.00	1.25
2.00	1.67	2.09	0.93	1.03	1.04
2.56	2.67	1.71	0.88	0.58	0.95
3.00	1.50	1.40	1.63	1.00	0.89
2.60	3.00	2.40	1.14	0.00	0.89
2.40	2.20	3.00	0.89	1.30	0.00
3.00	1.75	3.00	0.82	0.96	0.00
2.33	2.50	3.17	0.87	0.84	1.33
		Superintendent			
4.67	2.00	2.78	1.03	0.00	1.30
3.13	2.25	2.33	1.73	1.26	0.52
2.75	4.00	2.14	1.39	0.00	1.46
1.67	2.00	2.33	0.52	0.00	2.31
2.70	4.25	2.14	1.42	1.50	1.35
2.00	2.83	1.89	1.31	1.60	0.60
1.89	2.00	3.00	1.27	1.00	1.73
2.25	3.00	3.20	1.89	1.41	1.79
2.20	1.50	1.80	0.45	0.00	0.45
2.00	2.60	1.67	0.71	1.34	0.58
2.00	4.25	1.67	0.82	1.71	0.58
2.33	2.17	2.83	1.41	1.47	1.83
		School Board			
4.33	1.00	2.67	2.07	0.00	2.18
2.75	2.33	2.33	1.39	2.31	2.07
2.50	5.50	2.86	1.69	0.00	1.68
2.00	1.00	3.67	2.00	0.00	2.08
3.30	4.00	2.00	2.11	2.45	1.53
3.00	2.33	2.00	1.69	1.21	1.12

TABLE XXV (continued)

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
2.56	2.33	3.86	2.01	1.53	1.95
2.75	3.50	3.80	2.22	2.08	2.05
2.40	1.50	2.40	1.34	0.00	2.19
2.60	4.00	1.33	2.30	2.74	0.58
2.50	3.75	1.33	1.29	2.22	0.58
3.11	2.33	2.33	2.15	1.97	1.75
		Index of Centralization			
68.66	89.00	79.87			
75.19	79.75	82.99			
82.18	64.50	81.15			
85.50	89.33	76.28			
75.25	68.00	84.86			
81.68	83.19	82.81			
82.35	84.68	75.42			
79.25	77.50	73.80			
84.20	88.50	83.30			
82.20	73.60	89.01			
83.75	72.00	87.67			
80.08	83.17	79.36			

TABLE XXVI

SCHOOL VALUES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE QUALITIES AND INDEX OF THE FORMALIZATION OF RULES AND PROCEDURES IN SCHOOLS BY SOCIAL CLASS RANKING OF SCHOOLS

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
		Required Textbooks			
2.80	0.00	2.57	0.84	0.00	0.53
2.00	2.25	2.50	0.63	0.50	0.00
2.43	0.00	2.75	0.53	0.00	0.46
2.33	2.50	3.00	1.03	0.00	0.00
2.44	2.60	3.50	0.53	0.55	0.76
2.43	2.33	3.29	0.79	0.52	1.01
3.00	2.00	2.73	0.00	0.00	0.55
4.00	3.00	3.50	0.00	0.00	0.82
2.00	2.33	2.33	0.82	0.58	0.45
2.50	1.80	3.20	0.58	0.84	0.00
2.00	2.33	4.00	0.89	0.58	0.58
2.88	2.00	2.50	0.99	0.82	0.63
		Supplementary Reading			
2.75	0.00	2.86	0.96	0.00	0.38
1.71	2.00	2.00	0.76	0.71	0.00
2.29	1.00	2.57	0.49	0.00	0.53
2.00	3.00	3.50	0.58	0.00	0.00
2.50	2.20	3.00	0.53	0.45	0.58
2.14	2.33	2.64	0.38	0.52	0.92
2.50	2.00	3.20	0.53	0.00	0.45
4.00	2.50	2.57	0.00	0.00	0.98
1.75	2.33	2.20	0.50	0.58	0.45
2.20	1.75	3.30	0.45	0.84	1.15
1.83	2.00	2.50	0.75	0.58	0.58
2.88	2.00	3.17	0.99	0.82	0.41
		Required Courses			
3.00	0.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.82
2.43	2.60	2.50	1.13	0.55	0.00
2.75	3.00	3.13	0.46	0.00	0.64
2.33	2.50	3.50	1.03	0.00	0.00
2.78	2.60	3.60	0.67	0.55	0.55
2.71	2.80	3.33	0.49	0.84	0.50
2.83	1.50	3.60	0.41	0.00	0.55
4.00	3.00	2.86	0.00	0.00	0.90

TABLE XXVI (continued)

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
2.75	2.50	3.00	0.96	0.00	0.00
3.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.75	2.67	3.00	0.96	0.58	0.00
3.25	2.40	3.40	0.89	0.89	0.55
		Outside Speakers			
3.25	2.00	2.71	0.50	0.00	0.76
2.25	2.80	2.67	0.89	0.45	0.58
2.83	0.00	2.80	0.75	0.00	0.45
2.00	2.50	2.50	0.89	0.00	0.00
2.67	3.25	3.67	0.50	0.50	0.52
2.57	2.80	3.38	0.53	0.45	0.52
2.44	2.00	3.00	0.88	0.00	0.63
1.67	3.00	2.50	1.15	0.00	0.84
1.88	3.00	2.80	0.84	0.00	0.45
3.33	1.33	2.67	0.58	0.58	1.15
2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
2.50	2.40	3.50	0.76	0.89	0.55
		Instructional Policy			
2.67	0.00	3.00	0.58	0.00	0.63
2.57	2.60	2.40	0.98	0.55	0.55
3.00	2.00	3.00	0.63	0.00	0.00
2.00	2.67	2.50	0.89	0.58	0.00
2.50	3.00	3.25	0.53	0.71	0.50
2.86	2.50	2.91	0.38	0.55	0.70
3.00	2.00	3.60	0.71	0.00	0.55
4.00	3.00	2.33	0.00	0.00	0.58
1.80	2.00	2.75	0.84	0.00	0.50
3.50	3.00	2.67	0.58	0.00	1.15
2.00	2.00	3.25	1.00	0.00	0.50
2.75	2.25	3.50	0.89	0.96	0.55
		Promoting Teachers			
2.50	0.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.63
3.00	2.75	3.00	1.73	0.50	0.00
2.75	0.00	3.00	0.50	0.00	0.71
2.00	2.50	3.00	0.89	0.00	0.00
2.78	3.00	3.60	0.44	0.82	0.55
3.14	3.00	3.29	0.69	0.82	0.49

TABLE XXVI (continued)

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
3.00	2.00	3.40	0.71	0.00	0.55
4.00	3.00	2.50	0.00	0.00	0.58
2.33	3.00	3.00	1.53	0.00	0.00
4.00	2.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	1.15
2.22	2.00	3.33	0.84	0.00	0.58
2.57	2.50	3.50	0.79	1.29	0.55
		Passing Students			
2.50	2.00	2.43	1.00	0.00	0.79
2.00	2.00	2.00	0.89	0.82	0.00
2.50	0.00	2.83	0.58	0.00	0.41
2.00	2.67	3.00	0.89	0.58	0.00
2.70	2.00	3.17	0.67	1.00	0.41
2.40	2.50	2.50	0.55	0.55	0.93
2.33	1.67	3.00	0.71	0.58	0.71
1.67	3.00	2.57	1.15	0.00	0.79
2.00	2.50	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
2.75	1.80	2.67	0.50	0.84	1.15
2.00	1.75	3.00	0.71	0.50	0.82
2.63	2.50	2.67	0.74	1.29	1.03
		Index of Formalization			
19.47	4.00	19.57			
15.96	17.00	17.07			
18.55	6.00	20.08			
14.66	18.34	21.50			
18.37	18.65	23.58			
18.25	18.26	20.78			
19.10	13.17	23.30			
23.34	20.50	17.66			
14.43	17.66	18.95			
21.28	13.68	22.67			
13.78	14.75	20.50			
19.46	16.05	22.74			

TABLE XXVII

SCHOOL VALUES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL GOALS BY SOCIAL CLASS RANKING OF SCHOOLS

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
		Critical Thinking			
2.50	1.50	2.17	0.58	0.00	1.17
1.75	1.67	1.83	0.46	1.03	0.98
2.75	3.00	3.86	1.67	0.00	0.90
3.57	4.67	4.75	1.51	0.58	0.50
2.88	3.00	2.83	0.99	1.63	1.47
2.86	4.00	3.63	1.35	0.89	0.74
4.00	3.30	3.14	1.00	0.58	1.21
5.00	3.00	2.67	0.00	1.41	1.86
3.50	3.00	3.20	0.58	1.00	1.48
2.25	1.75	3.50	1.50	0.96	0.00
2.40	2.33	3.00	1.34	1.15	2.00
2.75	4.17	3.50	1.28	1.33	1.29
		College Preparation			
3.50	4.50	3.33	1.73	0.00	1.97
1.43	3.50	4.00	1.13	1.38	1.55
2.13	5.00	3.50	1.64	0.00	1.97
2.29	1.67	2.00	1.38	1.15	0.82
2.78	4.33	2.17	1.79	1.15	1.33
2.71	3.50	3.29	1.60	1.97	1.50
3.71	4.67	2.86	1.10	0.58	1.35
1.00	4.75	4.00	0.00	0.50	1.55
3.00	2.33	2.20	1.00	1.53	1.30
4.00	2.50	5.00	2.00	1.00	0.00
2.17	3.67	4.00	1.47	2.31	1.73
2.75	2.00	3.25	1.39	1.67	1.71
		Vocational Training			
4.50	4.50	3.67	0.58	0.00	1.03
4.43	4.50	3.17	0.98	0.84	1.17
4.13	4.00	2.33	1.13	0.00	1.03
4.43	3.67	3.25	0.98	1.53	1.71
4.75	4.00	2.50	0.46	0.00	1.64
5.00	3.83	3.13	0.00	0.75	1.64
4.14	4.00	3.57	0.69	1.00	1.51
2.00	3.75	3.50	0.00	0.96	1.22
3.67	3.67	3.20	2.31	2.31	1.64

TABLE XXVII (continued)

$\bar{X}$ H	M	L	S H	M	L
4.25	2.50	3.50	0.50	1.73	0.00
4.40	4.33	3.67	1.34	0.58	0.58
5.00	3.00	3.75	0.00	1.55	0.96
		Character Training			
3.00	3.00	3.17	1.41	0.00	1.17
3.86	2.50	3.50	0.69	1.05	1.38
3.00	1.50	2.71	0.76	0.00	1.38
2.71	2.25	2.50	0.76	0.50	1.29
2.33	1.75	3.67	1.12	0.96	1.21
2.14	1.50	2.56	0.38	0.55	1.24
1.57	1.33	3.29	0.53	0.58	1.38
4.00	1.50	2.86	0.00	0.58	1.07
2.25	3.30	3.80	1.89	1.53	1.64
2.50	4.25	1.00	0.58	1.50	0.00
3.17	3.00	2.33	1.33	1.00	1.53
2.88	2.67	3.25	0.64	0.82	1.50
		Citizenship			
1.50	1.50	2.67	1.00	0.00	1.63
3.25	2.83	2.50	1.04	1.33	1.38
3.00	1.50	2.14	1.31	0.00	1.21
2.00	2.25	2.50	1.15	1.50	1.29
2.11	1.75	3.83	0.78	0.50	1.17
2.29	2.17	1.89	0.95	0.75	1.36
1.57	1.67	2.14	0.79	0.58	1.68
3.00	2.00	2.57	0.00	0.82	1.40
2.00	2.67	2.60	0.82	1.53	1.14
2.00	4.00	2.00	0.82	0.00	0.00
2.40	1.67	2.00	0.89	0.58	1.00
1.63	3.17	1.25	0.74	1.17	0.50

VITA

Karlheinz Helmut Paul was born in Hamilton, Ohio, on August 22 1950. He attended elementary school in Fort Lee, New Jersey. He entered St. Francis Xavier Military Academy in New York City in 1964, and graduated in June, 1968. In September of that same year, he entered the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and received a Bachelor of Science degree in Sociology four years later, August, 1972. In September of that year, he entered the graduate program in Sociology at the same institution, and received his Master of Arts degree in March, 1975.